

Walker, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallingford, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wayne, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weaver, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, Lance C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiss, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiss, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wells, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wells, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheelock, Johnny B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitton, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Widmer, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilde, Linn E. III., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wildman, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Alan P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Wilson, Barry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wohlman, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolfert, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wooten, Marc A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worth, Brian D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Donald O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yaap, Henry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yasuhara, Thomas T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yeilding, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 York, Jeffrey P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yucuis, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zdanuk, Anthony F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Barton, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bower, Ralph E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burden, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cathcart, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chafin, James T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conley, Adrain C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crewse, Douglas O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dejonckheere, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fletcher, William A. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hulse, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirk, Flayo O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lengnick, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lennon, Mark P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luce, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Ted A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McConnell, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muir, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oxford, Vayl S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robbe, Adrian D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Winfield W. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stinson, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weidner, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Westenhoff, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 541 and 8284, title 10, United States Code, date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MANY STOOD BEHIND HANK
HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADEN
 OF OKLAHOMA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. McSPADEN. Mr. Speaker, on the night of April 8, 1974, at 9:07 p.m., in Atlanta, Ga., a 40-year-old professional baseball player named Hank Aaron blasted a baseball 385 feet over the left field fence. That is not the first time Hank had blasted a home run, nor was it the longest. The notable fact was that particular home run established an all-time world's record for the most home runs hit by any one player.

Hank Aaron was the man who held the bat, but behind the former shoeshine boy who accomplished this feat, stood a long line of precursors, other men, black and white, which made that historic moment possible. It is a moment in history which all Americans share because all Americans, regardless of race, creed, national origin or religion, are a nation of achievers.

Henry Aaron held the wood which made that moment in history possible in which he eclipsed the world's record for home runs previously held by the great Babe Ruth. There will be constant and never ending discussions and debates concerning minor points: that the Babe hit his in fewer games; that the Babe hit more in one season; there will be many sessions of avid fans who will have topics of conversations for years to come. Irrespective of the discussions and debates, behind Hank Aaron we find many instances of innovators and explorers such as the black who sailed with Christopher Columbus on the voyage which discovered the New World. Behind Henry Aaron was the black, who with the Spanish Conquistadore Coronado roamed what is now Mexico and the great Midwest of the United States in search of the fabled and elusive golden villages of Fiddola.

Behind Henry Aaron was Crispus Attucks, a black slain by panicky British troops on the streets of Boston two centuries ago. Further, behind Hank Aaron stood Mathew Henson, a black companion of Admiral Perry and the man who actually planted the Flag of the United States at the North Pole. Further back behind Hank Aaron stood the Mississippi Senator, Blanche K. Bruce, the first black in history to serve a full term in the U.S. Senate. Behind Hank stood the innovators like Jackie Robinson who reportedly withstood an hour of vituperation from the mouth of Branch Rickey who was trying the first black to play in the major leagues. Rickey was testing the great Robinson to see if he could stand the racist explicitives which would be, and were, hurled at him until his greatness and gentleness as a man, drew admiration instead of catcalls and slander. Rickey, the story goes, then apologized and said, after Jackie had kept his cool, "That's what you're going to have to put up with."

Behind Hank stood the living legend of Sachel Paige who's motto was "Don't look back, they may be gaining on you." Hank Aaron didn't look back and he was the one who made the gains.

Behind Hank stood Luke Easter, the second black admitted into major league baseball. There behind Hank and Jackie and Luke stood such great athletes and great men as Don Newcomb and Roy Campanella, a great catcher sliced down in mid-career by a tragic accident.

Hank Aaron was the man who held the wood which batted ball number 12-12-2-2- over the left field fence but there were countless men who made that moment possible—that moment which is cheered by all Americans, black, white, red, green, or pie-balded. A salute to Hank Aaron should also be a salute to all those men, named and unnamed, who made it all possible. This is a time when we need heroes. Hank Aaron is a Christian gentleman and a hero.
 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MASSACHUSETTS CHAMPIONING
 CAUSE OF FREEDOM
HON. JOE MOAKLEY
 OF MASSACHUSETTS
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of our great Nation the people of Massachusetts have consistently championed the cause of freedom not only at home but abroad as well.

This drive to improve the condition of all men, which has its roots in Lexington and Concord, once again has surfaced to champion the cause of black people in South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, and anywhere else in the world where apartheid exists.

This "apartheid" doctrine, which denies the basic human equality of all men, is an affront to the people of Massachusetts and all persons of good will throughout the world.

Under the leadership of the Massachusetts Black Caucus, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth on March 27 approved a resolution condemning the white supremacist policy wherever it exists today.

At the direction of the Speaker of the Massachusetts House, this resolution is being sent directly to the Governments of South Africa, Rhodesia, and Angola.

It is with great pride and honor that I place the full text of this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues in the House might know of the dedication to freedom of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS CONDEMNING THE SYSTEM OF "APARTHEID"

Whereas, The Governments of South Africa and Rhodesia have consistently followed a system of "Apartheid"; and

Whereas, Wages for white workers in South Africa and Rhodesia are ten to fifteen times more than wages for black workers; and

Whereas, Most black workers are forbidden to join labor unions; and

Whereas, The conditions of illiteracy and poor health are prevalent among all black families; and

Whereas, Black people in South Africa and Rhodesia are denied basic human rights; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives condemns the system of "Apartheid" in South Africa and Rhodesia and wherever it exists; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth, to the Government of South Africa, the Government of Rhodesia and the Government of Angola.

THE EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, many a prospective college student has his or her future life determined by college admissions tests. Until recently, one company, the Educational Testing Service—ETS—has had a virtual monopoly on these admissions tests. Since ETS is a nonprofit institution, no one ever seemed too interested in looking into the structure of this organization.

Last month's edition of the Washington Monthly, however, takes a long, hard look at the history of ETS and its present "difficulties." The lead article by Eric Rodriguez is so informative that I thought I should bring it to the attention of my colleagues; I hope that they will give it their closest consideration.

INSIDE ETS—OR THE PLOT TO MULTIPLE-CHOICE US FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE

(By Eric Rodriguez)

The Educational Testing Service (ETS):

- (a) is a non-profit institution;
- (b) makes almost \$2 million annually;
- (c) has a contract "in perpetuity" to produce the College Boards;
- (d) is more than five times the size of its closest competitor;
- (e) all of the above.

You score 800 and probably will get to attend "the college of your choice" if you answered "(e) all of the above." But don't be discouraged if you didn't score in a high percentile on this little test. Your confusion is understandable because the inner workings of ETS are little known outside of educational circles. What public attention ETS has received has generally been concerned with the impact on American education of multiple choice tests like the Scholastic Aptitude Test (better known as the SAT or "College Boards"), the Law School Achievement Test (LSAT or "Law Boards") and the Graduate Record Exam. Such debates probably peaked during the mid-1960s when the College Boards played a major role in selecting the small percentage of the products of the post-war baby boom who got to attend a prestige university.

Even more enlightening questions remain to be asked about other aspects of ETS' performance, especially about how it has responded in its recent role as an imperiled institution. Educational circumstances have changed remarkably in the 27 years since ETS administered its first test. The "college entry crunch" of the last two decades has subsided, and while competition has in-

creased among candidates for law and medical schools, the over-all demand for educational testing has undoubtedly fallen.

Yet ETS has neither reduced its staff nor restricted its operations in the face of slack demand—a reaction that might have surprised the educators who first chartered ETS to serve as a convenience to the universities. ETS is larger now than ever, and it is still growing. The most intriguing question in this story is why ETS' will-to-grow surprises us. Its course toward survival has been entirely predictable. It is neither a private business nor a public organization, yet like both of them it has employees who must be supplied with the kind of work they know how to do. ETS has done this by diversifying into new activities, by fighting hard to retain jurisdiction over threatened areas, and by generating a demand for products no one knew he needed before. When government employees start to defend a program simply because it keeps them in work, we call it featherbedding. When business convinces us we need to buy more deodorants and bigger cars, we can see Madison Avenue's hand. But when ETS operates behind its veil of "non-profit" probity, we spare it the skeptical eye with which we view other organizations. Even if we were alerted, the "non-profit" veil can conceal many activities. If a business wants to sell us deodorants, it has to advertise. If ETS wants to increase the demand for its test, the selling job goes on in college administrative offices, and the captive student never really has any choice in the matter. ETS cannot retain any profit or pay dividends, but that does not prevent it from building up a cash-flow "surplus" that many businesses would envy. If the surplus cannot be sopped up by salaries and expenses before it reaches the bottom line, it can be reinvested in more institutional expansion. ETS and its non-profit sisters are not despoiling the environment or rigging oil prices or doing anything outside the norms of business practice—but because it is behaving like other corporations, it is worth lifting its veils.

ETS got its start in educational testing back in 1947, when the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the American Council on Education joined to create a non-profit corporation authorized to "engage in . . . services, research, and other activities in the field of educational testing. . . ." CEEB, faced with soaring numbers of college applicants, which might separate the wheat from the chaff.

Even today, these CEEB-commissioned College Boards constitute the largest single program in the ETS repertoire. But the corporation has come a long way since 1947. One official estimates that ETS has doubled its volume of business every five years since its founding. It now has regional offices in Evanston, Berkeley, and Austin (although most employees are based in Princeton, where the organization has its beginnings). Its several-hundred acre Princeton "campus" is dominated by eight large buildings—including a warehouse where forklifts stack bales of ETS publications, the recently constructed Chauncey Conference Center (which has already, according to ETS officials, achieved an "occupancy rate above expectations"), and offices for a work force of almost 2,000.

This real estate was assessed at \$26.5 million in 1972. But an even better picture of the corporation's size can be derived from ETS' balance sheet. In fiscal 1972, ETS grossed \$47.9 million—not enough to put it on the *Fortune* 500 list, but enough to equal the budget of a medium-sized university. More significantly, income exceeded expenditures by \$1.9 million. In the crass world of private enterprise this \$1.9 million would be called profit and be subject to taxes. But in the non-profit world of ETS, this tax-free \$1.9 million surplus is turned into investment

capital to fund ventures like the Chauncey Conference Center.

Not only in size but also in scope, ETS has gone far beyond the visions of 1947. In fact, one ETS official remarked that the organization had outgrown its very name, because "Educational Testing Service" no longer adequately suggests its range of activities. In recent years, ETS has, for example, designed tests to measure the vocation-related skills of stockbrokers, realtors, automobile mechanics, housing managers, and golf shop pros. So that now not only college admissions officers, but also employers interested in rationalizing their personnel departments may turn to ETS for assistance.

ETS has also broadened its horizons at the other end of the age scale and now has tests for pre-schoolers as well. At the Infant Laboratory in Princeton, researchers behind one-way mirrors monitor the behavior of four- and five-month-old "paid" subjects in studies on cognitive development. ETS also designed a battery of tests for Children's Television Workshop (a growing educational conglomerate in its own right), which was interested in testing how effective *Sesame Street* and the *Electric Company* have been in educating children.

The *Sesame Street* contract is typical of most ETS research, which, in the words of one institutional official, is done largely "in response to requests" from government agencies, educational associations and—that other bastion of non-profitability—foundations. This educational "R&D" work has been a key growth area for ETS. In 1968, the Educational Testing Service received \$1.8 million for 105 research projects. Within five years the number of projects had more than doubled to 241 annually, and the payments had tripled to \$5.5 million—about 11 per cent of ETS' revenues. To guarantee a steady stream of research "requests," ETS maintains a six-person Washington office where staffers pore over publications like the *Commerce Business Daily*, looking for contracts on which to bid.

Nonetheless, the CEEB examination program remains ETS' best-selling product. In 1972, for example, 1.6 million students took the Scholastic Aptitude Test, which ETS produced for CEEB on a 7½-percent "cost-plus" contract. But "test volume decline" has become a major concern at ETS. In fact, it was the first topic mentioned by corporate officials when I talked with them in Princeton. This problem is directly linked to a decrease in college applications due to lowered birth-rates during the 1950s, the end of the need for a draft deferment, and a small, but steady, decline in the social pressure to "get into a good school." Fewer students are applying to the more selective four-year colleges, and more are going part-time or attending junior colleges, which usually don't require SAT scores.

A decade ago, public service announcements asked ominously, "When your child is ready for college, will college be ready for him?" Today, there are 500,000 vacancies on college campuses for the current school year. Where once college applicants were lucky to get a tour of the campus and a perfunctory handshake at the admissions office, now many are wined, dined, and perhaps otherwise entertained, in a manner once reserved for athletes.

The demographics are difficult enough for ETS, but the trend that must seem even more pernicious is the spread of open admissions policies, which often makes completion of high school the only requirement for college acceptance. This trend strikes at the raison d'être of the SAT, whose aim is to rationalize the process of selection. Even where open admissions policy has not been embraced, admissions officers are beginning to question the value of tests such as the SAT. As an official at a moderately selective Washington, D.C., university put it, "Are test scores necessary when you're already accept-

ing 80 per cent of your applicants?" The SAT scores themselves, he explained, are not strong predictors of academic performance. They can improve a "prediction index" derived from such measures of performance as grade average and rank in class, but, "Do you need that additional refinement? We never did."

RECYCLING WITH ELAN

Diversification into other forms of research is not the only strategy ETS has developed to combat "test volume decline." When confronted with steadily dwindling sales, most companies redesign their product in hope of reaching a wider market. But few do it with the elan that ETS has displayed in facing its current crisis. As a creature of the CEEB, an association representing academic institutions, ETS has always emphasized the interests of college admissions offices. Now, instead of expecting the colleges to motivate students to take the tests, ETS is now trying to appeal directly to the student. ETS has repackaged the old tests that weeded students out for the Vassar admissions office and now offers the tests and a host of other services to help students decide where to go to college and what to do with their careers.

The concept of student-as-consumer represents a 180-degree turn for ETS. Back in the late 1940s, SAT scores went directly to the designated colleges under the theory that students were not mature enough to know their own abilities. Later the process was modified so that copies of SAT scores were sent to high-school guidance counselors who presumably decided whether it was in the best interest of the student to know his scores. Direct reporting of SAT scores to the students is a relatively new development. Now ETS has come all the way around and lets students decide, after receiving their scores, what schools they want them sent to.

In 1970, the notion of student-as-consumer was dignified with a Commission on Tests sponsored by the CEEB. The Commission recommended that "a symmetry or balance should exist between the services that the CEEB offers to potential entrants and those that it offers to colleges." Among the services now offered the student are the College Locator Service, a kind of computer dating service to ease the admissions rat-race (or what is left of it), and the *College Handbook*, a college guide stressing such information as the average SAT scores of freshmen at individual colleges. And this is just the beginning: David Nolan, director of the Washington office of ETS, described a program now in the R&D stage which would enable the student to "interact" with a computer on a "real time" basis, feeding information about himself into the computer, and retrieving answers to questions about his future academic career. The federal government is helping pick up the tab for this program; the "software" for this computer interaction guidance service is being funded under a National Science Foundation grant.

ACTING ON COMPETITION

It is only fair to mention that much of ETS' haste in developing these new services for the student comes from that most American of motives, healthy competition. The Iowa-based American College Testing Program (ACT), a non-profit corporation founded 15 years ago, is ETS' closest rival. ACT produces the exams used by the less selective state colleges and universities, especially those in the Midwest, while ETS has always had a definite Eastern bias. ACT, which calls ETS the "sleeping giant," is a leaner, less diversified number two, with roughly one-sixth the staff and one-fifth the budget of ETS. Like ETS, ACT experienced "test volume decline," but somewhat later than its rival. In the resulting shift of markets, both corporations began to make inroads into the traditional domains of the other.

ACT, which traditionally served admissions offices more concerned with counseling and placement than with selection of students, has responded more nimbly than ETS to changed circumstances, especially the open-admissions problem. After all, ACT grew up in a part of the country where open admissions was the rule rather than the exception. Consequently, the older Eastern institution is now looking to its younger Midwestern counterpart for guidance in redefining its role. The ACT Student Profile Section, a standard component of the ACT student assessment program, for example, obviously influenced the design of the ETS Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ), a recent addition to the Admissions Testing Program. (Incidentally, students who complete SDQs may find themselves besieged with letters from unheard of colleges around the country. Before forwarding SDQs to designated colleges, ETS stores information from the questionnaires in computers programmed to produce customized mailing lists for colleges willing to buy the names of desirable candidates.)

With these advantages, ACT has beaten ETS several times in recent years. ACT produced a coup of major dimensions when it recently won the contract for the Basic Education Opportunity Grant from the federal government, a contract ETS was already counting as its own. Last year, the Association of American Medical Colleges, apparently dissatisfied with ETS's handling of the Medical College Admission Test (MCAT), offered the contract for bidding. ACT underbid ETS, winning not only the contract, but also an invitation to design both guidance programs for pre-med students not accepted by medical schools and evaluation procedures for doctors in need of refresher courses.

Following the transfer of the MCAT, the Law School Admission Council, which contracts with ETS for the Law School Admission Test and other admissions programs, approached ACT to discuss possible transfer of the LSAT contract. One reason for the Council's restlessness was the way ETS was handling a service called the Law School Data Assembly (LSDAS). This service was a concept of quite remarkable effrontery, for it forced the students to pay for what they'd been doing themselves all along. At each school where ETS convinced the admissions office to go along with LSDAS, the student would no longer send his customary packet of transcripts, letters of recommendation, and application forms. Instead, he had to pay LSDAS \$15 for the privilege of having it do the same thing—collecting transcripts and recommendations, and passing them on to the school in a standardized form. This would just be a textbook make-work project if LSDAS did not exercise its tyrannical power over the student (if LSDAS loses the information, the schools will never consider your application) in such a remarkably capricious way. An American studying at Oxford applied early to Harvard Law School on its rolling admission plan under which students are accepted in waves rather than all at once. When several months went by with no word from Harvard, he called the school only to be informed that his LSDAS records had never arrived. The deadline for applications had not passed, and LSDAS assured him that his records would be forwarded immediately. As the crucial moment approached, the student checked again with Harvard: no records. Urgent appeals to LSDAS produced the records at the last minute. A Boston College law student suffered a similar experience. She applied to nine law schools. The eight which used LSDAS never received her records. She was able to attend law school only because Boston College did not subscribe to LSDAS.

Such bungling is not confined to any one division of ETS, nor is it solely confined to those divisions that serve students. Institu-

tional clients also encounter incompetence: the admissions office of a Washington, D.C. university contracted with ETS for a study of the validity of its selection procedures. The university eagerly awaited the results of the study—but ETS had nothing to say. Inquiries revealed that extensive and difficult-to-duplicate data submitted by the university to ETS had been accidentally erased from computer tapes—three months earlier.

SIAMESE TWINS IN PERPETUITY

None of this threatens to undermine the contracts for the SATs. The relationship between ETS and CEEB still guarantees that ETS will run the tests, although in other ways the relationship has changed considerably since 1947. Indeed, its current status is like the tail (ETS) wagging the dog (CEEB). ETS calls the relationship a "dialogue," but a CEEB staffer comes a good deal closer when he speaks of a "symbiotic dependency." Asked to elaborate, he explained that the relationship seemed so "murky" and "ad hoc-ish," that in practice he scarcely distinguished between the two groups. Indeed, people do shuttle back and forth between ETS and CEEB as readily as they might between different branches in the same corporation.

How does CEEB regard its progeny? Created to serve the interests of the member institutions of the Board, ETS now engages in activities that lead it far from the field of educational testing. To be sure, CEEB itself no longer focuses its attention exclusively on that small interval between high school and college in which students and schools make their choices. But it hardly shares the range of interests that occupy ETS. Nothing in its charter explicitly bars ETS from pursuing these far-flung interests. One clause, however, prohibits competition with the activities of the founding institutions. There is some feeling that ETS has violated this clause, in spirit at least, by reusing, or recasting, materials originally developed for CEEB—as when ETS adapted the Financial Need Analysis Report system, designed for a CEEB council, for the Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Service, a program administered by ETS for an association of graduate institutions.

Despite these internecine squabbles, the relationship itself doesn't seem in peril. Actually divorce between the two institutions would be difficult, since they seem to be forever joined, like Siamese twins—a clause in the original contract between CEEB and ETS prevents CEEB from contracting with any other agency to produce its admissions testing program. A former president of the CEEB described this arrangement as a "contract in perpetuity." Moreover, ETS is in the enviable position of being guaranteed business by all of the individual members of the CEEB. While colleges and universities may join CEEB for various reasons, all are required to use at least one ETS service.

Not satisfied with this minimum of guaranteed business, ETS pressures member institutions to use more than one service. An administrator at a member university described with some indignation the ETS promotion techniques: a new service is generally announced in a pair of letters, one to the president of the university, the other to the admissions director. The effect of this double-teaming may be to put the admissions director "in the hot seat" when his boss starts asking why the school is not employing the latest from ETS.

Nor is ETS above junketing potential clients. A school board administrator from a prosperous Washington, D.C., suburb spoke of the "impressive building program" on the Princeton "campus" of ETS, adding quickly that she had visited there on occasion: "As you may know . . . they sponsor all kinds of meetings . . . workshops . . . for professional people." Small wonder the Chauncey

Conference Center has an "occupancy rate above expectations."

Other promotional devices designed to boost "sales" amount to pure hucksterism. One ETS publication mailed to admissions officers lists nearly 100 institutions which participate in a certain program. "It is hoped," explains the brochure, "that additional colleges and universities will join this consortium [italics added]; their names will be added to successive editions of this list." There's the incentive: get your college's name associated in print with such fellow "consortium" members as Harvard and Stanford. This kind of appeal is particularly well-suited to higher education where "academic quality" is so nebulous a concept that institutions place a disproportionate emphasis on the importance of these symbolic linkages with "great" universities. ETS shrewdly plays on these insecurities by fostering the notion that use of their services can bolster an academic reputation. Some colleges that admit virtually all applicants still require the submission of SAT scores. The scores are not used by the admissions office, rather they are required to create the impression that the school is on a par with more selective institutions where the College Boards still play an important role in determining who will enter the freshman class.

Yet most colleges and universities don't seem to mind the aggressive marketing strategy employed by ETS. Their tolerance grows from the College Entrance Examination Board's mantle of academic respectability, and its paternal connection with ETS. ETS then flourishes largely because it is free from the laws of the market. This independence releases ETS from any responsibility to its ultimate client, the test-taker. The failures of the Law School Data Assembly Service can't be dismissed as simply a corporate snafu that jeopardized an important contract. Rather this corporate error may have unfairly prevented a number of students from attending law school. Yet ETS is far too insulated from the pressures of the marketplace to feel any real responsibility for these fiascos.

Despite ETS' near monopoly position, its publications are redolent with the echos of venture capitalism. Take, for example, the November, 1973, issue of the ETS house organ, aptly titled *Examiner*, that proclaimed in a banner headline, "Finances Brightening, Officers Say." Reading on, we encounter the president of ETS encouraging employees with news that "we have strong areas of growth. . . . This is a difficult time, but we've started many promising ventures. We have the resources to carry through, and what we need now is faith and hard work." ETS employees are exhorted that there must be "no relenting of effort." All this, while the "non-profit" institution expects to finish the fiscal year with a net income of over \$1 million.

All this adds credence to the claims of those who accuse ETS of unfairly exploiting its special status. The commercial firms active in the field (such as Science Research Associates, Houghton Mifflin Company, and Westinghouse Learning Corporation) find themselves at a severe disadvantage bidding on contracts against ETS. As a non-profit, non-stock corporation, the Educational Testing Service enjoys tax-exempt status and therefore doesn't have to allow for taxation in calculating its bids.

So ETS uses its special status as a non-profit institution, as the creature of respectable academic associations, to strengthen its hold on the testing market. But that market is shrinking. As colleges hustle to attract students, ETS must scramble to create new products and new demands for old ones. As our institutions of higher education, those

erstwhile bastions of moral superiority, descend into the hurly-burly of the marketplace, they'll find ETS—the ETS of the "Rosedale" Princeton "campus," of the quiet muted earth-tone booklets—already well established there, thoroughly versed in the techniques and values of cutthroat free enterprise, and perhaps even willing to share its expertise, at a modest price.

**AEC STAFF STUDY RECOMMENDS
5-YEAR, \$850 MILLION PROGRAM
FOR SOLAR HEATING AND COOLING
OF BUILDINGS**

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a recent staff study of the Atomic Energy Commission casts serious doubt as to whether the Congress is being too timid in formulating a national policy for the development of solar heating and cooling of buildings. In February, the House passed H.R. 11864, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974. Under this legislation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will oversee a program of demonstration projects which are intended to be a "proving ground" for solar technology. The legislation is funded at a level of \$50 million for 5 years.

However, in conjunction with its work on assessing the technological potential for achieving energy independence, the AEC has developed a program plan which goes far beyond the recommendations of H.R. 11864. The objective of the AEC plan is to achieve commercial production of solar heating and cooling equipment within 5 years. This is where the AEC plan differs significantly from the program outlined in H.R. 11864. H.R. 11864 was intended primarily to demonstrate solar technology. The AEC study assumes that this stage of development has been or will soon be accomplished and goes on to recommend a 5-year, \$850 million program to develop this technology to the stage of commercial application. According to the report:

After completion of the recommended program, solar systems should be in mass production and cost competitive with other heating and cooling systems, therefore, the appropriate stimulus should be available for industry to continue the program at an increasing rate without Government support.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to support the enactment of H.R. 11864. However, this study by the AEC points to the absolute necessity of reviewing the performance and objective of this legislation to insure that we are not underestimating the importance of the contributions to be made by solar energy to our goal of energy independence.

The digest follows:

DIGEST

Between December 3, 1973 and February 4, 1974, an informal working group of three AEC Headquarters staff members working in

consultation with representatives from ANL, LASL, LBL, LLL, OR and Sandia developed the program plan entitled "Solar Energy Program Plan for Heating and Cooling Buildings." The procedure followed was to meet with the laboratory representatives, specify the objective, outline the program framework and solicit their proposed program plan. After discussion of all plans in a meeting with the representatives, an AEC draft plan was formulated which was later reviewed and commented on in a meeting with laboratory representatives. Subsequently, the existing plan was finalized.

The objective of this program plan is to accelerate the development and marketing of solar heating and cooling systems for buildings, using existing technology, with a goal of achieving commercial production on a national scale within five years.

The technology of solar domestic water heaters is well developed. This is evident from the commercial water industry in Japan, Israel, India and Australia. The technology for solar space heating exists now. More than twenty experimental solar heated structures have been built and operated in the U.S. by private entrepreneurs. With mass produced solar collectors, solar space heating should be competitive with fossil fuel heating in many regions of the country. The technology for solar space cooling is in the early stages of development and a research and development program is required to develop air conditioners powered by solar heat.

Approximately fifty percent of the 14x10¹⁰ or 7x10¹⁰ BTUs used to heat buildings could be saved if all buildings were equipped with solar heating systems and approximately 1.8x10¹⁰ BTUs if all buildings were equipped with solar cooling systems. The figures demonstrate the large potential energy savings possible. For example, if 1/2 of all buildings were equipped with solar heating and cooling systems by the year 2000, it is estimated that 3/4 to 1 billion barrels of oil would be saved annually.

Heating and cooling by solar energy produces no pollutants. Another overall effect is to reduce the demand for peak electrical energy and the need for additional transmission lines.

The conservation and use of our national resources substantially affects the health and welfare of all citizens and therefore, it is a Federal responsibility to preserve these resources for the benefit of all its citizens. Private industry is currently unwilling to invest in solar systems development because the equipment apparently cannot be marketed profitably. Government action would be appropriate to stimulate the industry to mass production.

Three basic Federally supported five year programs were developed representing differing levels of solar system production and deployment in Federal and private buildings. Each of these programs would begin with a survey of existing technology in solar systems and the development of design criteria for installation in buildings. A survey would be made of geographical areas and specific buildings to receive solar units and design initiated for installation of these units. A training/education program in solar systems would be developed for designers, constructors and craftsmen. A continuing program evaluation effort initiated at the onset would be used to make necessary adjustments to the total scope of the program based on solar system costs and performance. The minimum program includes only solar systems for Federal buildings, however, the maximum and recommended program provides solar units for the private sector in the second and third year respectively. The recommended program and two alternates are compared as follows.

5-YEAR PROGRAM

	Recommended medium	Maximum	Minimum
Total Federal cost (maximum) (millions).....	\$850	\$2,600	\$275
Total residential heating units (equivalent) installed.....	151,050	604,200	30,210
Total residential cooling units (equivalent) installed.....	11,100	51,100	1,110
Energy saved during 5th year (millions of barrels).....	2.6	11.6	.5
Production rate at end of 5th year (residential units equivalent)—			
In total units (heating).....	100,000	400,000	20,000
In total units (cooling).....	10,000	40,000	1,000

The Federal Government would have the responsibility of overseeing the development of acceptable standards for the design, construction and performance of solar systems for those installed in Federal buildings and those in the private sector which they will subsidize or underwrite. Present local building codes and design standards would have to be modified to provide for installation of solar systems and to protect the rights of individuals against proposed adjacent construction which could shield them from the sun.

Suggested ways of Federal financial support for units designated for the private sector are tax or loan incentives in support of the purchase of solar systems for use in private buildings, or direct payment by the Federal Government for a portion of the costs involved in the purchase and installation of solar systems.

After completion of the recommended program, solar systems should be in mass production and cost competitive with other heating and cooling systems, therefore, the appropriate stimulus should be available for industry to continue the program at an increasing rate without Government support.

I. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this program is to accelerate the development and marketing of solar heating and cooling systems for buildings, using existing technology, with a goal of achieving commercial production on a national scale within five years.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Energy consumed by buildings and potential savings by tapping a new energy source

Of the various solar energy methods now undergoing research and development, the heating and cooling of buildings and heating of domestic hot water is probably the most likely to achieve economic viability in the near term. There are no technological barriers to the use of solar energy in this manner; the only barrier to present use is that such systems are not now developed to be economically competitive with other forms of heating energy and are therefore not commercially available. Reductions in cost of solar heating systems resulting in commercial availability and widespread usage would make a substantial impact on reducing the fossil fuels required to heat and cool the nation's buildings.

It has been estimated (1970 figures) that the annual energy consumed in the U.S. is 70×10^{15} BTUs. About twenty per cent of this total is used to heat residential and commercial buildings. Approximately 7×10^{15} BTUs or fifty per cent of that used to heat buildings could be saved if the buildings were equipped with solar energy heating systems. With each 42 gallon barrel of oil containing 6×10^6 BTUs, this would be a savings the equivalent of 1.2×10^9 barrels of oil annually. (See Table 1, page 3).

It has been estimated (1970 figures) that the annual energy consumption for cooling is

1.8×10^{15} BTUs. This is equivalent to the use of 300 million barrels of oil annually. This amount of fuel could be saved if buildings were equipped with solar energy cooling systems. (See Table 2, page 4).

These figures demonstrate the large potential energy savings possible. For example, if $\frac{1}{2}$ of all buildings were equipped with solar heating and cooling system by the year 2000, it is estimated that $\frac{3}{4}$ to 1 billion barrels of oil would be saved annually.

It is proposed that the best way to proceed to accomplishment of the objective is by initially equipping new and certain existing Federal buildings with solar heating systems. Areas of possible Federal action to demonstrate the feasibility and economics involving the installations of solar heating and cooling systems can best be determined by examining the potential impact in each area. The relative sizes of these areas are tabulated below.

	(Billion square feet)	
	Existing buildings	Annual construction
Private.....	85.0	3.0
Federal.....	2.5	.04

Table 1.—Potential energy savings using solar heating systems

20 percent—total heat used by buildings (annually)

50 percent—saved by solar heat

70 times 10^{15} —total energy required (annually—BTUs)

$.20 \times .50 \times 70 \times 10^{15}$ divided by 5.8×10^6 BTUs/bbl oil equals 1200×10^6 barrels oil saved annually if 100 percent buildings have solar systems.

Percentage buildings (ft²) with solar systems:

	Energy saved— in millions of of barrels
0	0
10	120
20	240
30	360
40	480
50	600
60	720
70	840
80	960
90	1,080
100	1,200

100 percent represents 87.5 billion ft.²

Table 2.—Potential energy savings using solar cooling systems

Total energy (BTUs) for A/C (annually): 1800×10^{12} divided by 5.8×10^6 BTUs/bbl equals 300×10^6 bbls oil saved annually if 100 percent buildings have solar systems.

Percentage buildings (ft²) with solar systems:

	Energy saved— in millions of of barrels
0	0
10	30
20	60
30	90
40	120
50	150
60	180
70	210
80	240
90	270
100	300

100 percent represents 87.5 billion ft.²

The energy required for the heating of buildings is roughly proportional to the square footage in each. However, commercial-type buildings require more energy per

square foot for heating than residential. The national average annual requirements are about 180 thousand BTU per ft² of commercial space and about 100 thousand BTU per ft² of residential space. The composition of the private and Federal sectors differs:

	(Billion square feet)	
	Existing Residential	Commercial type
Private.....	60.0	25.0
Federal.....	.7	1.8

A consequence of this is that Federal space requires more heating energy per square foot than private space, on the average.

The estimated cost of a solar heating system at the end of the recommended program is \$3750. Assuming this system would save one half of the heating costs and using present day retail costs of oil (\$13 per barrel) it will take approximately 21 years to amortize this capital investment cost. Any increase in oil costs would reduce the number of years for amortization, i.e., if oil cost at the end of the five year period is twice the present price, the 21 years would be reduced by one half. Additionally, subsequent increases in mass production of solar systems beyond that at the end of the recommended program will result in decreased initial capital costs and further shorten the amortization period.

Preliminary calculations indicate that the energy required to fabricate the materials used in a flat plate collector comprised of aluminum, glass, steel and rock wool insulation is approximately 2.5×10^6 BTU per ft.² The total energy required, therefore, to produce a residential size solar collector is $750 \text{ ft}^2 \times (2.5 \times 10^6 \text{ BTU/ft}^2) = 190 \times 10^6$ BTU. The total energy saved per year by this solar collector would be one half of $150 \text{ ft}^2 \times (100,000 \text{ BTU/ft}^2)$ or 75×10^6 BTU. The period of time required to regain the energy used to produce the solar collector is 190×10^6 BTU divided by 75×10^6 BTU/yr. or approximately two and one half years.

The air conditioning (cooling) of buildings in some areas requires more energy than heating, averaged over the year. Using the solar collectors to provide the energy for summer cooling would be important, since even more fuel would be supplanted and the solar system would be even more economically viable. However, at the present time, the cooling of buildings with solar energy systems is only in the early development stage. All collector systems installed in areas requiring cooling should be made compatible with the most probable space-cooling technology, however, to allow for future adaptation. A parallel accelerated development effort in the cooling of buildings with solar energy would complement this demonstration project and greatly increase its ultimate impact.

In addition to the direct saving of conventional fuels, other benefits exist through the use of solar energy for heating and cooling of buildings, and can be summarized briefly as follows. The use of solar energy will decrease the United States' dependence on foreign oil and thereby reduce the effect of the oil embargo and balance-of-payments problems, and export of solar energy heating and cooling equipment can make a contribution to the balance-of-trade problem. The adverse effect of fossil fuel operations upon the environment, such as emission of pollutants into the atmosphere, is substantially reduced or minimized. Thermal pollution of the streams will be reduced as well. It will also reduce the demand for electrical energy and peak electrical loads.

B. Federal role

The conservation and use of our national resources substantially affect the health and welfare of all citizens. Therefore, it is a Federal responsibility to implement and carry out a plan that preserves, to the extent that is practical, the national resources for the benefit of all its citizens.

The profit motivation in the private market place is not strong enough at this point in development to independently carry out the development and engineering necessary prior to marketing and production of the required solar heating and cooling systems.

Private industry is currently unwilling to invest in the development at the necessary rate because such equipment cannot yet be marketed profitably. The price of existing fuels is expected to rise in the next few years. As part of a national program to achieve energy self-sufficiency, the Government needs to proceed now in the technological development of solar energy heating and cooling systems.

Overall emphasis for and the coordination of the many areas of technology required to carry out a national program necessitates management by and financial support from the Federal Government.

The construction industry is slow to incorporate changes to established construction design criteria in a short period of time. Architect-engineers and builders are reluctant to incorporate experimental or untried systems in new construction because of the risk of poor performance, lack of dependability and safety. The Government may want to initially offset these risks in order to substantially reduce the use of fossil fuels to heat buildings.

Government actions would be appropriate and necessary in the stimulation of private investment in the development of systems for the solar heating and cooling of buildings. Examples would be: a) purchase of systems for incorporation in Government buildings; b) tax or loan incentives in support of the purchase of solar systems for use in private buildings; and c) Government subsidy of solar equipment.

TRIBUTE TO CARL O. SJULIN

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Carl O. Sjulín, a long-time personal friend of mine and a leader in the nursery industry, passed away Friday, March 29, 1974, at Hamburg, Iowa. Carl was 84 and although he had been fighting emphysema for many years, he was a vital, dynamic individual who continued to work until just 2 weeks prior to his death.

As an innovator in the nursery enterprise, Carl became a highly respected member of the business community. He was a natural in the industry, having been born in Shenandoah, Iowa, at a time when the normal thing for an energetic young man to do was work at one of the local nurseries. In 1919, having gained considerable experience, Carl joined his brothers Leslie and David in founding Hamburg's Inter-State Nurseries.

Carl moved with as much ease managing the complexities of a growing business as he did tending to the many plants his nurseries produced. He felt most at home closing a deal for a magazine ad or

bargaining for a new mailing list for his nursery catalogs. Many people were familiar with Carl through his easygoing radio broadcasts. Other recognized him through his participation in mail order nurserymen's meetings.

As a forerunner in development of nurseries as a viable industry, Carl made large and small contributions and his considerable impact will not be forgotten. He will be greatly missed by his family and many friends both in and outside the nursery business.

REMARKS OF ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN: A SOVIET MARTYR'S ANGUISHED PLEA

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the Nobel Prize-winning Russian exile is, first and foremost, an adroit historian who, until his cruel banishment, wrote from a unique historical vantage point. His perspective of peace and war from behind the Iron Curtain is worthy of our attention and understanding. In this regard I am inserting an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 19, 1973, 4 months before his enforced exile. This article was excerpted from the Norwegian newspaper, *Aftenposten*, and was forwarded to me by Mr. A. J. Angelino, of Scotia, N.Y. As Solzhenitsyn so passionately states—

... what is happening in the Soviet Union is not just something in "just about every country" but is the *tomorrow of mankind* and is thus, in the matter of its inner processes, worth full attention by Western observers.

The text of the Solzhenitsyn letter follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 19, 1973]

A SOVIET MARTYR'S ANGUISHED PLEA

(The following letter, by the Nobel Prize-winning Soviet novelist, is excerpted from the Norwegian newspaper, *Aftenposten*.)

(By Alexander Solzhenitsyn)

Moscow.—Shaken by two gigantic world conflicts in quick succession, recent generations have committed an emotional error or misconception. They saw the threat against mankind's peaceful, just and good existence as almost exclusively deriving from war. And thus they strengthened the conception of the contrast of "war or peace."

Many exceedingly vocal and exceedingly one-sided congresses were called together and a world peace council came into being. And those persons who devoted their efforts (some honestly, others playing the role of demagogues) to averting the new wars (occasionally favoring one type of war over another) acquired the title of "Fighters for Peace."

But a title of that nature covers considerably more ground than the scope of the task these people assigned themselves. The movement "against war" falls far short of the demands of a movement "for peace."

The contrast "peace-war" involves an error of logic. War is a mass phenomenon—compact, noisy, distinct. But it is by no means the only expression of the world-wide wave of violence that never ends. A logically

balanced and morally truthful contrast would thus be: peace-violence.

Man's existence is torn and shattered not alone by the violent arms of war but also by the unending, inhuman processes of violence. And if one may say that peace is indivisible—that a small infringement of peace (not merely military!) is a violation of peace in its entirety—then violence must be equally indivisible.

A hostage who is seized and an aircraft that is hijacked are just as great examples of threats to peace as is a rifle shot across a border and a bomb thrown on the territory of another state.

But here we immediately run into a selfish effort to contradict the truth. Well-known groups of violent men insist that just those precise forms of violence that they themselves use cannot be considered a threat against peace, but as instruments in the cause of peace.

One example—the terrorism of the past few years. While man is tense and on his guard against wars, he has a tendency to fail to detect other forms of violence. The confusion is complete, and people are not prepared to reject terrorism committed by a single, little, individual. And most astonishing, a world-wide humanitarian organization is incapable of securing a moral condemnation of terrorism!

One could jokingly suggest the following: "When we are attacked, that is terrorism. But when we are the attackers, then it's a partisan freedom movement."

THE MOST THREATENING DANGER

Permanent state violence—which throughout the decades it has reigned has succeeded in taking over all "judicial" forms, codifying thick collections of its violent "laws," draping capes across the shoulders of its "judges"—is the most threatening danger in our world of today, even if it is only barely recognized or understood.

This violence no longer needs to place explosives under something or to toss bombs. Its procedures are carried out in strict silence, seldom disturbed by the final shrieks of he who is being strangled. This type of violence permits itself to take on a respectable appearance.

There is an emotional error involved in the comprehension of what is included in the conception of "peace."

We do not err because it may be difficult to see the truth floating on the surface. But we err because it is pleasant and easy to seek an understanding in exact conformity with our feelings—especially our egotistical feelings. The truth has been around a long time. It has been exhibited, proven and explained. But it draws no attention or sympathy, just as in the case of Orwell's "1984," with its "conspiracy of flattery."

The bestial mass killings of Hue, that have been proven with certainty, drew only momentary attention and were almost immediately forgiven—because the sympathy of society leaned in that direction and one did not wish to make a protest. It was, instead, a shame that these accounts leaked out to the free press and for a time (very short) gave rise to embarrassment (very little) among the energetic defenders of this social system.

Is it possible to believe that the fluttering little butterfly, Ramsey Clark, even though a former Attorney General, quite simply just could not understand, quite simply could not imagine that the prisoner of war who handed him a piece of paper that is necessary for the carrying out of some clearly defined political aim had previously been put through torture?

(Perhaps all that he failed to realize was the form of the torture: What is a hand crushed by a block and tackle that has been raised and lowered through a roof? Yet, there was no one in the United States to criticize this Clark; this is not "Watergate." But with the help of the same moralizing facial

expressions, it was possible for the English labor leader to sum up his courage and pay a visit to another country (naturally enough, not an African country; that would not have been permitted) and there to issue his own "forgiveness" of the government without having asked the local population.

And when the Norwegians in 1968 proposed—alone—that not all had a right to participate in the Olympic Games, the faces of the majority of the Olympic participants stiffened in an embarrassed moral grimace as they closed their eyes and mumbled something about the lofty interests of athletics and commercialism.

But what kind of wall would they not erect if it was a case of protesting in the other direction? Would, for example, the South African republic be able to hold a black leader imprisoned for four years and subject him to torture, as was the case with General Grigorenko? No, the world's storm of indignation would long since have blown the roof off his prison!

In 1966, an English publication exercising its own unlimited rights of freedom decided tactfully that M. Mikhailov's idea of creating a similar and equally free publication in Yugoslavia was "conceited." And a German publication, looking on from its own idyllic position, decided that Mikhailov's idea had "ripened too soon and was a disservice to liberalization." (After Mikhailov was broken, we can see how far liberalization has spread in Yugoslavia without any use of disservices.)

And recently New Zealand and Australia protested in vain against the French atomic tests—but why not against the Chinese tests, which are a much more serious matter? Simply because the expenses of maintaining a supervisory vessel are too great and the times for the tests have not been made public in advance? I maintain with conviction: Not just because of a moral grimace, but very simply because of cowardice. Nobody would come back from an expedition into the Chinese desert or to the Chinese coasts, and they knew this.

It is precisely this that constitutes the hypocrisy of many Western protests: They protest where their lives are not in danger, where they can expect the other side to give way, and where they are not risking being condemned by "leftwingers." (The best thing is of course always to make your protest along with them.)

Until the beginnings of the highly motivated 20th Century, one used the term *hypocrisy* when a person used two varying yardsticks of moral judgment. But what do we call it today?

Is it possible that the hypocritical facial expressions of the West can only be seen from a great distance but never detected at close range?

This type of hypocrisy is typical of the American political life of today, for the Senate leaders with their distorted vision, for the sensational "Watergate" scandal.

Without in any way defending either Nixon or the Republican Party, one cannot avoid being astonished by this loud, artificial anger among the Democrats. What had they really expected from a democracy without the slightest binding ethical basis, a democracy with its clash of interests, where nothing ranks above interests, where the battle is determined by the rules of the Constitution without any ethical roof above it? Has it not been full of mutual swindles and misuse of power from the days of the earliest election fights, with perhaps the sole distinction that then there were no electronics and fortunately nothing could be discovered?

I have throughout my years devoted myself to examining Russian life before it was ruined, and I have been personally impressed by the apparently impossible resemblance between the Russian czarist regime in its final years and, for example, the Republic of the

United States of recent years—years, I venture to predict, that also are the final ones before the great chaos. This is not a comparison of material and economic qualities and not a comparison of social structures, but of something more important: a comparison of the politicians' lack of emotional ability to reflect. The entire storm of wrath of the Democrats on the subject of Watergate resembles a parody of the angry, thoughtless storm of the Cadets against Goremykin-Sturmer in 1915-1916.

This is one of the puzzles of irrational history. How could Russia in the final years of the 19th Century, a Russia that was not yet industrially armed and which led a sleepy existence, acquire an impulse and make such a dynamic leap forward that today's Russian research looks on the Western society as something "backward," something from out of the past? It is depressingly amusing to observe how fugitives from society, politicians and youth in the West, 50 or 70 years behind the times, repeat "our" ideas, our performance and our mistakes.

On the other hand, one must agree—as so many, many maintain—that what is happening in the Soviet Union is not just something in "just about every country" but is the tomorrow of mankind and is thus, in the matter of its inner processes, worth full attention by Western observers.

No, it's not the troubles involved with gaining an insight that pose difficulties for the West. Rather, it's the lack of a desire to know, the emotional preference of the comfortable solution instead of the difficult one. Such a searching for insight is fed by the Munich Spirit, by concession and the spirit of compromise, led by an anxious self-deception on the part of societies of good intentions and persons who have lost their determination to make sacrifices and stand firm.

And even though this path of theirs has never meant preservation of peace and justice, but only their being trod upon and violated, human feelings are shown to be stronger than the most obvious lessons. Again and again the weakened world paints sentimental pictures that show how violence has generously become softened and is now willing to part with some crumbs of its superior strength—and all the while one can continue one's unbothered existence.

"Aircraft hijacking" and other forms of terror have multiplied tenfold precisely because we are all too quick to capitulate to them. But when one displays toughness, then one can always triumph over terror. Heed this well.

PROPAGANDA AND PEACE

I don't know how it is in Europe, but in our country you will find placed alongside all railway lines small stones with these inscriptions: "Peace for the world!" "For peace throughout the world!" This kind of propaganda is quite useful, if it means that there must not only be no wars throughout the world but that in addition every inner form of violence must end.

In order to achieve not merely a short-term postponement of the threat of war but a real peace, it is necessary to wage battle against the "quiet," hidden types of violence with no less determination than one would wage battle against the "noisier" types. The task must be more than merely stopping the rockets and cannons. We must draw the line against the violence of the state wherever it is necessary to defend members of society. The task must be to banish from mankind's thoughts the idea that anybody has the right to use force against righteousness, against justice, against mutual agreements.

This means that peace is not served by those who trust in the agreeable nature of the men of violence, but by those who—unbribable, uncompromisingly and untiringly—insist on justice for the persecuted, for the subjected, for the dead.

The widespread, mistaken definition of peace as "antiwar" and not as "antiviolence" has quite naturally also led to an incorrect evaluation of individual person's accomplishments in the fight for peace.

One looks first for the best fighters for peace among those who collect laurel wreaths at airports and in parliaments, who at any price divert the threatening breath of war, "warm" or "cold." This is the type who uses whatever admission is at hand to achieve an end to criticism in the press, to create a breathing space for trade and self-deceptive happiness. On the other hand, those who uncompromisingly point out the global danger to peace from all types of violations run the risk now and then of being labeled "warmongers."

This distorted conception of exactly what it is that stands in the path of peace can find expression in the activities of the Nobel Committee for the Peace Prize. Its evaluations and decisions are, on the one hand, formed by the attitudes of world opinion. But on the other hand—and this is just as natural—its work is reciprocal and forms the attitudes and lays down the criteria.

Therefore the Nobel Committee has an exceptionally large responsibility in choosing its winners. Even when no prize is awarded, its importance grows; the value of deserving earlier winners' work is so great that no one else can compare with them.

PROPOSING A CANDIDATE

As I hereby make use of my right as a Nobel Prize winner to propose candidates for the Nobel Prize, and as I have no responsibilities of doing so directly to the Nobel Committee for the Peace Prize otherwise than through this article in the newspaper *Aftenposten*, I beg that my words here may be regarded as a formal nomination of Andrei Dimitrevitch Sakharov for the 1973 Nobel Peace Prize.

I have already given my reasons for this in my interview with the newspaper *Le Monde*: Sakharov's untiring and sacrificing (and personally dangerous) resistance to unceasing state violence against individuals and national population groups.

Such activity must also be judged as a great contribution to the general peace, a contribution which has no overtones of publicity, which is without illusion, but which is entirely fundamental; through his modest, individual powers he works heroically to dam up a mighty wave of violence—that is what it means to strengthen the general peace.

And may the Nobel Committee be in no doubt because of Sakharov's former, quite considerable achievements in the area of weapons, nor see here something paradoxical: the human spirit's admission of its earlier mistakes, its cleansing and its breaking free from these mistakes. Precisely here is to be found greater justification of man's existence on this earth.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AWARDS

HON. ELLE T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, at the White House last Friday, Mrs. Richard Nixon presented special landscape architecture awards from the American Association of Nurserymen to four companies from my State of Connecticut.

Three of the four firms shared in the association's coveted first award for the

parts they played in the development of a landscape project in Orange, Conn. This is the highest honor achievable in this field. These companies are A. E. Bye Associates of Cos Cob and the Glenn Terrace Nurseries of Hamden, which planned and planted the award-winning project, and the Harvey Hubbell Corp., which owns the land where it is located.

A fourth Connecticut firm, C.M.A. Partnership of Farmington received a certificate of merit from the Nurserymen's Association for a landscape project in Massachusetts.

The awards were accepted at the White House ceremony by W. James Everett, president of Glen Terrace Nurseries; Mr. A. E. Bye of A. E. Bye Associates; David B. Morgan, of the Harvey Hubbell Corp., and Frank MiFlorski of the C.M.A. Partnership.

A total of 53 projects nationwide received recognition at the White House ceremony—the 21st annual landscape awards program sponsored by the Nurserymen's Association. The purpose of the recognition is to stimulate commercial and institutional organizations to pursue environmental improvement and beautification through effective landscape architecture.

For example, in the Hubbell project, special care was taken to preserve the area's natural landscape while endeavoring to successfully utilize the concept of inward and outward visualization.

The citizens of Connecticut are proud that a responsible and innovative attitude toward the environment is being taken by members of our State's landscape industry. Such accomplishments justly deserve national recognition.

WINNERS AND LOSERS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CANCER

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the month of April is cancer crusade month in my State of Maine. I understand that the Maine branch of the American Cancer Society hopes to raise over \$270,000 during this month alone.

As you know, I have sponsored legislation that would increase our national commitment to health education. Health education can be especially important in fighting cancer, since early treatment is working daily miracles in cases where people recognize their own symptoms in time.

In Maine, some of the most powerful appeals to fight cancer through early detection and research have come from a prominent and outstanding journalist, Bill Caldwell of the Maine Sunday Telegram, who has himself felt the threat of a cancer attack.

Because I am sure my colleagues will be interested in his remarks on cancer, "Winners and Losers," I insert a copy of one of his recent columns in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram]
CANCER—AND NAMES YOU KNOW: WINNERS AND LOSERS
(By Bill Caldwell)

"Maine has the highest death rate from cancer of any state in the union." Swallow that fact.

Dr. W. S. Lowry of the Maine Medical Center said those words recently on a TV panel. Those of us on the panel with him were shocked by this seldom heard statistic about cancer in Maine. Maine seems so healthy. But Dr. Lowry knows first hand whereof he speaks. He is Chief of Radiation Therapy at the Maine Medical Center, where more cancer patients are treated than anywhere else in the state.

But there is a good side, a very good side, to cancer news in Maine, and in a moment we will tell it to you. But first let us face the harder facts. . . .

The fact is that in Maine the death rate from cancer in 1974 is expected to be 212 per 100,000 population. This is the highest in the United States. The national average is 167 per 100,000 population.

The experts say 3,000 new cases of cancer will be found in Maine this year, 1974.

Thousands more will be getting treatment for cancer already discovered. And in many kinds of cancer, early treatment is working miracles. Every year, more and more cancer patients are cured; that is they have no traces of the disease five years after their last treatment.

Thanks to more knowledge about cancer by patients as well as doctors, 1½ million Americans are alive today who have been cured of cancer. Another 700,000 are as good as cured but have not yet reached the five year mark. You could reasonably put the cured figure up to two million cured cancer patients and be right. That is double the entire population of Maine.

Remember these facts, and be guided by them. This month of April is the cancer crusade month in Maine. Some of your neighbors are likely to ask you for money to help lick cancer. Probably you will give some money to the crusade. That would be sensible. For cancer will eventually strike one out of every four Americans now living, strike into two out of every three families.

But this column is not about money. It is about cancer. And it is not going to scare you. I hope it will astonish you, and give you good news about cancer that you did not know was there. There is lots of good news. People don't talk or write enough about the good news. We should—especially those of us who have had cancer, have been treated and are walking around cured, happy and in love with life. This is not polyanna talk. Sure, there is still lots of bad news about cancer, very bad news indeed. But that is only half the cancer story. The other 50 per cent is very good news. Want to hear some?

Start with the names you recognize, people who are cured of cancer now, but who once were its victim.

In the movies—there is the Duke, John Wayne; and William Powell; and Glynis Johns and Van Johnson, just for starters. And there is Senator Maureen Neuberger; and Roy Wilkins of NAACP; and Broadway composer Richard Rodgers, actor William Gargan, pro football's Jack Pardee, opera's Marguerite Piazza; and from TV, there is Arthur Godfrey and Virginia Graham.

That is just the tip of the iceberg. We could fill the page a hundred times over. As we said earlier, 2 million Americans are walking around right now cured of cancer—me among them.

This year, some 218,000 more Americans will be cured of cancer, thanks to skilled treatment and early detection. You'd need a directory twice as thick as the Greater Portland Telephone book just to list the names and addresses of the people who will be

cured of cancer before Christmas. That is part of the good news.

The tough news is that 2,200 people in Maine will die of cancer in 1974; and 335,000 in the U.S.

The famous die from cancer, just as the famous are cured—even as you and I. But names make news.

Some film names you know who died from cancer are Tallulah Bankhead, Edward G. Robinson, Betty Grable, Humphrey Bogart, Gary Cooper, Charles Laughton, Sophie Tucker and Gypsy Rose Lee, Sonja Henie and Ann Sheridan. Some writers you know, who died of cancer include T. S. Eliot, Edna Ferber, Rachel Carson, John Gunther, Aldous Huxley, Damon Runyon; some people you know from the world of music who died from cancer include Sidney Bechet, Eddy Duchin, Oscar Hammerstein, John Charles Thomas.

Athletes are far from immune from cancer. Cancer killed Ty Cobb and Babe Ruth and Babe Zaharias and Notre Dame football coaches Elmer Layden and Frank Leahy, and golfer Walter Hagen and boxer Barney Ross.

Quentin Reynolds and Chet Huntley and Ed Murrow and Bill Cunningham and Rube Goldberg and Dan Parker and Walter Winchell and Arthur "Bugs" Baer are some of the newspaper, TV and radio people whom cancer took.

Right now it is lung cancer that is killing most cancer patients. Mostly, men are the victims. This year lung cancer will kill 60,000 men and 15,000 women in the United States. It is caused mostly by smoking. But it is hard to detect, and often doesn't hurt until it is too late to cure. About 200 people a day die from lung cancer. And that figure is climbing, fast among men smokers.

Some of the big names who died of lung cancer include King George VI of England (his brother Edward, Duke of Windsor died of throat cancer in 1972) and Walt Disney; Nat "King" Cole; Robert A. Taft; Robert Taylor; Franchot Tone; Bill Corum; Glenda Farrell; Buster Keaton.

In Maine, the American Cancer Society is on a crusade this April to raise some \$270,000. That is a bit over 25 cents, one quarter, for each man, woman and child in Maine.

But it takes some big donations to make that average. For most of the tiny kids can't give; and lots of adults can't give or are not asked.

So if the Cancer Crusade comes to your house—regard it as your chance to really make your money work hard. That money of yours can buy lives—by helping to get people in treatment early, helping to get people in for checkups regularly, it can stop them from dying. And that money of yours can buy happiness. Yes, your money can buy happiness. Ask any of the 2 million Americans cured of cancer. One of them may live on your street; or in your house, this year or next.

PASTOR GUIDO MERKENS, MAN OF GOD

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a book was given me that has happily and favorably impressed me. The title of the book is "Great Churches of Today" prepared by the staff of the publication "Decision," in whose pages contents of the book first appeared, and published by World Wide Publications.

On page 91 of this book is a whole chapter dedicated to Concordia Lutheran Church of San Antonio, Tex. This church is—and has been for some time—pas-

tored by a truly man of God—Rev. Guido Merkens.

A city or a community is as good in direct proportion as its churches. For many years many of us in San Antonio have known of the tremendous contribution to the progress and well-being of San Antonio made by Concordia Lutheran Church under the inspired and dynamic leadership of Pastor Merkens.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point this much deserved article:

CONCORDIA LUTHERAN CHURCH, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Where the fertile plains of South Central Texas give way to the rolling bush country lies the city of San Antonio, "cradle of Texas liberty." The 15th largest city in the United States, San Antonio is an unusual blend of old Mexico and young America. Forty-five per cent of its 654,000 inhabitants are of Spanish descent. Its four Air Force bases and the Brooke Army Medical Center stamp it as youthful, transient, defense-minded. The Alamo, hallowed to Texans, a monument to one of history's notable stands, has turned the city into a major tourist center.

From the year 1718 when San Antonio de Valero became the capital of the Spanish province of Texas, San Antonio's people have shown a deep religious sensitivity. In this hospitable setting in the last 20 years a church has grown and shared its enthusiasm for the Lord Jesus Christ and his Kingdom as have few churches of our time. It is the Concordia Lutheran Church, pastored by the Reverend Guido Merkens.

Born in Aberdeen, South Dakota, the son of a scholarly Lutheran pastor, Guido Merkens grew up in a strong church atmosphere. He was 24 years old when he went to San Antonio in 1951. Pastor Merkens still remembers, upon his graduating from Concordia Lutheran Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, what his roommate thought of Guido's call to Texas. "He was going to New Guinea and was convinced he had the 'better' call," says Merkens. "And if I had known that I would live 20 years in a city with no major league team, I might have been inclined to agree with him!"

The pastor had been a three-sport letterman in college.

"But," he added in a serious vein, "my primary work has been here, and one thing God has taught me, 'My word . . . shall not return unto me void.'"

In 1950 a religious census of north San Antonio revealed that the area was high-potential soil for the planting of a church. Merkens and his wife, Barbara, arrived in June, 1951. Within three months he had visited over two thousand homes. On December 16, 1951, a congregation of 37 charter members formally banded together to form Concordia Lutheran Church. In a chapel built on farmland by the members of this young church, the new congregation began its service to the San Antonio community.

On December 1971 Concordia marked its 20th birthday. Its baptized membership has increased to 3,000 persons, 2,100 of whom are communicant members. The church is known as the fastest-growing congregation among the 6,000 parishes in the Missouri Synod since 1951.

Where horses once galloped with their colts on the old Kessler farm, Lutheran school children now scamper, and hundreds of young people and adults take to Concordia's gymnasium and lighted ball fields for recreation and athletic competition. Where a barn and a windmill once stood, a modern worship and education complex now graces the ten-acre Basse Road site. When the sanctuary was completed in 1955 the Church Architectural Guild of America named Concordia an award winner among America's middle-sized churches. The sanctuary, con-

structed of a sand-toned Mexican brick, has since been enlarged four times to the present seating capacity of nearly one thousand.

As word spread throughout the Texas district of the growth of this San Antonio congregation, Pastor Merkens was asked to share what he calls "Living Lutheran Leadership" with other parishes. In 1965 he and Arthur Samuel, superintendent of the Concordia Sunday School, began traveling to other states, holding seminars eventually with 125,000 pastors and laymen in 44 states. "The seminars grew out of years of practical experience," says the pastor. In a 350-page manual Merkens spells out procedures for "evangelism," "stewardship," "admiration," and other ministries. In 1971 Pastor Merkens accepted invitations from Lutheran churches in England, Australia and New Zealand to conduct seminars with clergymen and lay people.

What commodity does this pastor and church offer to San Antonio? "We have a sound, evangelical belief that appeals to people at this time—a solid faith anchored in the Word of God and trusting for salvation through Jesus Christ," answers Bill Wagner, managing editor of the *San Antonio Express and Evening News* and a church council member. Someone else says "esprit de corps." The pastor would say, "It's the lay people." The laymen say, "It's the pastor." Concordia is what Izaak Walton might call the "complete church"—serving, witnessing, caring, singing, exalting God, giving careful attendance to his Word, and doing all of this with contagious joy and gladness in the Holy Spirit.

Entering the sanctuary for the 8:45 morning worship service one Sunday, I sensed what one member described as "a feeling of power in the gathered congregation." Here and there worshippers knelt at their pews in silent prayer. The Concordia Day School Choir, a group of 55 fifth and sixth graders, sang the processional that lifted the mood to praise and signaled the beginning of corporate worship. Robed in cassock and surplice, the Reverend Theodore Graalman, visitation pastor, led the order of worship. The congregation joined in responsive readings of the Old Testament lesson and the Gospel. After the united confession of the Apostles' Creed came "The Matter of Importance."

"This is something we learned from the Baptists," the pastor explains. "It is a way of bringing a matter of importance to the attention of our people for their support in prayer and for their edification." On the day of my visit Pastor Merkens asked Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Juelg and their five children to come forward, after which he conducted an impressive commissioning ceremony, setting them apart for missionary support with the Lutheran Bible Translators in Liberia, West Africa.

The most important part of church life to 75 percent of Concordia's members, according to a congregational poll, is the sermon. The congregation stood for the reading of the text: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Romans 12:1). The sermon was inspirational, Biblical, well illustrated, simple enough for the young to understand.

At the 11 o'clock service the anthem, sung with authority by the 60-voice adult choir, carried the theme of the morning sermon:

God of grace and love and blessing,
Thine alone shall be the praise.
Give us hearts to trust Thee truly,
Hands to serve Thee all our days.*

* From "God the Father, Son and Spirit," in the Chapel Choir series, ed. by Carl Schalk, copyright 1961 by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mrs. Rhoda N. Canton is the organist and director of the adult and the four Sunday School choirs. She is a graduate of Concordia Teachers' College, River Forest, Illinois, and a sister of the pastor. "When we were young," she recalls, "Guido played the clarinet and I the piano and we would work up concerts for Mom and Dad."

"From Dad I gained a tremendous respect for the Word of God," says Pastor Merkens. When a man stands up to preach he had better put his whole heart into it. He must be excited in his own way, and he had better tell his people loud and clear what Jesus Christ means." Pastor Merkens was made a vice president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in 1971 and has preached on "The Lutheran Hour" international broadcast, but he is first and foremost a shepherd of souls.

Church members and visitors register their attendance in worship each Sunday. Before the following Sunday a member of the parish calls on the visitor in his home. One day while paying such a call, Ramona Stevens, head of the Women's Doorbell Ringers, noticed that the lady showed unusual interest. "I watched Billy Graham on TV from Oakland last night," she told Mrs. Stevens, "and I want to make my commitment to Christ." The 15-week adult instruction class was starting the next Sunday morning, and she became a part of that group of 60 adults. Assistant Pastor Stephen A. McClintic teaches the class. A majority of those attending become active members of the church.

A variety of services attract people to Concordia: the day care center, the elementary school, the vacation Bible school (last summer's school enrolled 911 children), and an aggressive sports program. Softball, volleyball and basketball teams from Concordia are regular winners in the city church league, and as the saying goes around the church: "They come to play; they stay to pray."

A geologist, Bob Keahey, and his wife and five children visited Concordia in 1963, searching for a church "that was not ashamed to proclaim Jesus Christ boldly." At Concordia they found what they needed. Later when Keahey began teaching in the Sunday School he was "scared to death" to pray aloud. "Pastor told me to talk to God just the way I talk to a good friend," he says. Keahey now calls each of his 35 ninth graders every week and is one of 11 teachers in the Young People's Bible Class. Attendance in this division increased 15 per cent in 1972; almost three hundred teen-agers are enrolled.

Sunday School and worship weekly attendance averages 2,750 children, young people and adults. On Wednesday night Sunday School teachers study methods and consider the Bible lesson for the following Sunday. Dr. Harold Meador, a dentist, shares the fruit of his Bible research with first-through eighth-grade teachers.

Concordia Lutheran School began as a kindergarten in 1952 and has developed into an accredited elementary school, with ten teachers and 317 pupils. Because Texas public schools do not yet offer kindergarten, Concordia provides a special service for parents who want early training for their children, says Principal James H. Borlack. Each year a number of families become members of the church as a result of this initial contact with the school. Over half the pupils in these modern classrooms come from Concordia families.

Something of what the school means to church members is indicated by newspaperman Wagner: "The school gave our son, Steve, a firm foundation on which to make the decision to enter the ministry." He is one of three young men from Concordia serving as vicars in a one-year internship before completing his final year at seminary.

Twenty of the church's sons and daughters have entered or are preparing for the Christian ministry. Lenten offerings provide scholarships for every young person entering Christian training.

"Saving faith is personal, but never private," says Guido Merckens. He believes that those who criticize organization must admit that the Spirit can breathe through structure, and that "what is everybody's responsibility is no one's responsibility." He also believes that Satan is "pulling out all the stops today, but that when the world is at its worst, God will see to it that the church is at her best."

Paul describes the church "at her best" as a body "fitted together perfectly . . . each part in its own special way helps the other parts, so that the whole body is healthy and growing and full of love." Concordia is one congregation striving in the Spirit toward that goal.

NORTH VIETNAMESE TACTICS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently much propaganda has been directed against the Republic of South Vietnam. Many old false charges have once again raised their discredited heads. Many thousands of Americans fought and died in Vietnam to help that beleaguered country retain its freedom against the Communist onslaught.

Some in the media and elsewhere were predicting that the withdrawal of American Armed Forces from that country would result in its quick demise. Of course, Vietnam did not fall. Rather, the government was able to expand its control of the countryside and able to gain more allegiance to it. This was not the result of the Vietnamese Communists lack of attempts against the free Vietnamese nor was it a result of the North Vietnamese lacking supplies. The Communist Chinese and Soviet Communists continue to provide the ammunition, weapons, and finances that the North Vietnamese want to continue pursuing their goal of taking over the South. The Communists, having poor luck on the battlefield, are taking their battle to another arena—the United States itself—to attempt to sell the falsehoods that they have been so unsuccessful in putting into practice in South Vietnam. The battle for South Vietnam continues. The Communists have great persistence in seeking their goals of conquest. No longer are American men fighting and dying in Vietnam—for which we all should be thankful. But can we throw away the sacrifices of so many brave Americans who were wounded, captured, or were killed to stop the Communist advance? The Soviets and Communist Chinese are still pursuing their goals in Southeast Asia, as in so many parts of the world, through proxy wars and subversion.

At this point I include in the RECORD two recent articles which deserve the attention of all those concerned about American foreign policy. One is entitled "The Sword Pulled Aside" from the March 16, 1974, issue of the Economist

and the other is an Evans and Novak column entitled "Hanoi's New Strategy in South Vietnam" from the Washington Post of April 10, 1974.

The articles follow:

[From the Economist, Mar. 16, 1974]

THE SWORD PULLED ASIDE

(It looks as if North Vietnam has dropped the idea of another attack into the south for the time being—in favour of a campaign against American help to South Vietnam's economy.)

The next big push in South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong may not now come this year, and very likely not next year either. The aim of the North Vietnamese government presumably remains what it always was: to unite Vietnam under a communist government. But the North Vietnamese appear to have reached the conclusion that an attempt to bring that about by sending their army into the attack again in the next year or two would either be defeated, or must be abandoned for other reasons. The sword suspended over South Vietnam's head may for the moment have been withdrawn.

There are many signals of this change of tack. Not much has been seen or heard of General Giap, the principal architect of the great offensives of 1968 and 1972, over the past six months. In a major resolution, the Hanoi politburo recently declared that the economic reconstruction of North Vietnam is its immediate priority. Still more revealing is a Vietcong document captured earlier this year (the so-called Cosvn resolution 12) which shows that the communists are thinking in terms of a campaign that could last until 1980, and will be psychological and economic as much as military.

It has been suggested that the North Vietnamese are playing things quietly in the hope of getting a large amount of aid from the Americans. If they indulge in such hopes at all—and they know as well as anyone how hard it has become to squeeze any kind of aid out of Congress, most of all for so recent an enemy—the idea is almost certainly marginal to their calculations. To begin with, North Vietnam is receiving about as much economic aid as it can usefully absorb from its Russian and Chinese backers, who sent a million tons of rice last year. Spanning new tractors, generators and machine tools are piled up along the road between Hanoi and Halphong. Even the Swedes are contributing.

So American money is not a sufficient reason for the communists' restraint. But the North Vietnamese, having seen how American aircraft and American-made antitank missiles defeated their armoured units two years ago, will be inclined to hold back from a new offensive until they are quite sure that the Americans are unable to do anything to resist it. The effort they have put into restoring their anti-aircraft defences shows that, despite Watergate, they still think President Nixon is capable of hitting back. Their tactic is therefore to wind down the war to a pitch they judge the South Vietnamese economy cannot stand, but American opinion can accept without reacting.

For the next couple of years this will be largely a war for South Vietnam's economy. The military threat limits the extent to which the South Vietnamese can pare down their armed forces, the biggest drag on the country's weak economy. The real war in Vietnam today is not the see-saw struggle for scraps of land; it is a test to see which side's national structure holds out the better. The North Vietnamese have their problems too: they have not yet recovered from the effects of the American bombing, or from the typhoons that wiped out a fifth of their rice crop last year. They are short of manpower, and above all of skilled management. But they have reliable, and generous, outside backers. The South Vietnamese, in con-

trast, cannot be very confident about the future generosity of the Americans.

South Vietnam's war is still paid for in American dollars. But at a time of unprecedented world commodity prices, American economic aid has been pruned back from \$385m in 1972 to \$320m last year. Congress is being asked to approve an additional \$150m this year, but it may take a struggle to maintain even the 1973 aid when the issue comes up next month. Yet the need is obvious. South Vietnam's economic troubles are the result of bad luck as well as the distortion of war. The price of fuel in Saigon has been multiplied by 10 in the past two years. Inflation is running at an annual rate of 50 per cent, and real wages have dropped to a third of what they were in 1964. The effects of all this on morale can be imagined.

THE NEXT CUT WOULD DRAW BLOOD

The South Vietnamese picked up expensive habits from the Americans but now, out of necessity, they are learning not to throw money away by the bucketful in wasted ammunition or redundant consumer goods. The average South Vietnamese battalion is operating on a fifth of the ammunition and a tenth of the fuel that used to be consumed by an American battalion. The problem is that—short of a miraculous off-shore oil discovery—there is no way that South Vietnam can make itself anywhere near self-sufficient in the rest of this decade. Further cuts in American aid will be slicing into the red meat, not the fat.

North Vietnam's friends will do everything they can to persuade Congress to order those cutbacks, by the familiar tactics of selective outrage. Every effort that the South Vietnamese government makes to recover lost ground in what is still its territory is represented as an affront to peace. The issue of political prisoners is still trotted out at regular intervals—the argument being that since South Vietnam's rulers, under war conditions, are tougher on dissidents than democratic governments are expected to be in peacetime; they might as well be replaced by communists. Since the communists, pleading military exigency, do not allow foreign investigators to tour their jails and rehabilitation camps, these are rarely mentioned.

Such arguments will be heard repeatedly in the debate over aid for South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese are chasing the chimera of an American handout for themselves much less than the very real possibility that Congress can be persuaded to cut into the subsidies that keep South Vietnam going. This is one reason why it suits them to play a waiting game for a year or two longer.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1974]

HANOI'S NEW STRATEGY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A Communist document captured by government forces in Binh Thuan province on South Vietnam's central coast six weeks ago points to tragedy growing out of the Nixon administration's bungled campaign in Congress for continued aid to Saigon.

The document spells out unequivocally what the Communist high command in Hanoi really wants: "The revolution in South Vietnam can only be won by means of armed violence in close coordination with the political violence of the masses." This is not local bombast. Rather, the directive is based on a secret resolution setting out a muscular strategy for the entire south.

That sharply contradicts propaganda spread in Congress by radical "peace" groups that continued bloodshed in South Vietnam is caused by Saigon. Beyond that, the Communist strategy reveals the danger facing South Vietnam, if as now seems increasingly possible, it is threatened by drastically reduced U.S. aid. Thanks to falling resolve and

uncertain leadership, the root of the new Vietnam crisis is in Washington.

Early last autumn, U.S. intelligence experts still expected a massive Communist offensive this year from 210,000 North Vietnamese regulars in Northern and Western parts of South Vietnam. But the 21st Communist Party Conference in Hanoi decided Saigon's army was too strong. What resulted was a new strategy outlined in COSVN Resolution 13, secretly issued in December. In turn, COSVN 13 was incorporated in provincial directives, such as the guidelines sent out in Binh Thuan province.

The directive, dated Feb. 5, is remarkable, omitting the usual propaganda about general elections and a coalition government (required by the Paris peace treaty). Instead it bluntly admits that Hanoi's political progress in South Vietnam since U.S. forces pulled out has been disappointing.

"The enemy temporarily has the upper hand," says the directive. "... Puppet soldiers are still plentiful" and are "still able to control populated areas." In contrast, Communist forces "are still weak and undermanned; the guerrilla warfare movement has not yet become strong." The answer: "push our attacks strongly in all areas."

As viewed here, such directives and other intelligence data mean the Communists will continue sharp military attacks locally this year while preparing for a possible general offensive in the future. In sum, Hanoi is not abandoning force as the means to unite Indochina; the strength of the Saigon regime has simply delayed the showdown.

The one factor that could advance the showdown is an economic breakdown, to which Communist headquarters have been alerting their cadre. A drastic, sudden reduction of U.S. aid would surely trigger such a breakdown. Thus, defecting Communists report that Hanoi's strategy is designed to undermine U.S. confidence in President Nguyen Van Thieu's government.

This dovetails with the campaign laid out last October when veteran radical Tom Hayden invited 200 anti-war activists to Germantown, Ohio, for a strategy session. The propaganda lines set forth then have been vigorously relayed on Capitol Hill: the Thieu government, not Hanoi, is the aggressor and would collapse without provocation should the U.S. withdraw aid.

Even though such propaganda is contradicted by the Communists' own documents, it has found fertile soil in a Congress sick and tired of the Indochina burden. Hawkish leaders of a decade ago, such as Democratic Rep. Otis Pike of New York, have joined the aid slashers. In the Senate, old super-hawk Barry Goldwater has defected.

Joining this widening congressional fatigue is a combination of ineptitude and lassitude by the Watergate-obsessed Nixon administration. No effective lobbying effort has been launched. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's letter to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy justifying the aid on the basis of private and verbal Paris peace agreements, did not help. Far worse was disclosure of an outrageous and self-defeating cablegram by the usually astute Graham Martin, U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, urging that Kentucky not be given an "honest and detailed answer" about Vietnam aid.

The major administration effort was a plea before a closed-door House Republican caucus March 26 by Vice President Ford. Shortly thereafter, the administration lost a critical test for more military aid on the House floor by 20 votes. Some Republican congressmen feel the anti-Saigon tide on Capitol Hill is so strong that even an all-out Nixon administration effort could not reverse it.

If so, the last chapter of the tragic Vietnam story may be drenched in irony. At the cost of so much American blood, treasure and political turmoil, the Saigon regime at last has established itself politically and

militarily, as even Communists documents concede. Having reached this point, however, its worst threat now is not Hanoi's aggressive designs but ineptitude and battle fatigue in Washington.

**JACK KEMP PAYS TRIBUTE TO
RETIRING MARYVALE SUPERIN-
TENDENT DR. SAMUEL R. BEN-
NETT**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the last several years many school districts in the Nation have undergone a great deal of unrest and experienced various difficulties of one sort or another. However, we in western New York have been fortunate to have had an extraordinary man as superintendent of Cheektowaga's Maryvale Board of Education for the past 23 years.

Dr. Samuel R. Bennett has, because of his enlightened leadership, not only avoided the kinds of troubles which afflicted so many other school districts, but also helped bring the Maryvale School District to the public eye as a progressive, and responsible example of what a school district can be.

Dr. Bennett is going to retire at the end of this school year. His accomplishments include an extensive adult education program, a well-developed work experience program, a growing capacity of BOCES—Board of Cooperative Educations Services—to provide specialized teaching, and a school budget which Maryvale residents have never rejected.

The Buffalo newspapers commended Dr. Bennett for his contributions and achievements. Their commentaries follow:

**DR. SAMUEL BENNETT RETIRING; LED MARYVALE
DISTRICT 23 YEARS**

Dr. Samuel R. Bennett, head of the Maryvale school system since 1951 and the man who guided it through an explosive period of growth, will go on retirement July 31.

During his tenure here, the Maryvale school student population has grown from about 1,000 to more than 7,500 and its faculty from 35 to 358. At the same time, the district has spent about \$14 million on new buildings.

The announcement of his retirement described his time at Maryvale as years of decision. Besides the construction program and enormous influx of students he had to manage curricular changes and face up to new mandates from the state.

A measure of his skill as an educational administrator is illustrated by the fact that six people who served under him in the district now have superintendentcies of their own. He served on several important committees concerned with public education, including:

The Superintendents' Council, to which the late Dr. James Allen appointed him while he was state commissioner of education; the State School District Administrators Board of Directors; the Erie County Education Television Committee, of which he was chairman, and the Western New York Committee on Legislation & Finance.

He also accepted an invitation to attend for two years the prestigious Harvard University Advanced Administrative Institute.

Dr. Bennett came to Maryvale from Birmingham, Mich. He had been junior high school principal there from 1948 to 1951 un-

der the superintendency of Dr. Dwight B. Ireland.

He graduated first in 1934 from old Genesee Normal School with a major in elementary education and from Albany State Teachers College in 1934 with a major in elementary education and from English and social studies. He received his doctorate from the University of Buffalo in 1959.

Dr. Bennett taught in the elementary and junior high schools at Mt. Morris until 1942, when he transferred to LeRoy. With time out for World War II service as a Navy gunnery officer, he was vice principal and junior high principal there until 1948.

He and his wife live at 32 Eastvale Dr. Dr. Bennett hopes to do some college teaching in his retirement, but meantime he will play some golf, travel and devote time to relaxation and reading.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Mar. 20, 1974]

**MARYVALE SUPERINTENDENT RETIRING AFTER
LONGEST TENURE IN COUNTY**

When Dr. Samuel R. Bennett told Cheektowaga's Maryvale Board of Education Monday that he wants to retire at the end of the school year, he signaled the close of a unique 23-year career as a chief school officer.

For not only has Dr. Bennett been Erie County's longest-serving school administrator, his tenure has been among the quietest.

While controversy from time to time has erupted in districts all around Maryvale, Dr. Bennett's influence is credited with Maryvale's quiet image.

That doesn't mean that nothing has happened at Maryvale. Far from it. Rather it reflects the loyalty and confidence that Maryvale's 30,000 residents feel for their school and its leadership.

For example, Maryvale's residents have never rejected a budget. School Board elections have been relatively tame compared to those in adjacent districts.

A fine and extensive adult education program flourishes at Maryvale and Dr. Bennett has had the wisdom and luck to have selected excellent aides to run the district's seven school buildings.

Dr. Bennett has a partial explanation for the district's harmony.

"Maryvale grew from a residential area and the school became the center of the community and drew its loyalties."

Another long time observer pointed out that the school system is the closest thing to a Main St. the community has.

Dr. Bennett credits the district's School Planning Board with valuable service too. The board draws its membership from virtually every Maryvale organization.

Its sub-committees perform valuable research into vital school matters so that new developments and proposals rarely come as surprises to the community's leaders and residents.

If Dr. Bennett has gained the confidence of residents, the onetime social studies teacher also has won the respect of his fellow chief school officers.

Currently, he's chairman of the Legislative Committee for the Erie-Niagara Chief School Officers Association. The committee tackles such difficult matters as state aid, and the new recommendations of the State Task Force for restructuring the aid programs.

Maryvale now enrolls about 7100 students and has reached its peak population. The frantic building of the 1950 and 1960 decades is over.

That has given Dr. Bennett (and his successor) the chance to spend more of his time on purely learning matters than used to be the case.

If Maryvale has been a peaceful district, it's also a "poor" district in state fiscal terms. There's only about \$20,000 assessed valuation behind each Maryvale pupil as compared to a New York State average of about \$40,000.

In a way that has benefited the district because the state government has carried a large share of the district's school costs.

But with state aid having dropped from 48 per cent to 39 per cent of local costs in recent years, some crucial decisions about where the school money will come from lie ahead for Maryvale and other districts.

Dr. Bennett is confident that the youngsters finishing Maryvale schools today is much better prepared than graduates of 20 years ago. "They have to be because our teachers today are so much better prepared," he explained.

Dr. Bennett also places great store in the new work experience program that Maryvale and other schools use and the growing capacity of BOCES, the Board of Co-operative Educational Services, to provide specialized teaching.

For Dr. Bennett, who started teaching in Mt. Morris Central School, then moved to LeRoy Central and then Birmingham, Mich., Maryvale is not the end of the educational line.

"I gave my notice early enough so that I might find something else after I leave here," he said.

Sam Bennett's low-profile manner has proven useful out of as well as in school. He's pretty good with the woods and irons, as regulars at the Lancaster Country Club have learned.

For years, he and his erstwhile school neighbor, Dr. William E. Keller, the former Williamsville superintendent, maintained a hot rivalry on the golf course.

Worried that revelation of his golfing talents could cramp his betting game on the links, the slim, trim educator would only admit to shooting in the low 80s on his better days.

A confirmed believer in walking as a good exercise, this year Sam Bennett mechanically advanced to cross country skiing.

After this year, he hopes to spend his evenings reading more political biographies and fewer school budgets.

AN URBAN ARCHITECTURAL TRIUMPH IN MINNEAPOLIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the new 51-story Investors Diversified Services—IDS—building has added a new sense of visual excitement to the Minneapolis skyline.

The office tower is part of a larger complex of four buildings joined together by a glass enclosed courtyard. The entire complex covers a full square block in the center of downtown Minneapolis. It, in turn, is linked to the buildings that face it on all four sides by a series of glass enclosed walkways spanning downtown streets at the second story level.

This new office, shopping, and hotel center, designed by Philip Johnson and John Burgee, is gaining wide acclaim for its architectural quality. William Marlin in the Washington Post has called it an "urban triumph." Writing in the New York Times, Paul Goldberger says that it is "one of the finest skyscraper groupings built in any American city in the last decade."

Goldberger goes on to say:

It is all a good urban space should be, full of life and activity, yet not too busy or fussy;

and large enough to create a sense of grand civic scale, yet able to relate well to existing buildings and street patterns.

The IDS complex is most significant as a focal point of our revitalized downtown. Undoubtedly, it will help to spur the continued growth of a central business district that is alive and flourishing today because of creative efforts by both the public and private sectors.

Through this project, Philip Johnson and John Burgee have shown how urban architecture can have a major social, cultural, and economic impact far beyond the immediate space that it encloses.

I want to take this opportunity to insert the articles by Paul Goldberger and William Marlin in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AN URBAN ARCHITECTURAL "TRIUMPH" IN MINNEAPOLIS

(By William Marlin)

MINNEAPOLIS.—The Midwest now has its own Piazza San Marco in Minneapolis.

Investors Diversified Services (IDS), commissioning architects Philip Johnson and John Burgee of New York, apparently feels that making sense is as important as making money. Their new IDS Center is, in more than architectural terms, an urban triumph—a street-smart cluster of four buildings on one downtown block with an enthralling, multi-level, 20,000-square-foot covered court.

A 51-story tower, with rooftop restaurant and observation deck, benignly reigns over the city's low profile skyline. Its octagonal plan, notched out with setbacks on each of the four angled sides to create 32 corner offices on each floor, reads out with multifaceted facades of mirror glass, making the tower more a presence than an imposition in the city's cozy scale.

A 19-story hotel, including a bank, is located on the opposite side of the IDS block. Its plan, evocative of the tower's, also has setbacks. Guestrooms are sequentially staggered along a zig-zagged center corridor, giving most of them a corner-window view down the adjacent streets.

An eight-story office annex, containing an underground garage, is more rectangular in plan, yet it too is notched out at two corners, diagonal from each other. This annex edges along Marquette Avenue, creating a border on that side of the block between the hotel which, in turn, creates a border lining 8th and the tower which, in turn, creates a border on 7th.

In this way, the identity of the streets is kept intact. The fourth quadrant of the IDS block, at the corner of 8th and Nicollet Mall, contains a two-story retail structure, including a cavernous Woolworth's and assorted shops and services.

These buildings, taken separately, are beside the point. But taken together, they create the point—that center-block piazza, called (hereabouts) Crystal Court, canopied with a pyramidal composite of metal framed glass and plastic cubes, and rising to a high point of 121 feet.

Here, at least, is a real gathering place—as is San Marco in Venice, and as most of history's piazzas and squares and courts were conceived to be.

At IDS Center, the Crystal Court serves a congenial function. People have reasons to gather. They have reasons to tarry and, at the same time the system of interconnected bridges and esplanades, feeding into the court and threading through it, supplies quick, convenient, weather-safe passage for those in a hurry.

The reason that IDS in general and the Crystal Court in particular are so street-smart, as it was said, is that four glass-

enclosed skyways make it a functional as well as sociable extension of the city's movement arteries.

These second-level, midblock bridges—versions of which are now appearing in Seattle, Portland, Denver—also serve to add yet another dimension to the economic vitality of the streetscape.

Minneapolis has 10 of these completed and 50 more projected. Directly beneath the four IDS skyways in street-level access as well—thus giving double life to these four points.

Once inside this great "outdoors" or outside this great "indoors" the skyways connect, lining the space on all but the tower side with a potpourri of shops and, right next to the inside block face of the tower, jutting into the court itself, an almost Parisian kind of restaurant.

IDS is not so much structural innovation as it is social innovation—a work of technology and art which recognized the existing pattern of streets, and kept them wholly; a work which, though expensive in terms of first cost, will yield economic dividends for itself and downtown by making it even more sociable and attractive and efficient.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1974]
FIFTY-ONE-STORY TOWER TOPS MINNEAPOLIS SKYLINE

(By Paul Goldberger)

MINNEAPOLIS.—Taped to the wall of a service elevator in the new 51-story IDS Center here is a postcard view of the Foshay Tower, the eccentric nineteen-twenties obelisk which, until the completion of IDS, was Minneapolis' tallest building. Scrawled beside the picture are the words, "To my good friend IDS—best wishes, Mr. Foshay."

The inscription rooted in sarcasm had a serious intent: to express the concern of many residents here over the decision of Investors Diversified Services to allow its huge new headquarters grouping to dominate the city's skyline, once topped off by Foshay's tapering tower. Yet this concern seems hardly called for. Minneapolis never really had much of a skyline, and although residents may feel sentimental about it, Foshay is not a very good building.

SKILLFUL DESIGN

The new building is. It is not only a good building but one of the finest skyscraper groupings built in any American city in the last decade. It's a skillful piece of design with not only the elegant detailing characteristic of architects Philip Johnson and John Burgee, but the site planning is so sensitive that it should put to rest any suggestions that the complex is not a respectful part of the Minneapolis cityscape.

And it is proof that the scale of a city can be altered skillfully, without the devastating effects that a project like the World Trade Center has had on lower Manhattan.

The IDS Center consists of a 51-story tower, a 19-story hotel, an eight-story office building and a two-story wing of stores, all arranged around a central glass-roofed court. Each building is accessible from the street as well as from the court, and there are four entrances to the court from the street itself.

The store-lined court has, in the months since its opening, become one of downtown Minneapolis' vital public spaces. It is an exciting, dramatic room, full of both vertical and horizontal movement. The roof, made up of a pile of glass and steel pyramids, mounts toward the southeast corner of the court, reaching 121 feet at its highest point. It is like a great glass circus tent pitched in the center of the city.

Two of the hotel's restaurants are perched on balconies overlooking the space, adding to the activity. But the court is perhaps most interesting of all in its floor plan. There are no straight lines here, only diagonals pulling from a subtle balance of entrances around the space.

The headquarters relates to its surroundings both at street level, where funnel-shaped entrances pull the pedestrian off the street into the court, and at one level above. There are four new additions to Minneapolis's second-floor "skyway"-enclosed crosswalk system literally tie the complex to its neighbors.

It is all a good urban space should be: a clear, processional entrance to the buildings surrounding it, yet an identifiable place in itself; full of life and activity, yet not too busy or fussy; and large enough to create a sense of grand civic scale, yet able to relate well to existing buildings and street patterns.

GLASS SKIN

The buildings of the complex maintain this quality. The 51-story tower is basically octagonal, with eight small setbacks along each of the four diagonal sides to provide 32 corner offices on each floor. The shape is effective in reducing the large mass of the tower as seen from afar (as is the precisely detailed mirror-glass "skin"). At ground level the diagonals play a major role in shaping the spaces of the court.

IDS, like all of the Johnson-Burgee firm's current skyscraper work, makes certain gestures back toward the Seagram Building, on which Mr. Johnson worked as associate architect with Miss van der Rohe, and which he and Mr. Burgee continue to consider an essential source.

The two-story travertine lobby, the steel and copper wire pattern of the elevator cabs, and the alignment of the elevator banks with the tower's entrances to avoid the useless 90-degree turn so common in office towers are all borrowings from Seagram.

But they are borrowings of respect, not blind worship. What is encouraging about this project is how well Mr. Johnson and Mr. Burgee apply lessons learned from Seagram in the entirely different context that the IDS Center represents.

The Center's hotel repeats the setbacks of the office tower, and with the rooms on each floor set back sequentially the corridors assume a zigzag shape. They are perhaps the only hotel corridors anywhere that manage to be interesting spaces in their own right.

The hotel has no real lobby—the court assumes most of the lobby functions, with a registration desk tucked in on the third floor. The interiors, all designed by Johnson & Burgee, are sleek and clean, a bit too Bloomingdale's for some tastes but a refreshing change from the blandness of Holiday Inns. (As well as from the interiors of IDS's offices, which were designed by Welton Becket and Associates and fall far short of the level of quality set by the Johnson-Burgee building itself.)

One of Johnson & Burgee's preoccupations over the last several years has been the esthetic problem of the skyscraper in relation to the street. They have rejected the open plaza in favor of something more interesting visually and more compatible with the streetscape, while attempting to vary the form, although not the engineering, of the glass tower itself.

One building in this series is Pennzoil Place, a pair of towers joined by a glass-roofed lobby now under construction in Houston; another is the project for Lehman Brothers in New York, which would have included a covered arcade. And another is IDS.

It is typical of the economic and other problems of building in New York that their superb effort for lower Manhattan, the Lehman Brothers building, was never built. In a way it is unfortunate that Johnson & Burgee, a New York firm, should not have been able to build a project of IDS's scope and quality in their home city—and that New York architects must go to Minneapolis to teach some lessons about combining size with architectural and urbanistic quality that New York City desperately needs to learn.

ANN ARBOR'S ST. THOMAS HIGH SCHOOL WINS ITS FIRST STATE TITLE IN OVER 40 YEARS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the disappointment of defeat makes the triumph of victory all the more satisfying. This was the case 10 days ago for the St. Thomas High School basketball team of Ann Arbor, Mich., as it lived up to the year-long chant of its cheerleaders that, "We're Number One."

Last year St. Thomas High lost in the semifinals and in 1972 an equally spirited and determined team was beaten by a single point in the regional final. But on March 30 at East Lansing the St. Thomas High team proved the value of team play as it defeated Harbor Springs 68 to 53 to win the finals of the class D State high school tournament.

The victory brought Ann Arbor its first State title in over 40 years and left St. Thomas with a 26 to 1 record for the year. The win was especially satisfying to the St. Thomas team because Harbor Springs had maintained an undefeated record until the championship game.

The purpose of my calling this matter to the attention of the House is to give high praise and honor to the team for winning the championship. I also wanted to note the low-key philosophy of Coach Mike Ramker about the importance of winning.

The coach said in a post-game interview with the Ann Arbor News:

We figured they were not going to run us out of town if we lost. Our kids were really relaxed. We were just going to play a basketball game and the better team would win.

Once again, I want to extend my congratulations to the St. Thomas team and its coaches and I include an article from the Ann Arbor News about the final game to be printed at this point in the RECORD: IRISH DISCOVER THEY CAN RUN ON "D" FINALIST

(By Jeff Mortimer)

EAST LANSING.—The fun began when the St. Thomas High basketball team found out it could run on Harbor Springs.

The message came through from Coach Mike Ramker during a time out two minutes into the second quarter of Saturday night's Class D state championship game at Jenison Fieldhouse.

Harbor Springs was leading, 21-16, after three straight baskets, but neither team had been able to seize momentum. After the time out, the Irish ran off 10 consecutive points in a little over two minutes.

They did it in classic fashion—using their 2-3 zone to keep the Rams outside and deny them the offensive boards. Len Lillard or Ken Richard would clear and outlet. Pat Gallagher and, after Richard fouled out, super-sub Pete Lemmer would finish the carnage at the other end before Harbor Springs could reverse itself.

"After we realized we had the fast break, we told them to run," said a proud but restrained Ramker. "They sent a lot of guys to the boards and nobody was back."

"We didn't expect that kind of trap zone," Ramker explained. "They didn't use it when

we scouted them. After we started getting it in the corners, it was all over. It was three against two.

"We didn't think we could run that well against them. They were kind of slow getting back down court."

From the time St. Thomas made the adjustment until the new state champs enjoyed their biggest lead, 65-45, the margin in favor of the Irish was 49-24.

Another way of saying that is "no contest." The triumph was sweet vindication for the Irish, who lost in the semifinals last year and were beaten by a point in the regional final in 1972.

"We try to set our goals realistically," said Ramker. "I thought we could have won the state the last three years. We learned a lot from last year. We made mistakes in preparation and the pressure got to the players."

This year's approach was more low-key, and it paid off.

"We figured they weren't going to run us out of town if we lost," the coach said. "Our kids were really relaxed. We were just going to play a basketball game and the better team would win. Maybe we didn't take it as seriously as some people did. We made it like we were just going to Dearborn to play a game."

While the Irish found the flaws in the Harbor Springs' zone, the Rams had considerably more difficulty with St. Thomas' defensive strategy.

"We felt if we could make them shoot over us all night, they couldn't beat us," said Ramker. "I know they've played against zones before but ours is a very intimidating zone."

Harbor Springs shot only 32.4 per cent from the field in the first half and fizzled to 27.8 after intermission. The Rams were forced into low-percentage shots and more important, pressed into shooting beyond the range they would have preferred, even for outside shots.

Favorites have a notoriously poor track record in state tournaments. That the Irish confirmed their number-one poll ranking was especially satisfying.

"This isn't something that fell into our laps," said Ramker. "At the start of the season, we intended to be here. We liked the idea that we were rated and everybody was looking for us. This is where we got our training. I'd do it again."

A state championship team produces not only congratulation and celebration but also speculation. Where will the team's main man go to college? Has anyone sought to lure the coach's services?

The 6-7 Lillard will be a prize catch for someone, although Ramker emphatically denied the report in the tournament program that Notre Dame is Lillard's destination.

A TRIBUTE TO KING, ATTUCKS, AND POWELL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we all know that this past Thursday, April 4, 1974, marked the death of two great men, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., men whose lasting contributions and whose impact on the American system of justice created a turning point in our history.

From the start of his congressional career, Powell saw himself as representing not just Harlem constituents but also those who, at that time, had no political

voice "because they can't vote." He spoke out on civil rights supporting equal opportunity for blacks and other minorities in all levels of society. As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee from 1960 to 1967, Powell was the predominant force in obtaining passage of several major pieces of legislation for the purpose of providing equality of economic opportunity for all people.

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., laid the legislative foundation to assist the socially and economically oppressed minority Americans in our society. He advocated an end to segregation in the armed services, a permanent fair employment practices commission, legislation for the purpose of providing equality of economic opportunity for all people.

It was his belief that there is no future for the black man that he does not fight for. And there is no future for the blacks until they are, first, proud that they are black and second, black in their thinking. This was his platform prose, the ground upon which he stood and fought for his rights and for the rights of all black Americans.

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., made himself the unchallenged voice of black people and other minorities, infusing within all people strength which gave the civil rights revolution its stature.

I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream.

All of us in this Chamber today remember the emotional thrust of these words. We who were present are indeed fortunate to have experienced the power and charisma of his eloquence. It was King's contention that nonviolence could be the most effective weapon in the black man's fight for justice in the United States and may prove the answer to the need of all humanity.

We remember well how King, sometimes referred to as the "father" of the sit-in, inspired and encouraged this form of protest against discrimination at lunch counters, theaters, department stores, colleges, and libraries. Eager to provoke the Federal Government into greater involvement in the civil rights cause, he supported the Freedom Riders of whites and blacks which tested the willingness of the National Government to protect the rights of blacks in the South. One tends to forget that most men, black or white, are essentially non-violent, and that Dr. King was trying to marshal this nonviolence. It must be remembered that he brought about a sense of a black-and-white community of decent men.

With their commanding presence and great oratorical talents both King, the moralist, and Powell, the legislator, could mobilize people to act. Both had an indescribable capacity for empathy that was the touchstone of leadership. And both, by preachment, articulated to blacks a sense of identity and functional unity.

In conjunction with the special order commemorating these two men, I would like to bring to your attention a parade sponsored by the Crispus Attucks Society

held in my hometown, Newark, honoring Martin Luther King, Jr., and Crispus Attucks, a runaway slave who was one of the first Americans killed at the Boston Massacre. The theme for this year's parade was "March in Pride" for "it is truly better to march in pride than in protest."

Among the many dignitaries who participated in the ninth annual event were Gov. Brendan T. Byrne, Assembly Speaker S. Howard Woodson, Jr., and Newark Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson. There were approximately 50,000 people who joined in the march and, at least, 15,000 persons who were among the spectators. Among the young marchers were the Newark West Side Boys' Club championship Little League team and the Orange High School State championship basketball team. There were 20 floats, including one transporting the State's seven black mayors, Miss Junior Miss of New Jersey, Miss Black Teenager of New Jersey, and for the first time the Newark Policemen's Benevolent Association.

As grand marshal, Mr. Woodson said he was "honored to see such an excellent display of togetherness to honor two great Americans." Connie Woodruff, who served as parade commentator, commended black fraternal organizations and black businessmen for their work throughout the years "to keep the parade alive."

It was my feeling that, although King and Attucks lived during different eras of history, we can speak about them at the same time because they held in common an ideal, and equally important, the courage to speak out and take action.

Even in today's sophisticated and modern society, it has not been fashionable to dream of an ideal and then speak out honestly and openly regarding it. Nor has it been fashionable to act according to those ideals. Yet that is exactly why we praise these men. They were not afraid to speak out, to act and even give their lives in order to achieve justice and freedom for their people.

I believe that this country is now at another critical point in its history. We are confronted with crises and problems that go to the very core of our political and economic systems. And if we are to overcome these obstacles what we should do, rather, what we must do, is to follow the example set forth by King and Attucks. For there can only be one way to truly do honor to these two men, and other men like them, and that is by using them as examples for our own conduct as we attempt to deal with today's challenges.

And so I ask those who wish to pay the highest tribute to King, Attucks, and Powell to do so by making their bravery, their integrity, and their great desire for justice and freedom our own.

THREE PLATEAUS OF ADULT LIFE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in addressing my constituents in the Third

District of Georgia, which I am privileged to represent, I frequently refer to the three plateaus of adult life.

The first plateau is in having children of your own for it is then that you learn the full meaning of unselfish adult life.

The second plateau is Little League baseball because a family as a unit can participate—agonizing together in defeat and rejoicing together in victory.

The third plateau is having grandchildren because you can love them as your own without quite the same responsibilities.

Many of us have arrived at the second plateau. Our family has participated in Little League, Pony League, and Babe Ruth League baseball from Sleepy Hollow, Va., to Columbus, Ga., and back to Vienna, Va.—and back again to Georgia. Both of our sons have moderately experienced what it means to sit on the bench, play as a regular, and finally to be selected for all-star teams. Tommy, 17, our oldest son, graduated as an all-star from both the Sleepy Hollow Little League and the East Columbus Babe Ruth League. Fred, 13, our youngest, was a member of the Georgia State championship team last year.

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, youth baseball does mean so very much to our family and people like us in Georgia and across the land. As in most things in life, we know you get out of it exactly what you put into it, and we are putting as much "hustle" into baseball as we possibly can. This past Saturday, in fact, it was my very distinct pleasure to participate in the opening day ceremonies for the National Little League of South Columbus, and then in the Eastern Babe Ruth League opening day ceremonies at Edgewood.

In recent weeks much national attention has been given to the possibility of young ladies becoming active participants in Little League baseball. Misunderstandings have developed and have been given much play by the national news media.

The Little League leaders in my home town of Columbia, Ga., are setting what I believe to be an outstanding national example in their attitude toward this situation. The Little League of Columbus has expanded its program to include a "Little League for Girls" in softball. This new dimension, I know, will prove to be a positive step in our city's overall recreation program. How do I know? I saw it in action at the National Little League on opening day. It was demonstrative evidence of a success story—a program open to all girls, not just to a few, in this age bracket, under proper supervision.

Abe Lincoln said it very well. You can not make a short man tall by cutting off the tall man's legs. The moral here is not to allow envy to tear down a successful program in one's efforts toward equal opportunity; rather channel those efforts into a companion program as an affirmative, positive alternative.

May I in particular, Mr. Speaker, congratulate Mr. Gene Rumph, district 8 administrator of Little League baseball, and Mr. Wallace P. Sellers, Jr., president of the Greater Little League of Columbus for enunciating that "builder"

approach referred to above. This is the road to achievement.

May I conclude by quoting a prayer from Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston in which he pays the supreme compliment to baseball by describing the game of life in baseball terms. I believe this is precisely the attitude and example of Hank Aaron to whom I dedicate this space on the occasion of his record-breaking 715th home run. We are proud of Hank, a legend in his own time, and express our appreciation to him for keeping our national pastime on such a high plane.

The prayer reads:

Help me be a good sport in this game of life. I don't ask for an easy place in the line-up. Put me anywhere you need me. I only ask that I can give you 100 per cent of all I have. If all the hard drives seem to come my way, I thank you for the compliment. Help me remember that you never send a player more trouble than he can handle.

Help me, O Lord, to accept the bad break as part of the game. And may I always play on the square, no matter what the others do. Help me study The Book so I'll know the rules.

Finally, God, if the natural turn of events goes against me and I'm benched for sickness or old age, please help me to accept that as part of the game, too. Keep me from whimpering or squealing that I was framed or that I got a raw deal. And when I finish the final inning, I ask for no laurels. All I want is to believe in my heart that I played as well as I could and that I didn't let you down.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—NOW IS THE TIME FOR DECISIONS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest paradox of the energy crisis is that it suddenly entered the American consciousness last fall despite the fact that forces which brought it about had been developing openly for years. The interruption of some oil imports by the Arab oil embargo intensified the discrepancy between domestic supply and demand, which was increasing before the Middle East war began. Each year the Nation has been demanding extra amounts of energy equal to 1½ million barrels of oil a day. Since 1970, virtually all of this increase came from imported oil, much of it from the Middle East. By last summer, Arab oil imports amounted to about 2 million barrels per day.

The gap between domestic production and consumption grew not by design but through a complex of Government, industry, and consumer decisions which were often unrelated to energy supply-and-demand calculations. Consumption grew virtually unchecked while domestic production of fuels has been stable since 1970. In recent years, imported fuel, primarily oil, has made up the difference. In slightly more than two decades this country has changed from a net exporter to an importer of 15 percent of our energy, including 35 percent of our oil. Oil imports have tripled since 1960.

The Arab oil nations have reached a conditional decision to lift their embargo on Persian shipments to the United States. The key question is how much oil the Arabs will actually make available and at what price. The lifting of the embargo brings no guarantee of the elimination of petroleum shortages.

Although several Government officials are predicting a much brighter energy outlook than they were several months ago, I submit that we are still at a crucial stage in our energy policy decisions. Even on a worldwide scale, known petroleum reserves can only be expected to be sufficient for 37 years at current rates of consumption. The 5-month embargo is behind us, but we are still faced with the challenge and the legacy of an energy crisis. And if the embargo were reimposed, it would have longer and more far-reaching effects than the one just ended.

Some fundamental changes will have to be made now if we are going to avoid serious energy crises in the 1980's, 1990's, and 2000's. It is very disturbing to witness the lack of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches on this matter of vital national and worldwide concern.

President Nixon recently charged that Congress is imposing a legislative embargo on 17 urgently needed energy measures proposed by the administration. The President's attack is not supported by the facts. Energy matters have dominated the work of Congress in the past 9 months. Over 1,000 separate energy bills have been introduced, and over 30 committees and subcommittees have conducted over 600 days of hearings on nearly every aspect of energy. Four of the 17 administration proposals were incorporated in the Emergency Energy Act, which the President vetoed. Five have been passed by one or both Houses, and eight are currently being processed in committee.

Here are brief summary paragraphs explaining the status of the 17 administration proposals:

STATUS OF ENERGY LEGISLATION

PASSED BY CONGRESS AND VETOED BY PRESIDENT

Special Energy Act (S. 3150, introduced March 11, 1974)

This bill authorizes the President to impose mandatory energy conservation measures and to ration gasoline and other petroleum products. It also authorizes grants to the states to carry out energy emergency programs. This authority was contained in the Energy Emergency Act vetoed by the President. The House Commerce Committee is currently drafting its own legislation to replace the vetoed bill.

Job security assistance (draft proposal submitted Feb. 14, 1974)

This bill provides unemployment assistance to workers who lose their jobs because of the energy crisis. A similar program was included in the vetoed Energy Emergency Act. The Administration's energy-related unemployment benefits proposal is contained in comprehensive legislation amending the unemployment insurance program. The Ways and Means Committee has not yet scheduled hearings on the bill.

Energy Information Disclosure Act (S. 3151, introduced March 11, 1974)

This bill requires all domestic energy companies to report energy inventories, production, cost and reserves. A similar disclosure

requirement was included in the vetoed Energy Emergency Act. The bill is pending before the Senate Interior and Commerce Committees.

Windfall profits Tax (draft proposal submitted February 4, 1974)

This proposal is designed to prevent windfall profits to the oil companies during the energy shortage by imposing a tax of up to 85% on that part of the selling price of domestic crude oil above the December 1, 1973 ceiling price. The Ways and Means Committee has conducted hearings on the proposal and is currently drafting legislation.

IN CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Federal Energy Administration (H.R. 11793, introduced Dec. 5, 1973)

This bill creates a statutory Federal Energy Administration to administer the fuel allocation program and other programs for energy conservation, production, and distribution. The legislation has passed both Houses and is now in conference committee.

PASSED BY EITHER HOUSE OR SENATE

Energy Research and Development Administration (H.R. 9090, introduced June 29, 1973; S. 2135, introduced July 10, 1973)

This bill reorganizes and consolidates energy research and development functions in the Federal Government under a new Energy Research and Development Administration. The House passed the Government Operations Committee bill (H.R. 11510) on December 19, 1973. The Senate Government Operations Committee is currently marking up its own legislation (S. 2744).

Mined Area Protection Act (S. 923, introduced February 20, 1973; H.R. 4863, introduced February 27, 1973)

This bill establishes federal requirements and guidelines for state programs to regulate environmental consequences of surface and underground mining operations. The Senate passed its own strip mining legislation (S. 425) on October 9, 1973 and the House Interior Committee has conducted extensive hearings and markup sessions on its bill (H.R. 11500). Final action on this bill has been delayed because of conflicts within the Administration regarding its position on the legislation and because of delaying tactics on the part of Administration spokesmen within committee. The Interior Committee is expected to report the measure by the end of April.

Naval Petroleum Reserves (S.J. Res. 176, introduced Dec. 4, 1973; H.J. Res. 832, introduced November 27, 1973)

This bill authorizes limited production of oil from the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 and provides funds for further exploration and development of reserve No. 1. The Senate passed the bill on December 19, 1973. The House Armed Services Committee held hearings on the proposal last year; it is currently pending before the Investigations Subcommittee.

Appliance and Motor Vehicle Energy Labeling Act (not yet introduced)

This bill requires that major appliances and motor vehicles be labeled to show their energy use and efficiency. A gas mileage labeling requirement for automobiles was included in the National Fuels and Energy Conservation Act (S. 2176) passed by the Senate on December 10, 1973, despite Administration opposition to the proposal. The House Commerce Committee is currently drafting its own legislation.

PENDING IN COMMITTEE

Drilling Investment Tax Credit (draft proposal submitted April, 1973)

This proposal is designed to provide an incentive for new domestic oil and gas exploration by authorizing a tax credit for costs incurred in exploratory drilling. The

Ways and Means Committee has conducted hearings on the proposal and is currently drafting legislation.

Foreign Depletion Allowance (draft proposal submitted February 4, 1974)

This proposal eliminates the 22 percent depletion allowance permitted in computing U.S. taxes on foreign production of oil and gas. It is designed to eliminate the incentive for investment in foreign oil and gas development rather than in domestic energy resources. The Ways and Means Committee has conducted hearings on the proposal and is currently drafting legislation.

Foreign Tax Credits (draft proposal submitted February 4, 1974)

This proposal limits foreign tax credits available to U.S. oil companies by providing that royalty payments to foreign governments be treated as a business expense rather than as an income tax creditable against U.S. income taxes. The Ways and Means Committee has conducted hearings on the proposal, and is currently drafting legislation.

Mineral Leasing Act (S. 1040, February 28, 1973; H.R. 5442, March 8, 1973)

This bill places all mineral exploration and mining activities on federal lands under a modernized leasing system designed to assure that persons having leases have an interest in early exploration for oil, gas and other minerals. The Senate Interior Committee has scheduled hearings on the bill. The House Interior Committee has scheduled no action on the measure.

Revision of Nuclear Power Plant Licensing Procedures (S. 3179 and H.R. 13484, introduced March 13, 1974)

This bill revises nuclear power plant site review and licensing procedures so as to reduce the time required for licensing and construction of nuclear plants. The Joint Atomic Energy Commission is currently holding hearings on the legislation.

Deregulation of Natural Gas (S. 2048, submitted June 21, 1973; H.R. 7507, submitted May 3, 1973)

This bill provides for the deregulation of natural gas prices. The Senate Commerce Committee completed hearings on the Administration's bill and similar measures on March 28, 1974. The House Commerce Committee has not taken any action on the proposal.

Deepwater Port Facilities (H.R. 7501, introduced May 3, 1973; S. 1751, introduced May 8, 1973)

This bill authorizes the construction and operation of off-shore deepwater port facilities to accommodate super tankers. Both the House Merchant Marine and Public Works Committees have reported deepwater ports legislation (H.R. 5898 and H.R. 10701, respectively). The Senate Commerce, Public Works, and Interior Committees have held hearings on the legislation and are scheduled to begin markup within the next few weeks.

Department of Energy and Natural Resources (H.R. 9090, June 29, 1973 and S. 2135 July 10, 1973)

This bill, in addition to creating ERDA, establishes a Cabinet Department of Energy and Natural Resources (DENR) for the comprehensive management of federal energy and natural resource programs. It would incorporate most of the responsibilities of the Interior Department, plus selected natural resource activities from other departments. The Senate Government Operations Committee is currently marking-up the Administration's bill. The House Government Operations Committee held hearings on the proposal last year; it is now pending before the Subcommittee on Legislation. The disagreement between FEO Director William Simon

and OMB Director Roy Ash on the format for the administration of the energy research program has delayed congressional action on the ERDA and DENR proposals.

The one measure designed to meet short-term energy needs, the Emergency Energy Act, was first delayed by an administration-supported filibuster in opposition to the provision limiting windfall profits and was then vetoed by the President because of the crude oil price rollback which replaced the windfall profits section. The proposal also authorized creation of the Federal Energy Administration, implementation of energy conservation plans, power to audit oil company reserves, and unemployment assistance for people displaced because of the energy crisis. Congress worked for several months on this bill, and it passed the House and Senate with bipartisan support.

Congress also passed the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act over administration opposition. That bill required the President to establish a mandatory fuel allocation program, which is now being implemented by the Federal Energy Office to assure equitable distribution of available energy supplies.

I think that Congress is making a serious effort to enact meaningful energy proposals. The President still refuses to face the issue—his four separate energy messages stress that we have a problem, but they say virtually nothing substantive. Shifting the blame to Congress will not heat a single home or hospital or keep a plant open. Such an effort will further divide a country that wants leadership, not partisanship. All branches of Government must work together to manage the shortage so that no individual or group bears an undue burden and so that short-term policy actions will not significantly restrict future options.

At the same time the President has criticized Congress, the executive agency under his jurisdiction, the Federal Energy Office—FEO—has been releasing optimistic energy predictions for the coming months. The FEO recently reported new estimates of the petroleum supply and demand situation to indicate the effects of lifting the Arab embargo. They claim that the total fuel shortfall during April, May, and June will be only 6 percent of unconstrained demand, assuming that the embargo is not reimposed and that Middle East production returns to 1973 levels and continues to increase.

Major conservation efforts have combined with warm weather, higher prices, and FEO's allocation programs to depress consumption below projected unconstrained demand. The FEO boosted the Nation's gas supply by about 4 percent for April. Every State received at least 90 percent of April 1972 consumption after adjustments for motor vehicle growth. The FEO is lowering reserves some 11 million barrels of gasoline this month for this purpose. The forecasted shortfall, taking into consideration price increases and conservation efforts, is 3 percent for the next 3 months.

Our enthusiasm for the lift of the embargo, however, must be qualified.

Energy problems were brought forcefully to public view by the Arab embargo of oil sales to the United States, but the roots of our energy troubles go back to trends in production and consumption which have persisted for some time. And until we regain an appreciable degree of energy independence, we will continue to face the threat of another embargo, production cuts, and the caprices of oil diplomacy. Any decision to draw down inventories must be consistent without responsibility to ensure that we have sufficient supplies for any threatening energy contingency.

It seems strange to me, in this regard, that in one month consumers in various regions of the country were faced with 2-hour lines, \$3 limits, and even-odd rationing programs to obtain gasoline, and suddenly the next month they find that such inconveniences have in large part disappeared. The FEO has failed to give me an adequate explanation for this development, and I have asked the General Accounting Office to investigate it further.

The United States can probably count on some short-term benefits from the expected relaxation of the Arab world's oil restrictions, but a multitude of long-range problems remain. The real danger is that we will not remember the economic crisis so closely approached this winter and return to our profligate energy-consuming ways without pursuing large-scale programs to develop new and alternative energy sources.

The energy problems facing the Nation stem from a long history of neglect and oversight. They will require time and vigorous effort to overcome. But our diverse national resource base and the capability we possess for using energy more efficiently give us room to maneuver. In the short run, we must accelerate development of oil and natural gas in Alaska and on the Outer Continental Shelf. We must boost coal production and bring on line coal gasification and liquefaction capacity, and we must develop our vast oil shale reserves.

However, increasing domestic supplies or implementing new, more efficient energy consumption technologies usually takes several years because massive capital investment is required. It will take years before much of an impact can be felt from such things as changing building codes, developing mass transit systems, and building more efficient automobiles. Unless oil imports can be increased at an acceptable economic and political price, which is possible but not very probable, the only way to reduce the gap in the short run is through more effective use of physical capital already in place and through short-run conservation measures. How individual and industrial energy consumers respond to energy shortages will in large part determine their severity. Business and industry consume 70 percent of our energy, and they will have to do the lion's share of the conserving.

The conservation effort in this country over the last 5 months has been widely acknowledged as successful. The FEO reports that many businesses have found it possible to reduce by 10 to 15 percent

their use of fuels. The Government has also recorded some impressive savings. During the last half of 1973, Federal energy consumption decreased by 23 percent. Finally, the American consumer has responded this winter with many energy-saving sacrifices. The United States must accept its energy diet as a permanent fact of life. We have to be on guard against slipping back to our old patterns of wastefulness now that the embargo has been lifted.

Although the depth of the crisis is still uncertain, it is clear that the energy industry has profited from the word "crisis" in its sometimes carefully orchestrated drive toward higher prices. There is a high degree of concentration in the energy industries. This concentration allows the behavior of large, integrated firms to be cooperative rather than competitive. To insure that the producers are responsive to increased demand for energy and that the prices charged by the companies are determined by the free market rather than an oligopoly of producers, I strongly feel that the Federal Government should actively foster free competition in the energy-producing industries through appropriate legislation and vigorous anti-trust enforcement.

The oil companies argue against a price rollback despite the recent devastating 300-percent increase in world crude oil prices, because they claim that a high price is needed to stimulate increased exploration and development. However, a condition where monopoly elements are present and prices are above a competitive level results in a poor allocation of resources to the detriment of consumers and the economy. We want to be sure that in all industries and especially the energy sector, either through competitive forces or through Government action, the industry uses the most efficient technological and organizational means to deliver its product.

In the long run we must develop a new generation of renewable energy sources such as geothermal, wind, tidal, and solar energy. Present energy problems originate in large part from the lack of a coordinated national energy research and development programs over the last 20 years. I believe that the solution to the energy crisis in the final analysis will be our success in developing alternative sources of energy. The House Subcommittee on Environment, on which I serve, recently approved a \$3.1 billion program to develop more efficient non-nuclear-energy sources. The majority of these R. & D. funds will be focused on bringing today's most promising technology out of the laboratory and into the market. This legislation represents the most significant attempt to provide the United States with energy flexibility and to insulate ourselves from the threat of economic and political blackmail.

The objective to regain and maintain energy self-sufficiency stems from conditions more fundamental than the current crisis. Worldwide energy shortages impend as energy-intensive growth spreads and accelerates. In addition, energy consumption in the United States has been higher than in other countries

for many years, but the rest of the world is growing even faster than we are in energy use. The United States has the resources and technology to approach energy self-sufficiency. A properly directed, sustained national commitment can achieve that goal.

We find ourselves again at a crucial stage in addressing the energy situation. Reduced lines at gas stations and release of the embargo must not preclude national focus on energy problems which are on the horizon and beyond. The United States requires a determined conscious, national effort to reduce demand for energy through the application of energy-saving technologies. We must continue to reduce demand through the conservation ethic which most Americans adopted this winter.

Our options will be much broader if we take the steps now to lay the groundwork. The future, though full of uncertainties, is in some measure within our control. But will the desire to do it be there? Will there be effective leadership to see that necessary and sound programs are carried through to fruition? The answer must come in large part from the Congress, and it must come soon. For the decisions we make today will significantly affect our energy alternatives for a long time to come.

REV. LOUIS GUILLAUME GAGNIER, FOUNDER OF 22 PARISHES IN CANADA AND NEW ENGLAND, ESTABLISHED ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, SPRINGFIELD, AS THE FIRST FRANCO-AMERICAN CHURCH IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS A CENTURY AGO

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church of Springfield, Mass., celebrated its centennial in 1973. This church is the oldest Franco-American Roman Catholic Church in western Massachusetts. It was founded in 1873 by Rev. Louis Guillaume Gagnier who traveled from Canada to the diocese of Springfield founding 22 churches along the way. The following is the story of Father Gagnier and the great contributions he has made to western Massachusetts. I include this article, published in the Springfield Sunday Republican on March 31, and written by Phyllis Andreoni of the Republican staff, at this point in the RECORD:

REV. LOUIS GUILLAUME GAGNIER, FOUNDER OF 22 PARISHES IN CANADA AND NEW ENGLAND

In his pockets, the bearded priest carried candy for children he met in his daily travels. And nickels for wayfarers.

He was easily recognized by the stove-pipe that he wore. And his "Prince Albert" coat. In his hand he carried a walking stick.

The Rev. Louis Guillaume Gagnier was responsible for founding 22 parishes in his lifetime. And the building of 17 churches. He began his priestly career in Canada.

He was a man of God who worked with the people, not just preaching inspiring messages from his Sunday pulpit, but working

side-by-side with them in the dust and mud of a building's foundation.

The times were difficult. It was the 19th Century, when today's necessities were unheard of luxuries. There were no electric lights, no telephones, no trolley cars, no automobiles.

In Springfield, horse-drawn streetcars, the only public transportation, provided hourly service over unpaved streets. There were less than 30,000 people.

Fr. Gagnier hit Massachusetts like a benevolent whirlwind (when it came to accomplishments) in 1870, the same year the Diocese of Springfield was established.

He immediately established two parishes, St. Denis in East Douglas and St. Ann in Manchaug. In 1871, he founded the parishes of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel in Ware and St. Aloysius in Gilbertville.

In 1872, he showed up in the Warren area, organizing St. Thomas Aquinas in West Warren and St. Paul's in Warren.

In 1873, he did what two predecessors in Springfield had failed to do. The zealous pioneer priest founded a Franco-American parish, St. Joseph's.

That parish, still strong and viable, celebrated a glowing Centennial last year.

And a Custombook, just printed, recounts the parish history and that of the acclaimed priest, Fr. Gagnier. The book, full of pictures and history, is being offered to parishioners and the public.

Also established in 1873 were St. Aloysius in Indian Orchard and St. Guillaume, now St. Theresa, in Agawam. St. Louis, in West Springfield, was established in 1895.

Fr. Gagnier celebrated Mass for the first gathering of his Springfield congregation in City Hall, March 9, 1873. Living at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Marsollas on Old Dwight Street, he said weekday Masses there.

In April 1873, St. Joseph's was firmly established and Sunday services were moved to Gilmore Hall on Main Street.

Land on Gilmore Street was purchased for \$20,000 in May. After that, parishioners and Fr. Gagnier picked up their shovels and began excavating.

The first Mass was heard in the church's basement on All Saints Day, Nov. 1, 1873. By 1877, the largest (and most beautiful, many say) of Fr. Gagnier's churches was completed.

Church historians note that precise records were kept of each of the churches Fr. Gagnier founded and built.

"... But he did not involve himself with details—he left that entirely in the hand of God and his people," they say.

In 1884, the Sisters of St. Joseph opened a parish school. Classes were held in the church basement for an initial enrollment of 150.

Electricity nudged out gaslights on city streets. Telephones were new items in many homes and businesses. And in 1890, Fr. Gagnier purchased the Root property.

St. Joseph's was ready to build again by 1897. And on May 8, 1898, the three-story, stone-trimmed brick school building was dedicated by Bishop Thomas D. Beaven.

Sisters of the Holy Cross came from their Canadian Motherhouse that year to run the parish school.

In its first 25 years, the parish, which served French-speaking people of Springfield, Mittineague and Longmeadow, grew in size from 1460 parishioners to more than 3000.

Within the next 10 years, the school enrollment reached a top of 408 students.

Fr. Gagnier's priestly career was highlighted on Dec. 5, 1905 with the Golden Jubilee celebration of his ordination.

It began with a Mass of Thanksgiving. Later, there was a huge banquet in St. Joseph's Hall. Church and city dignitaries paid tribute to the hard-working missionary priest. Some 300 priests attended.

A gala concert in his honor at the Court Square Theater climaxed the day.

Fr. Gagnier's only assistance through the years had come from the LaSalette Fathers of Hartford, Conn. on weekends.

In 1906, when Fr. Gagnier reached the age of 76, a curate was sent to aid him in his church activities.

In 1908, Fr. Gagnier presided at the final subdivision of his large parish. He died in August of that year.

St. Joseph's continues. And its parishioners continue to honor and remember the church's founder—who established the parish when he was an energetic 43-years old.

The candy and nickels in his pockets symbolized his interest in and dedication to his fellow man, they say.

HANK AARON'S ACHIEVEMENT

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my congratulations to a man who has earned for himself one of the most outstanding records of athletic achievement in history.

Millions of fans of America's favorite pastime were thrilled when Hank Aaron, with the first swing of his bat in the Atlanta Braves' home opener Monday night, drove the ball over the left field wall for his 715th career home run, breaking the record 714 set by baseball immortal Babe Ruth.

Just as the Babe inspired millions of young Americans for decades, Hank Aaron has set a new home run mark which will serve to inspire millions more in years to come. We baseball fans will beam with pride for the outstanding achievements of both.

Hank Aaron justly deserves the recognition he has earned, as was pointed out so ably in an editorial which appeared in Saturday's edition of the Washington Post. I invite the attention of my colleagues to that editorial and I wish for Hank Aaron a memorable 1974 season at the plate to push that 715 record to a level which will endure as a challenge for future generations.

The article follows:

HANK AARON'S ACHIEVEMENT

Hank Aaron's big stick had been smashing baseballs over National League fences for a number of years before many fans began to notice anything awesome, much less count them. And perhaps for good reasons. He hit only 13 home runs in his first season in the majors—1954 with the Milwaukee Braves—27 the next season and down to 26 the next. All those years in the 1950s and 1960s. Aaron was a solid performer, but solidity in the shadows of flashy titans like Willie Mays or Mickey Mantle was not what the public remembered or revered. Aaron's own modesty didn't help. The son of a shipyard boiler-maker's helper, Aaron came to the Braves from the sandlots of Mobile, Ala., via bush league stops in Eau Claire, Wis., and a class A team in Jacksonville. Even the way he broke into the Braves' starting line-up suggests that destiny had other things on its mind; Bobby Thomson (of home run fame himself) broke his ankle in a spring training game and Aaron, a rookie sub, was sent in to replace him. He's been playing since.

Now, of course, having tied Babe Ruth's home run record and standing poised to break it when he next comes to the plate, Aaron is known to his teammates and loyalists as "Hammerin' Hank." His achievement has put him into the hero status, no record in sports being better known or more Olympian than the immortal Babe's 714. But Aaron has given something else to the national life: an emotional relief from the number of tragedies and absurdities that now dominate the news and much of our consciousness. Here is a person who is authentic, whose acclaim is based on the results of his self-confidence and not self-promotion, who has been faithful to his vocation whether noticed or not. At a time when so many national events cast common citizens into doubts and confusions about what has really happened beneath the surface of the news, a profound reassurance is provided by Hank Aaron. Even aside from the positives, the negatives are impressive: he is not a fake, he is not a blowhard, he is not a fad. He has been at the heart of excellence for 20 years, and only a few people—in any line—manage the consistency of that.

Hank Aaron is in the record books for several batting feats, but the aura of home runs has a splendor of its own. Aaron once said that successful hitting is 90 to 95 per cent concentration and thoughts, so he has to be as heavy a thinker as a slugger. We hope he has another amazing season and goes as far as he can beyond the Ruthian record. Someday another player—on what Little League diamond is he now?—will come along and threaten, perhaps break, the immortal Aaron's homeric feat. If he does, let him remember that Hank Aaron did more than pound baseballs better than anyone else. He performs with honor, dedication and modesty, contributions as important to the national life as his contributions to the record books.

\$159,000 TO TEACH MOTHERS HOW TO PLAY WITH THEIR BABIES?

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as all taxpayers are well aware, the deadline for income tax filing is upon us. I think it is appropriate at this time of year for us in the Congress who make the Nation's tax laws, to be reminded of some of the amazing, if not ridiculous, ways in which much of that money is spent.

The following article by James Dale Davidson, appearing in the Pittsburgh Press of March 29, 1974, enumerates some of the more absurd uses of the Nation's money. I hope it will provide a little inspiration to all of us to contemplate our profound powers and how injustice and abuse in this country's tax system might be corrected.

I certainly hope that you do not come to the same conclusion as a friend of mine after reading it—

I don't blame Mr. Nixon for taking all of those deductions if that is the way the Government spends our income tax dollars.

The article follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, March 29, 1974]
IN AMAZING WAYS, BUREAUCRATS BLOW YOUR INCOME TAX

(By James Dale Davidson)

(NOTE.—The writer is executive director of the National Taxpayers Union.)

WASHINGTON.—Sitting down with their scratch pads at tax time, people comfort themselves with the notion their money is going to pay for activities which are at least hypothetically good.

It buys weapons to fend off the heathen, helps clean the slums, fights cancer, establishes "a lasting structure of peace" and so on.

REALITY FAR MORE DUBIOUS

The more cynical among us may have more gruesome theories, but our doubts are seldom equal to what really goes on.

Some examples of government spending are so implausible they make the Congressional Record second only to National Lampoon as a comic source.

One man in Texas, who spent several years gleaming fiscal funnies from the Record, thought the material was so hilarious he was demanding \$25,000 from a book publisher for his findings.

Chances are he'll never get the money, not because his examples aren't good reading, but because they are so easily duplicated.

They're like mosquitoes in a swamp. Anyone who cares to wade in can come away with as many specimens as he can stand.

For instance, how many typical taxpaying shoppers who complain about the cost of bacon know they are footing a \$35,000 bill for one year of chasing wild boars in Pakistan?

A SNIFF OF CASH

Just as ridiculous is the \$70,000 which went to study the smell of perspiration given off by the Australian aborigines.

No doubt some money could have been saved on the aborigine project if only the State Department had prevailed upon Turkey to lend the Australians the odor measuring machine we purchased for the Turks for \$28,361.

The Bedouins got \$17,000 for a dry cleaning plant to spruce up their djellabas (garments).

Morocco's economy got an unexpected boost from U.S. taxpayers in the form of a \$37,314 potato chip machine. All the Moroccans needed then was potatoes.

The queen of England received \$68,000 for not planting cotton on her plantation in Mississippi. Ford Motor Co. got only \$14,000 for not planting wheat, and Libby McNeil garnered \$19,000 for growing no cotton.

But the queen came off like a proletarian compared to Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who received \$2 million to purchase a luxury yacht.

Tito travels in even better style than Mr. Nixon's drinking buddy, Leonid Brezhnev, whose stake in solving the oil crisis was increased when American taxpayers picked up the tab on his 12th limousine.

Not all was lavished on royalty and foreign potentates: \$31,650 went into new carpet for House Speaker Carl Albert, D-Okla., \$21,000 for drapes and \$44,000 for chandeliers.

Another \$65,000 went to finish the furnishings.

Another piece of furniture, not in Albert's office, also claimed a lot of tax money. The zero gravity toilet—developed by the space program to function under such conditions—cost \$80,000.

But that was nothing compared to the tab for "environmental testing" of the same toilet, which came to \$230,000.

NUTS, BOLTS \$250,000

The interdepartmental screw thread committee, established as a temporary agency to speed the end of World War I, is still laboring to make nuts and bolts fit. Cost: \$250,000 a year.

Meanwhile, the bureaucrats who devise all these important projects need a break once in a while.

The Alaskan Chateau in Anchorage is maintained for their exclusive use (providing they make \$22,000 or more, or they're mem-

bers of the military above the rank of major.)

For 3 dollars a day, these "public servants" can unwind in steam rooms, sauna, sun-rooms, massage rooms, a gym and cocktail lounge.

Salaries of the government employes who act as servants at Alaskan Chateau exceed \$100,000 a year.

The cause of higher learning has been bolstered in ways that would have dazzled Gulliver more than his visit to the Grand Academy of Lagado.

For reasons unknown, government research has located the frontiers of man's knowledge in three remote countries: Poland, Burma and Yugoslavia.

FROGS CROAK \$6,000

A study of Polish bisexual frogs cost \$6,000; Another \$85,000 was consumed learning about the "cultural, economic and social impact of rural road construction in Poland" and \$20,000 was devoted to study the blood groups of Polish Zlotnika pigs.

The bounty for finding Yugoslavian lizards was \$15,000.

But geography is no barrier to the search for knowledge.

We spent money like mad in other areas too: \$5,000 to tabulate the differences between native American and Indian whistling ducks, and \$20,000 for investigating the German cockroach.

A history of comic books cost \$71,000, making it far more costly than the dictionary of witchcraft compiled for a few measly grand.

An analysis of violin varnish cost \$5,000, while 10 times that amount went for analysis of the fur trade between the U.S. and Canada between 1770 and 1820.

In another area of great concern to average taxpayers, \$20,324 was spent to learn about the mating calls of Central American toads.

The toads' problems were only one-tenth as pressing as those of the city of Los Angeles, which received \$203,979 to extend Travelers' Aid to migrants lost on the freeway.

POEMS IS ODE TO \$5,000

Culture also benefited from an infusion of government funds.

Some genius got \$5,000 to write the poem "Ighgt." That's not the title by the way, that's the poem.

The whole thing comes to seven letters worth \$714.28 each.

HEW spent \$19,300 to find out why children fall off tricycles. The answer: "Unstable performance, particularly rollover while turning."

Not to be outdone, the Pentagon spent \$375,000 to study the Frisbee. This, of course, is less discouraging than having them spend \$375,000 to buy a Frisbee.

That could have happened if Frisbees were large enough to be pitched as tents.

When Air Force engineers decided to "invent" a device to cover the lips of missile silos, they spent \$1 million to come up with a prototype which looked for all the world like a tent.

Within hours after the newly invented tent had been fastened down, it disappeared. Later, investigators found it blowing head-over-heels across the prairie.

PENTAGON PINNED

Experts investigating the construction of the C-5A cargo plane found proof of the Defense Department paying \$111 for a pin.

Overall construction was so inefficient that if your family car were built on the same methods with similarly inflated labor costs it would have to be priced at \$100,000.

Congressional spending watchdog Sen. William Proxmire heard testimony about another bit of fiscal mischief with true human interest.

I am not referring to Proxmire's discovery that Pentagon bigwigs routinely spend \$600-

000 outfitting executive jets for themselves, but to the testimony of Herbert J. Frank, president of Aerosec Corp.

He told the Joint Economic Committee the government once canceled one of his contracts because he was one day late in delivery.

The Pentagon then let a new contract for the same items to a giant aerospace contractor who failed to deliver for more than a full year.

When McDonnell-Douglas made square holes in an airplane instrument panel designed to house one of Frank's round altimeters, he saw a chance for revenge.

GREED CONQUERS SHAME

"They needed the plates (to cover the square opening and leave a hole the shape of the instrument) desperately. So we came up with a price of \$15 for each plate.

"We were actually ashamed to ask so much, for it was a little \$3 stamping plate, but we figured we were really going to take them."

Frank and his small company were disappointed in their effort to rip off your tax money. The Pentagon turned down his bid of \$15 apiece. The accepted bid, from McDonnell-Douglas, was \$230 per plate.

Other highlights of tax spending: \$33,101 to the Israeli Institute of Applied Science to conduct "a test of the husband-wife relationship."

The Department of Transportation gave extensive and expensive psychological tests to Polish truck drivers, which seems a bit more useful than the metric and morphological study of the evolution of the chin of Polish skeletal populations between 2000 B.C. and the year 1800.

\$3,000 to search for Indian lizards.

\$25,000 to study biological rhythms of the catfish in India.

\$8,500 to study Medieval Spanish satire and invective.

\$14,000 to learn about speciation in cave beetles.

\$2,458 to train 18 Good Humor peddlers.

\$70,000 to classify and determine the population biology of Indo-Australian ants.

\$12,600 to study the chromosomes of chipmunks.

\$159,000 to teach mothers how to play with their babies.

MARTIN LUTHER KING: A TRIBUTE TO GREATNESS

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the sixth anniversary of the death of the late and great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was so untimely taken away from us.

"Great hopes," wrote Thomas Fuller in the 18th century, "make great men." How true this is for the life and vision of Martin Luther King. Like Joseph of old, he was possessed by a dream—in his case, a dream of America as it might be, an America shaped and fashioned by the ideals of the Founding Fathers into a society both just and free, a society in which every man and woman would be equal in rights and in dignity. It was that dream which animated Dr. King throughout his life and which continues to inspire millions of Americans. It is the finest tribute we can render his memory.

Martin Luther King was born in 1929 in Atlanta, the son of a minister and a

schoolteacher. It is no accident that education and religion became the cornerstones of his deepest faith through the enduring influence of his own family. At 19 he had already graduated from Morehouse College, and at 22 he received his bachelor of divinity degree from Crozer Theological Seminary, serving also as his class valedictorian. Intellectual distinction and tireless dedication to his chosen calling marked his academic preparation. In 1955 he earned his doctorate at Boston University School of Theology, the largest Methodist seminary in the land.

It was while studying in Boston that Dr. King met Coretta Scott, who had grown up near Selma, Ala.—a town later to figure dramatically in both their lives; she was a student at the New England Conservatory of Music. They were married in 1953; she would share his commitment and his struggle in life, and continue to uphold his cause after his death.

On graduation, Dr. King accepted a call to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Ala., in the heartland of the Old Confederacy. A burning sensitivity to injustice and oppression, evils he knew from direct experience, gradually took root in Dr. King's conscience. In December of 1955 a black seamstress named Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery bus to a white man, saying simply, "I don't know why. I was just tired." The voice of a whole people found itself in her words, and the conscience of a Nation roused itself, led by the young pastor from Boston whose family origins were deeply rooted in the South.

The boycott which followed resulted in sporadic acts of violence against the black community, but ended in the Supreme Court of the land ruling bus segregation unconstitutional in accord with the provisions of its 1954 decision. No black boycott had ever been so successful. Not only did it overthrow a segregation ordinance but it energized and vitalized the black community across the land, and made of Dr. King a national and international leader in the cause of racial justice. His visit to India and pilgrimage to the grave of Gandhi dramatized his own commitment to nonviolence in the pursuit of his goals.

In 1962 he selected the city of Albany, Ga., as a desegregation target in a bitter campaign which lasted a year. The Montgomery pattern of frings, arrests, and bombings proved to be less intense, and Dr. King encountered resistance of a more subtle kind. Later, in Birmingham, Ala., a more violent response by police authorities won attention and condemnation from all over the world. In August of 1963 Dr. King served as leader of and spokesman for a national march on Washington, one of the greatest mass demonstrations in our history, a remarkably peaceful protest by over 200,000 Americans, black and white, of every faith, creed, and national origin. It was at that time that Dr. King's eloquent invocation on freedom and brotherhood entered into our American tradition: "I have a dream," he exulted, a dream whose time had come. The passage of

the Civil Rights Act of 1964 reflected the mood of an aroused Nation. In that same year Dr. King was awarded the Nobel Prize, the third Negro, the 12th American, and the youngest person ever so honored.

Dr. King's move to Selma marked his turn to the area of voting rights and the struggle for political self-determination in the black community. The famous march from Selma to Montgomery in 1965—50 miles in 4 days—in defiance of brutal intimidation, was perhaps the high water mark of Dr. King's achievement, fusing Americans together in courageous, peaceful demonstrations as seldom seen in our history. The Voting Rights Act that year gave implementation at law to the ideals for which Dr. King had striven.

There is little doubt that after 1966 the creative thrust of the civil rights movement appeared to weaken. Its popular appeal declined as tensions emerged within the Nation as a consequence of the protracted conflict in Southeast Asia. The more militant black leadership, impatient with the pace of change and restless with Dr. King's commitment to nonviolence in the face of extreme provocation, created dilemmas not easily resolved.

In 1965 and 1966 Dr. King moved his campaign north to Chicago, but met with limited success. This complex problem of housing and de facto segregation seemed to elude his call for moral renewal; in the big city northern ghettos, as Dr. King himself noted:

Religion does not exercise the same restraining influence . . . as it does in the South.

Dr. King's tragic death in Memphis in 1968, whether he had gone to exert his leadership in the bitter and protracted garbage men's strike, took from the American and world scene the first person to articulate and to apply effectively the concept of nonviolent persuasion in this Nation, the "soul force" of Gandhi but derived, in this case, from the New Testament teachings of Jesus by way of so deeply American a figure as Henry David Thoreau.

Dr. King had become an apostle of nonviolence in a violent time, a symbol to untold millions of the way by which men and women could attain a society formed more truly after the image of the kingdom of God. It was in service to that ideal that he gave his own life as a sacrifice to the bigotry and hatred which, however powerful for a time, are doomed to eventual defeat.

His epitaph was spoken nearly a century and a half ago (in 1836) by one of the great preachers and reformers of the springtime of American culture, William Ellery Channing:

The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution, who resists the sorest temptations from within and without, who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully, who is calmest in storms and most fearless under menace and frowns, whose reliance on truth, virtue, on God, is most unfaltering.

Such, indeed, was the greatness of Martin Luther King, and it is his continuing legacy to us.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, there is a serious and important debate going on in our country concerning the right to privacy, the focus of which is precisely in reverse. The primary subject of concern in the privacy debate is our criminals. Should data regarding their exploits be computerized and shared? If not, the usual objection is that one individual would have too much power under a nationally coordinated system. This is an argument in which I have very little faith as we are apt to hear it erode back into strong administration worship as soon as the party controlling the White House changes. Secondary objections about the irritation of such a practice to criminals are less convenient to express and often end up sounding like a Parker Brothers type concern with having the cops and robbers as even as possible in the homestretch.

The second group of people affected by the ramifications of this debate are generally easier to identify with. These are the names which appear in the lists of credit raters. Without emoting unnecessarily on behalf of people who cheat their creditors, we must all sympathize with the person who corresponds for years with the broken or misprogrammed computer and eventually loses his good name because of a series of mechanical mistakes. We object to our neighbors being asked to spy on us as we dislike spying on him. In the credit lists we have a combination of people who are in some cases clearly guilty of financial irresponsibility but in most the innocent and beleaguered. It is on behalf of this latter category that those who value privacy should speak out, but the rhetoric of many debaters today leads their readers to think that they are more interested in the necessity of hiding a person's past than in the protection of his future.

The third category of citizen most undeniably entitled to complete and undisturbed privacy is the man who gets least of it. He is the honest soul who fills out every personal detail of his private life for a census taker, every detail of his financial life for a Government agency which considers him guilty unless he can prove himself innocent and will soon be asked to fill out every detail of his political life for public reports. The latest assumption which runs directly in the face of the privacy movement is that the average citizen donating his hard earned and harder kept money to some political person or cause is a sort of suspect.

The man who does the most disclosing and reporting in the United States today is the man who may never have received a parking ticket.

No wonder things do not work ideally in a country in which we treat the guilty as aggrieved innocents and the innocent as suspicious characters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article published by Associ-

ated Press, on March 14, 1974, printed in the RECORD.

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

NEWSPAPER GROUPS HIT CRIMINAL RECORDS BILL

Newspaper industry representatives told Congress yesterday that legislation to restrict access to computerized criminal records may erode the public's right to know and lay the foundation for government censorship.

Three representatives of professional news associations endorsed the concept of providing some protection for individual privacy as contained in bills sponsored by the Nixon administration and by Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.).

But they advised Ervin's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee to exercise extreme caution.

"This particular bill makes the Attorney General of the United States a czar controlling the release, or keeping secret, criminal record information," Richard M. Schmidt Jr., counsel of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, said of the Ervin bill.

Schmidt said both bills probably have worthy objectives but should be carefully drafted "lest they become vehicles under the guise of 'right of privacy' of censorship and the creation of a highly secret governmental network."

John R. Finnegan, chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, also asked Ervin to move slowly in writing new legislation.

Finnegan, executive editor of the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press, said he fears that both the Ervin and the less restrictive administration bill would result in denying access to criminal justice records now available at the state and local levels.

A third witness, Harold W. Andersen, president of The Omaha World-Herald and vice chairman of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, said that while no responsible news medium wants to publish inaccurate or incomplete information, the public cannot be barred from all access to criminal justice data.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with others of the U.S. Congress in paying tribute to the late B. Everett Jordan, a former Senator from North Carolina.

As most of us know, he was appointed in 1958 and was successfully elected to two additional terms following that date. His service to North Carolina, and to agriculture in general, is almost beyond parallel. At no time during his term in the high office of Senator did he ever forget the people of North Carolina. Few, if any, Members of the Senate achieved more personal popularity than did the late Everett Jordan. He greeted everyone with a smile and a handshake which one immediately recognized as being sincere.

In addition to the Senator himself, his entire family made outstanding contri-

butions to the State of North Carolina, including a brother, Dr. Henry Jordan, as a State senator as well as State chairman of the highway commission; also another brother, Dr. Charlie Jordan who served for many years as vice president of Duke University.

Perhaps one of his greatest assets, in addition to his own warm personality, was that of his wife, Catherine, who usually accompanied him wherever he went. Senator Jordan, although a man of extreme wealth, never gave any evidence whatsoever of pomp or pretense as related to his association with his fellow man and his obligations within the Senate of the United States.

Certainly already his presence is missed, and there are many of us who will retain throughout our lifetime fond memories and appreciation for our acquaintance with him.

THE KUTZTOWN PATRIOT: 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY AND TO THE NATION

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech is perhaps our most cherished constitutional guarantee, for without it, other rights become meaningless. It represents the single, most significant example of the liberties which we enjoy in this nation.

I associate a free press more closely with our right to say and express what we feel than any other medium of communication. To foster a vigorous, dynamic free press is to insure that our freedom of speech will be safeguarded and preserved.

One hundred years ago, in the month of May 1874, the Kutztown Patriot, Kutztown, Pa., published its first edition as a weekly newspaper, having originally been the American Weekly Patriot. Since that day, it has made constant and invaluable contributions for the betterment of the community, of Pennsylvania, and of the Nation, not only by disseminating information, but also by serving as a strong, patriotic and responsible voice of the people.

The Patriot's first editor was Mr. Conrad Gehring and Mr. Isaac F. Christ was the publisher. Through the years, this long and honorable career of a newspaper has been fortunate in having the direction of capable, patriotic and responsible persons. After a century, today this tradition is being forcefully carried on by Publisher Jacob Esser and Editor Ade Floreen.

The cause of good government, civic and community advancement has always been championed by the Patriot. It has never represented anything less than the type of idealism and love of freedom that characterizes our American way of life, our tradition, and our heritage. For 100 years, the newspaper has faithfully and accurately reported the history of the

people and of the area in which they live. The caliber of reporting is of the highest and reflects journalism at its best. The newspaper is attuned closely to the people and the American community structure.

Kutztown, Pa., which is served by the Patriot, is a community that is heavily steeped in history and heritage. And, in these rapidly changing times, when we are reaching out for links to our history and to the times when society was more peaceful and secure, The Kutztown Patriot takes on an even greater meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks which provides an insight into the history of the founding of the Patriot. The article appeared in the 75th anniversary edition in 1949.

As Representative of Pennsylvania's Sixth District and of Kutztown, Pa., I am privileged indeed to serve the area. I know that I echo the warm wishes of the Congress for another 100 years of service by the Kutztown Patriot, to the community and the Nation.

KUTZTOWN PATRIOT FIRST EDITION DATED MAY 21, 1874; CONRAD GEHRING, EDITOR

The Kutztown Patriot, known as the American Weekly Patriot, made its first appearance on Thursday, May 21, 1874. It was published by Isaac F. Christ and Conrad Gehring as editor. Mr. Gehring, in a comprehensive article entitled, "The Press of the Century", in the Centennial History of Kutztown, published in 1915, has the following to say about the origin of the Patriot:

The printing office of the Kutztown Journal, which was destined to develop into a prominent publication house, was neither remarkable for size, arrangement nor comfort. But it answered its purpose and was only the unit of a more comprehensive plan. The building erected in the rear of Mr. Christ's bookstore and residence, next door to the time-honored Pennsylvania House, was of frame about 16 x 20 feet, one story, with a two-story annex in the rear. Mr. Christ had bought from and Hawley, publishers of the Reading Adler and Reading Eagle, the old Hoe railway press, which had done service for the Reading Gazette, the forerunner of the weekly Eagle. The press took up by far the greater part of the room. The type cases, stone cases, stone and editorial desk were lined up against the one side and rear wall. The annex was built of light frame and could not be used in cold weather. Inside of two years, however, Mr. Christ built a second story on the original unit and had the whole plastered. After that there was ample room, good light and the whole place comfortable.

"The writer foresaw that owing to the fact that the public schools laid stress on the English language and German was only taught in the home, the Sunday Schools and catechetical classes, the German would in course of time be superseded by the English. The territory was in a state of transition so far as language was concerned. He proposed to the publisher, Mr. Christ, that we start a new paper, half English and half German, which could keep pace with the transition, increase its English part and finally become an English paper. The publisher saw the matter in the same light and the result was the American Weekly Patriot. The first number appeared Sunday, May 16, 1874. The editorial announcement explained its intents and aims in the following words: 'Instead of stating in a long article how and what we will do, we simply refer our readers to the present number, which will show them that the paper contains English and German reading matter and is especially adapted to that

class of Pennsylvania Germans and those families who are educated in the one and are anxious of acquiring the other language. We hope and believe that our efforts in furnishing our community with reading matter especially adapted to its various classes will be properly appreciated and a large subscription list be the response.'"

The Kutztown Journal, mentioned in the first paragraph above, was an entirely German newspaper published by Mr. Christ, and it began publication in 1870. This paper was published until about 1920.

AMNESTY

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has been brought to my attention a resolution adopted by the Morton-Richardson Post 128, the American Legion, of Richland, Ga., in opposition to amnesty and veterans' benefits for conscientious objectors.

These are very important questions. I commend the American Legion for its interest and concern, and join in expressing my respect and admiration for the men and women who have served their country in times of war and peace in the U.S. Armed Forces.

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

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

RESOLUTION

A resolution expressing the sense of the Morton-Richardson Post No. 128, The American Legion, Georgia Department, Richland, Georgia 31825, regarding the question of amnesty for those who departed the United States to avoid military service via the draft or otherwise, and also with reference to the United States government and the Veterans Administration providing GI Benefits for conscientious objectors.

Whereas, this Post, with an average membership of 100, has on numerous previous occasions gone on record as commending the young men and women of America who have patriotically, willingly, and unselfishly supported their country and served this nation in time of national emergency and international armed conflict as well as those who have joined the Armed Services for military careers, and

Whereas, the President of the United States, the National Commander, the National Department of the American Legion, a vast majority of Congressmen and civic leaders, and this Post, have expressed opinions against amnesty as a national policy, and

Whereas, in recent weeks there has been a renewed effort to bring pressure on national leaders to endorse and effect a policy of amnesty for those evading military service by former Secretary of the Army Froelike, and other ultra-liberals of the country, as well as members of the draft-evaders families, and

Whereas, members of these groups are also pressuring the President, the Congress, and the Veterans Administration to extend the GI Bill of Rights to conscientious objectors, some of whom served in non-combatant and

non-military positions, rather than the armed forces, and

Whereas, this Post believes that GI Benefits should be extended only to those who, without reservation, answered the call of their country and served with the Armed Forces in any and all capacities and duties assigned them by their military commanders.

Therefore, be it resolved, that this Post be recorded as definitely opposing amnesty in any form, and further that we unalterably oppose the proposition of extending the rights and privileges of the GI Bill of Rights to conscientious objectors of this country.

Be it further ordered that a copy of this Resolution be furnished the President of the United States, Senator Herman Talmadge, Senator Sam Nunn, Congressman Dawson Mathis, Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, the National Commander and the Commander of the Georgia Department of the American Legion.

IMPORTATION OF CHROME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on April 3, two Virginia newspapers published excellent editorials concerning the effort to resume the ban on importation of chrome, a strategic material, from the African country of Rhodesia.

The editorials were published in the Richmond News Leader and in the Northern Virginia Daily of Strasburg, Va.

Both editorials make a point of the inconsistency involved in the Senate vote to reimpose sanctions on strategic materials from Rhodesia at the same time that the United States was protesting the Arab oil embargo.

In the words of the Richmond News Leader:

The boycott of trade with Rhodesia, though it originated at the buyer's end of the economic equation, was just as politically—and wrongly—motivated as the Arabs' decision to stop selling oil to the United States.

I feel that the Senate vote of last December 18, in favor of resuming the Rhodesian chrome embargo, was contrary to the national interest and to national security. I hope that the House of Representatives will reverse the action of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Of the Arabs and Rhodesia" from the Richmond News Leader of April 3, 1974, and the editorial, "Making the Same Mistake Twice?" from the Northern Virginia Daily of April 3, 1974, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Daily, Apr. 3, 1974]

MAKING THE SAME MISTAKE TWICE?

There is nothing more puzzling than the attitude of what may be a prevailing number

of congressmen in regard to the fact that Congress may be getting ready to clobber the free nation of Rhodesia, and in doing so will also weaken the defense strategy of the United States.

Rhodesia holds a large share of the world's supply of chromium, a metal vital both in military hardware as well as general industrial production. The United States has none.

Up until 1971, following the dictates of a United Nations' sanction against Rhodesia, the U.S. had been depending on Soviet Russia for chrome, at prices which were almost twice the price of the same grade of chrome on the Rhodesian market.

In 1971, showing good judgment and a proper regard for the untenable position the U.S. was in depending on the Soviets for chrome, Congress passed the Byrd Amendment which opened up the Rhodesian chrome market to the U.S.

Since then, those responsible for this nation's defense posture have breathed easier in the mistaken belief that the sound position taken in the Byrd Amendment would virtually guarantee the availability of chrome from as neutral a source as the world had to offer.

That was until Senator Hubert Humphrey introduced his bill, several months ago, which would again prohibit the purchase of chrome from Rhodesia, and would, if passed, also guarantee a reimposition of our total dependence on the Soviets for this essential metal.

Strangely, a number of senators in Washington, who just weeks ago were deploring the economic blackmail being practiced by the Arab oil-producing States, are now the most avid supporters of economic blackmail by the U.S. against Rhodesia.

There is no moral justification, or for that matter any consistency, in the U.N. singling out Rhodesia for punishment simply because of the pressure exerted by the emerging black African States which objected to the white dominance of the Rhodesian government.

That is an internal matter concerning Rhodesians only, which can be settled by Rhodesians only. Neither the U.N. nor the U.S. has any business trying to dictate to that nation either by military action or economic sanctions.

Passing the Humphrey bill would be an ill-advised action, and we hope Congress will have the good sense to reject it.

[From the Richmond News Leader,
Apr. 3, 1974]

OF THE ARABS AND RHODESIA

In reflecting on the recent Arab boycott of oil shipments to the United States, several points are worth making in connection with American policy towards Rhodesia:

(1) At the height of the Arab boycott, many Americans rightly deplored the Arabs' use of the boycott to force a change in American policy towards Israel. Such boycotts, the argument went, are economic blackmail, and are inherently wrong. So it is with U.S. concurrence in the boycott of trade with Rhodesia: The boycott is an endeavor to force a change in Rhodesian domestic policy. Such a boycott is equally wrong.

(2) At the height of the Arab boycott, many Americans rightly deplored prior American policies that had led to growing American dependence on the Arabs for oil. The U.S., the argument went, should not have allowed the situation to develop in which any nation—or group of nations—could conspire to cripple the United States through the withholding of any product; hence, President Nixon's "Operation Independence." So it is with those who would force us into dependence on the Soviet Union for the importation of strategic chrome ore: Thanks to the diligence of Vir-

ginia's Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., the U.S. currently is buying chrome ore from Rhodesia—which possesses the Free World's only major chrome deposits. To forbid the importation of Rhodesian chrome would, as in the past, force the U.S. into dependence on the Soviets for whatever chrome we might need.

(3) The boycott of trade with Rhodesia, though it originated at the buyer's end of the economic equation, was just as politically—and wrongly—motivated as the Arabs' decision to stop selling oil to the United States. And the Soviets are no less averse than the Arabs to using the economic weapon to gain foreign-policy objectives. Indeed, given the ideological pre-disposition of the Soviet leaders, they are more likely to use such a weapon to achieve their own purposes. Moreover, both the Arabs and the Soviet profit exorbitantly from the prices they set on the sale of their product to those whom they do not regard as lifelong friends.

(4) Said ABC news commentator Howard K. Smith, "The Arabs are applying what are in fact sanctions against the United States to change its policies. Well, history suggests sanctions don't work. Indeed, they backfire." And so they do. As the boycott of trade with Rhodesia has strengthened a regime that admittedly was not made in heaven, so the Arab boycott has pointed up the need for U.S. "energy independence." Both boycotts have achieved precisely the results they were intended to forestall.

If the Arabs were wrong to impose their boycott, surely we are wrong in going along with the boycott of trade with Rhodesia. As the Arabs have lifted their boycott—albeit contingently—so we should bow out of the boycott on Rhodesian trade.

TRIBUTE TO KEN GRAY: ABLE LEGISLATOR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I noted with regret the announcement by our esteemed colleague, Representative KENNETH GRAY of Illinois, of his plans for retirement at the conclusion of the 93d Congress.

KEN GRAY will be greatly missed around these sacred precincts—he is a grand gentleman, a warm personality, a splendid and able legislator, an eloquent speaker, and an effective advocate.

KEN GRAY is a member of the House Committee on Public Works, and there are many monuments to his record of service in the Congress throughout the United States.

Recently he has played a prominent role in the push for construction of the Eisenhower Center in Washington, and some have suggested that the name of this project should be changed to the Gray Center because of the great dedication and hard work of KEN GRAY in his efforts to secure its approval.

KEN GRAY has served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well—his career of public service in the Congress has been outstanding and certainly we all wish him the very best of good luck and success as he returns to private life and retirement from public service.

RAY KAUNISTO

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in troubled times like ours, stories of personal adversity are all too common. Occasionally, however, one person's story combines such elements of courage, faith, determination, human sympathy, and service that it seizes our imagination and vividly reminds us of the potential of the human spirit for bringing triumph out of tragedy.

Such is the story of Ray Kaunisto, a retired policeman in Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., who for 20 years dedicated his life and his energies to the young people of his community—is juvenile officer, hockey coach, and friend.

Ray Kaunisto's tragedy is that he was stricken in the prime of life by the same debilitating disease which struck Lou Gehrig. His triumph is that he has refused to surrender to the ravages of illness—and that the young people of Sault Ste. Marie continue to rally to his side.

Ray Kaunisto's inspiring story has been told in a front page report in the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News of April 1, 1974. So that it may be shared with the wide audience it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP DEDICATED TO RAY KAUNISTO

(By Ken Fazzari)

When Ray Kaunisto was graduated from Rudyard High School in 1944 he was quickly tossed into the throes of the Berlin airlift as an airman in the United States Air Force.

Two years later he was a member of the Ft. Richardson, Alaska hockey team.

This diversified start into the "outside" world was the harbinger of Kaunisto's diversified and dedicated life to the youth and youth athletics, particularly hockey, in the Sault Ste. Marie area.

Today Ray Kaunisto lies the immobile victim of an amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

This disease, commonly known as Lou Gehrig disease as it was first diagnosed in the former New York Yankee baseball great, is the deterioration of the muscular and nervous systems of the body.

Doctors told Kaunisto four years ago that he would not live to see two.

He continues the battle. And with the help and dedication of his wife, Peggy, and five children, will not give up the fight.

As a spunky cop on the Sault police force in the 1950's Kaunisto rapidly worked his way up to become a juvenile officer. It was not unusual for him to lay the wrath of the law on a youthful offender on the one hand and then turn around and purchase candy, pop, magazines etc. for the offender's stay in the proverbial cooler.

Kaunisto's commitment to youngsters came early in life and it has not wavered even in these times of helplessness. While his body deteriorates his mental capacity and attitude remain sharp and strong and to all ends he continues to follow the careers and lives that he helped mold over the years. And as a policeman for nine years and a

coach in Sault youth hockey circles for 20 years (1951-1971), Kaunisto has left his impression on many.

Ray Kaunisto has no new horizons to conquer.

His greatest joy in life is to have his proteges come to his home and visit. Even if it is just for a minute.

On Sunday 16 of Kaunisto's former students of the wars of ice hockey paid him such a visit. The Weir Moving and Storage city champion pee-wee hockey team, 15 members strong, dedicated their championship to their former coach. This team is the former East End team that Kaunisto coached for 10 years prior to his illness.

The 16th person to pay tribute to Kaunisto was the coach of the team, Dave Weir. He too was once coached by Kaunisto.

The Kaunisto family accepts the hard, cold facts of the nature of his illness and continues to fight the battle with an inborn instinct of never quitting. They pamper him and prod him and give in to his every whim. But silently and deeply they are groping and fighting every inch of the way with him.

Mrs. Kaunisto will not take time out from her busy schedule to feel sorry for herself or her family nor will she accept the sympathy of others.

"We have a lot to be thankful for," said Mrs. Kaunisto, "and Ray has lived a full life and done all the things that he has wanted to do. His mind is alert and he is not in pain. His attitude has been from the start that he was going to fight and was not going to give up. We will fight with him."

Kaunisto has lived with and for youth all his life and will continue to do so.

He is a life member of the Brimley VFW, was an active member of the Sault Kiwanis Club, was a Red Cross first aid instructor, sponsored and competed on bowling teams, was on the ski patrol, president of the Jefferson School PTA for two years, a member of the city parks and recreation board and a member of the Air Force reserve for 25 years just to mention a few of his active roles in our community.

Ray Kaunisto will continue his fight. Even if he loses he will have won.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO SIDS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, yesterday the House of Representatives took final action on the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Act of 1974 and the legislation will soon come before the President.

SIDS claims 10,000 babies each year. It is the leading cause of death in infancy after the first month of life. No one yet knows what causes this tragic killer and that is why it is essential to expand the research program into the causes of this disease. The bill calls upon the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development at NIH to carry out this research program. And the bill requires the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to report to the Congress on the scope and magnitude of this research program.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the exciting

news which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer today under the byline of Dick Pothier in which he describes a possible solution and ultimate prevention of "crib deaths" which could be achieved within 18 months as a result of the research discovery of a Pennsylvania State University scientist. According to the article:

Within the past week Federal and Penn State researchers confirmed that a lack of oxygen in the infant's blood is the cause of nearly all unexplained crib deaths.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CRIB DEATH PREVENTION IS IN SIGHT, RESEARCHERS SAY (By Dick Pothier)

The long-sought prevention of tragic, baffling "crib deaths" of up to 15,000 infants a year in America could be achieved within 18 months, Pennsylvania medical researchers said Wednesday.

The prediction of the crib-death solution came just days after government scientists confirmed a Pennsylvania State researcher's apparent discovery of the cause of crib deaths.

Across America, about 40 seemingly healthy babies die quietly in their sleep each night. And the cause of the death has become perhaps medicine's greatest mystery.

Within the past week, federal and Penn State researchers confirmed that a lack of oxygen in the infant's blood is the cause of nearly all unexplained crib deaths.

And the long-awaited breakthrough has led to quick medical speculation that the discovery will lead to a prevention or cure within several years and perhaps as early as a year and a half from now.

IMPRACTICAL CURE

In fact, researchers said, a cure—although an impractical one—may already be at hand: simply increasing the amount of oxygen in the air the infants breathe.

But because there are still no proven "markers" on which infants are at high risk of crib death, it's a practical impossibility to add oxygen to the nurseries of every baby in America.

So experts on crib death—more correctly called "Sudden Infant Death Syndrome"—are working hard to find reliable early-warning signs that a baby could be a future crib death victim.

Dr. George Peckham, director of the infant intensive care unit at Philadelphia's Children's Hospital, said Wednesday that "there is no actual treatment for crib death right now . . . but the next few years will probably lead to a treatment."

INFANTS SAVED

At Children's Hospital, he said, merely increasing the room-oxygen level only slightly, from about 21 to 25 percent, has definitely saved the lives of infants who would have become crib death victims at home.

"The baby would in fact have died without any known cause of death. But the practical problem of a cure comes in. Just increasing the infant's oxygen level at home is not only a logistical impossibility, but could lead to side effects."

There are several possible "markers" to identify high-risk infants already, he said. One of them is a slight anemia—an inability

of the blood's red cells to carry enough oxygen.

Another, based on the Penn State work, is a certain type of brown-colored body fat that seems to provide a warning signal of possible future crib death.

Dr. Richard Naeye, chairman of the pathology department at Penn State's Hershey, Pa., medical school and the researcher who first made the low-oxygen discovery in crib deaths, is also optimistic about a cure.

Basically, Dr. Naeye found evidence of chronic low oxygen in the blood of crib-death victims. In some unexplained manner, this apparently leads to a stopping of breathing in victims.

National Institutes of Health experts verified his findings and believe they represent the beginning of the end of crib death as a massive, mysterious killer of infants from two or three weeks up to a year old.

Crib death, in fact, is America's primary cause of death of babies between two weeks and a year old.

Grief-stricken parents have formed several national organizations to combat guilt feelings that the deaths were in some way related to the care of the infant.

But the experts agree that a still-unexplained, fundamental problem underlies the chronic oxygen lack. The abnormality could range from brain damage to immaturity of vital respiratory systems.

Medical researchers, in fact, may be able to prevent crib deaths even before they discover the unexplained mechanism that causes them.

"I believe it's preventable," Dr. Naeye said. "We have several challenges in front of us, but I think there are certain things we can do to prevent the deaths."

Through several means, ranging from merely increasing breathing oxygen to drugs that allow increased blood or oxygen flow through the lungs and arteries, high-risk infants may be protected from the silent sudden death that has killed at least 150,000 babies in the past decade.

Dr. Naeye, working under federal research grants, is studying records of 60,000 pregnant women and will follow the children's condition until the age of eight.

Once that study is done, he said, even more "markers" or risk-indications may be found.

"Now," adds Dr. Peckham, "we don't even know who to call in for study. We just don't know how to pick up the high-risk infant."

Dr. Naeye's new research means "new hope for tomorrow's children," said Dr. Eileen G. Hasselmeyer, the federal government's program director for infant mortality.

Another National Institutes of Health expert added: "We are now prepared to say that this is new, exciting and verified."

Most crib death victims, he said, were "predestined" to die because of their chronic low-oxygen problem. Death itself comes after the low-oxygen problem somehow leads to a cessation of breathing.

Nearly all victims die at night, researchers said, because the body's breathing mechanism—even in adults—doesn't function as well during sleep.

Crib death victims die quickly and without sound, Dr. Naeye said. "People have even been awake in the room when the infant died."

Past theories of crib-death causes have been numerous, but none has stood up to scientific investigation like Dr. Naeye's.

Until now, he said, the research has been "a graveyard of disappointments."

"But in another year we'll have very solid markers for this disease and we should be able to come up with a preventive program."

SEEKING SELF-SUFFICIENCY

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, this country must never again depend on other nations for materials, which if cut off, could plunge us into an economic crisis.

Surely the recent energy crisis has taught us the wisdom of seeking self-sufficiency for energy sources. We must not stop, however, with finding new energy sources—our aim must be to find substitutes for all vital minerals that we are now dependent on from other countries.

Besides petroleum, there are 13 other raw materials for which we must rely on other nations—and which are vital to our economic growth. Of these 13, we must import 50 percent or more of 6—bauxite, tin, chromium, manganese, zinc, and nickel.

Ninety-two percent of our bauxite supply must be imported. It is necessary in the production of aluminum and is used for making: house siding, window frames, aircraft fuselage, auto pistons, water treatment, leather tanning, spark plugs, and so forth. Tin, too, is one of our most vital imports—and we must import 75 percent of all we use. Our plastics, sheet metal, tin cans, and a host of other uses are dependent on tin.

We must import 47 percent of our zinc; 21 percent of our lead; and 100 percent of our chromium. All are vital for the production of many of our products.

The current trend is to depend more and more on foreign sources for these vital raw materials and the Columbia Journal of Business, spring 1973, said:

In the future, the United States will have to import a larger portion of its needed metallic and non-metallic minerals from Africa, Asia, Australia, and possibly some Communist countries. Supplies from these areas are expected to be more expensive on account of higher shipping costs, and with the exception of Australia, less secure. . .

The U.S.S.R. will continue to serve as a major supplier of fuels, mainly natural gas, and as a marginal supplier of some other minerals—chrome, manganese, asbestos—to the countries outside the bloc. Sometimes in the early 1980's, it will probably become the principal world producer, and perhaps exporter, of a number of important minerals.

It deeply concerns me that should scarcities develop on any of these imported raw materials—including the tendency for some countries to limit exports on them—the results could be devastating to our economy. I have, therefore, introduced a bill, H.R. 14157, entitled "The Minerals Research and Development Act" for the purpose of seeking substitutes for those minerals that are critical to our needs as a nation and which we must now import.

Under the bill which I propose, a Mineral Conservation Research and Development Commission would be established

under the direction of the Board of the National Science Foundation. The Commission would have the authority to: conduct research for the potential development of substitute minerals; make recommendations to appropriate agencies and departments; and provide mineral substitute information to any Federal or State executive or legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all my colleagues to support this legislation. We must never again be so vulnerable to other world powers for our vital materials.

ARAB OIL MONEY AND CONTROL OF U.S. BUSINESS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress, myself included, are becoming increasingly concerned at the growing foreign ownership of American companies. In almost every field, from food, banking, oil and gas, machine tools, you name it, huge blocs of foreign investment have been reported to be buying into the U.S. industrial complex, especially since devaluation. Many companies are said to be controlled outright by foreign owners. Some of these may be in security-sensitive fields, including research and development into military components.

If the Arab oil bloc persist in their exorbitant and unreasonable price demands the prospect of their acquisition of entire American industries including the major oil companies themselves, become truly alarming. It is all well and good to observe that expropriation might be available but this is no answer. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Legislation appears needed in the near future to require disclosure of foreign investment in U.S. business when foreign investment exceeds a basic percentage. Some have suggested that disclosure ought only to be required when ownership reaches a control level—51 percent—but there is reason to believe that even a 25-percent foreign ownership in such major U.S. industries warrants full disclosure.

In this connection a recent column by Joseph Alsop appearing in the Washington Post, merits attention:

A "RIVER OF MONEY"

(By Joseph Alsop)

NEW YORK.—In March-April, the insiders on the money market tell you that \$10 billion of oil-producing governments' profits will be looking for investment opportunities around the world.

The people who are searching for places to put this vast amount of money are the major oil companies, like Exxon in this country and Royal Dutch Shell abroad. Initially, most probably, they will select short-term obligations. Eventually, something a bit more permanent will be wanted.

Rudyard Kipling once wrote an entire poem about the unseen, worldwide flows of money as an underground river more power-

ful than the Amazon, the Mississippi or the Nile. What we are now seeing, in Kipling's terms, is the first great flood of high water on the underground river, resulting from the miscalled "energy crisis."

To give an idea of the extent of the high water, you have to bear in mind that the value of all the overseas investments of the United States is currently estimated at about \$90 billion. In just two months, therefore, a small number of oil-producing governments will invest one-ninth of the amount that thousands of immensely rich American individuals and corporations have invested abroad over a period of about three-quarters of a century.

The comparison is almost ludicrous with the British overseas investments at the beginning of World War II, when the British so desperately needed American money to finance their courageous effort to withstand Adolf Hitler alone. In short, insiders on the money market, pale-faced and confused, are mumbling about a wholly new situation.

The figures already cited, moreover, are only a beginning. By the best estimates available, the oil-producing countries will need to find places to invest about \$50 billion before 12 months have passed.

In other words, the high water on the underground river is going to continue. The \$50 billion is net, too. It is the amount, in fact, that the Persian Gulf countries and other oil producers will have *left over* after they've spent every cent they can think of spending, on everything from private luxury to national defense.

The oil producers' total profits for the first 12 months of the new higher oil prices are estimated at about \$100 billion. Given their small average populations and their real needs, it is probably optimistic to suppose that they can find ways of spending half this amount on goods and services provided by the big oil importers like the United States, the Western Europeans and Japan. But suppose the hopeful forecast is correct. The current value of the Mellon-controlled Gulf Oil Co., for instance, is no more than \$5 to \$6 billion. That means, for instance, that every one of the major U.S. oil companies can be legitimately purchased by just one year of the oil producers' new-style profits. Or look at it another way, on the simple assumption that the oil producers will want their profits to earn a currently normal return.

On this assumption, the big oil consumers like the United States will have to find \$4.5 billion—additional to what they will need to pay for new oil—in order to give the oil producers the money that their first year's investments ought to earn. And next year's net profits for the oil producers are again forecast to be around \$50 billion, since there is no foreseeable end to the high water on the underground river.

No wonder, therefore, that the older insiders on the money market have begun to whisper the name "Kreditanstalt." The Kreditanstalt was the great Austrian bank whose failure led to the collapse of the old world monetary system and thus to the second and worst phase of the Great Depression nearly 50 years ago. Besides Watergate, in short, we have some other things to worry about!

THE ENERGY CRISIS: CAUSES AND CURES

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, our debate in this House, on the energy crisis,

has consumed more time than any other subject during this Congress. Yet, not even the hope of a solution is in sight.

I contend that the main reason why Members of this House have not provided solutions is because they do not fully understand the real causes of the energy shortage. They are complex—extremely complex.

On March 19, 1974, Mr. Howard H. Hinson, president of Texas Pacific Oil Co., Inc., addressed the Preston Trails Chapter of the National Society of Professional Engineers in Dallas, Tex.

In that address, Mr. Hinson made one of the best concise explanations of the entire energy problem that I have ever before heard. I would like to share this information with my colleagues in the House and Senate.

The address follows:

THE ENERGY CRISIS: CAUSES AND CURES

The energy crisis is here. It has been a long time coming and will be a long time leaving. Theoretically and physically there is ample energy for many centuries or perhaps indefinitely. Our crisis is primarily in petroleum at this time, and is worldwide. As Engineers we know we have to determine the causes before we can find the cures. Some of the causes are reversible. The causes are in the realm of physical, economic and political. The cures are in the same areas. The first prerequisite is a complete reversal of our current public and political direction. We must stifle emotionalism and turn to facts and reality. The oil companies are not blameless, but that blame is being constantly sorted and distorted by the news media and Congress. This is the other side of the story.

I. PHYSICAL CAUSES

1. Supply-Demand: World oil demand has been doubling every 13 years. Other free world demand has been growing two times as fast as ours. In the last two years, U.S. demand has grown at 7% per year, twice normal. The bulk of the reserves to supply this increasing demand is in the Middle East, principally, in Saudi Arabia. If the Middle East countries would allow us to develop and produce these reserves as fast as we wanted to, we could supply the increasing demand for only about eight years. In other words, we have only eight years to develop substitutes for petroleum such as gasification and liquefaction of coal. This is the long-range outlook regardless of the piling up of the shorter term crisis problems.

2. U.S. Oil Reserves started to decline in 1967.

3. U.S. Gas reserves started to decline in 1968. (Not including Alaska North Slope)

4. The U.S. Coal industry has had essentially a zero growth the last few years.

5. Nuclear plant construction is behind schedule. In 1950, the prediction was that by 1970 nuclear energy would supply 30% of our electrical power. Actually, it is 1%; about the same as wood.

6. Most utilities have switched from coal and high sulfur residual oil to gas. More recently there has been a further switch from gas to oil, putting a greater burden on oil.

7. The construction of the Alaskan Pipeline and exploration and production from offshore California have both been delayed for several years.

8. Demand has also been increased beyond normal by:

a. Increased sales of automobiles with more power equipment and weight.

b. Pollution controls on automobiles.

9. More recently, restrictions on foreign production of about 20% and an embargo on oil to the U.S. has compounded the real energy crisis.

II. POLITICAL CAUSES

1. The early seeds of the energy crisis were planted in 1954 when gas producers were put under the controls of the Natural Gas Act. The distortions, inequities, unfairness, and damages to the economy of government regulations and interventions are well illustrated by the Act.

For instance, a recent study in our small company showed that 81% of our gas is sold in interstate commerce under control of the Federal Power Commission. For that gas we received an average of 17.4 cents per 1000 cubic feet. For comparable gas that we find now and are able to sell within Texas, we get 80 cents per 1000 cubic feet. Compared to oil on a basis of heating value alone we should be getting from 90 cents to over \$1.00 per thousand.

You can say, as most people apparently do, "This is your problem and you still are making a little money." Sure we are making a little money if you value things as they were fifteen to twenty years ago. But we are not making enough to replace the natural gas that you now need and will need in the future.

This terrible distortion and inequity is your business too. The oil industry pays \$700,000,000 per year taxes in Texas, most of which goes to schools. If Texas gets only a fraction of its value for exported natural gas, you pay more taxes to make up the difference.

Industry in Texas pays 80 cents for gas while the cheap gas goes to the Midwest and East Coast to competing industry.

This ultra-cheap gas has caused utilities and other industry to convert from coal to gas; wasting the valuable gas that should be used for home heating. The coal industry was ruined in the process by taking its market. Now that we need the coal industry, it is crippled.

The oil industry has not been allowed the real value of natural gas—so we have not been able to replace reserves, therefore, as mentioned earlier, the reserves of oil began to decline in 1967 and natural gas in 1968. The ultra-cheap natural gas and oil has retarded the development of alternate fuels. Because of their higher costs they could not compete with the cheap price controlling natural gas.

2. Despite our loud protestations, despite our low profits, and despite the declining reserves, Congress passed the Tax Reform Act of 1969 that increased the oil industry taxes by over \$500,000,000 per year, thus reducing the capital available to the industry by that amount. This is the bill that reduced the depletion from 27½% to 22% and made other changes that affected the oil industry only. To make matters worse and in spite of acute shortages, Congress now seems determined to immediately remove or reduce the depletion allowance and slap on an 85% excess profits tax on the sales price of oil. Certainly our profits are not in excess of what is required to find the oil and gas and develop alternate sources of energy so badly required by this country.

Much emphasis has been placed on the increase in profits of International Oil Companies in 1973 over 1972. Most of the increase in profits came from foreign operations. Part of the profit increase came from domestic price increases in late 1973.

These price increases received domestically in late 1973 should have been received many years ago.

3. The environmental legislation and advocacy of more and stricter legislation has had considerable effect on the energy crisis. The objectives of this legislation is good, but this is extremist legislation enforced to the extreme and without regard to costs or effects on our economy and freedoms. Some effects are:

a. Delay of the Alaskan pipeline-depriving us of about 2 million barrels per day of oil.

b. Delay in drilling and producing in California where much oil is available and off the East Coast where the potential is unknown.

c. Delay in granting offshore leases in other areas.

d. Delays or prohibitions on refinery sites.

e. Prohibition of use of higher sulfur coal and residual oils in power plants and other industry. This puts a larger demand on oil and natural gas. The Federal Power Commission reports that 400 plants were converted to fuel oil from 1965-72.

f. Delay in building nuclear plants and the running of existing plants below capacity.

g. Pollution control devices cause automobiles to use more gasoline.

h. Pollution controls on plants have required more energy, caused inflations by non-productive costs and has reduced capacity by controls or by the plants being abandoned.

i. Delay or prohibition of strip mining of coal.

4. The Mine Safety Act has caused an estimated 15% to 25% loss of production and a 20% to 30% increase in costs in underground mining. Progressive enforcement is estimated to close an additional 500 small mines at the end of March 1974, with a loss of 5% of the nation's coal production.

5. The normal delay of bureaucracy, the Act setting up the Atomic Energy Commission and environmental controls cause great delays in new nuclear plants. The lead time is from 8 to 10 years on a new plant. Other countries manage theirs in about 4½ to 5 years.

6. The oil quota systems for the import of crude oil was put into effect during the Eisenhower Administration. The objective was good—to keep alive a viable oil industry in the U.S. so as not to become dependent on foreign oil. The bad administration of the Act plus the government "jawboning" that went along kept the prices too low to replace the oil we produced and the uncertainty of supply prevented the building of the required new refineries in the U.S. The price of crude oil in 1958 was \$3.01 and in 1972 was \$3.39. In constant 1958 dollars the price was \$3.01 in 1958 and \$2.53 in 1973.

7. The U.S., including the oil industry, has been under price controls for 2½ years and the oil business has been singled out for continued price controls. Price controls freeze more than prices. Not only do companies not have the money to find oil and gas, we are also frozen in our plans or actions for the future. No business can plan based on the capricious and unpredictable actions of bureaucrats and Congress. Every day of controls means a day of delay in solving the energy crisis.

8. Allocation programs are other names for rationing and delay further the return to a free market system and increases in supply.

9. Myriads of other legislation such as the consumer protection Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission and others reduce our time and ability to find and develop new energy. Each promulgate their own regulations and have their own police forces.

We are accused of not paying enough taxes. Our critics compare only our U.S. income taxes with both U.S. and foreign profits. They forget the huge amounts of taxes paid on foreign profits. Actually, when all U.S. taxes, other than sales and excise, are considered, the oil industry pays about 5.8% of their gross income in taxes compared to 5.6% for all mining and manufacturing corporations as a whole. This does not include the state and federal tax collected at the pump. If this is included, the taxes

become 20% of gross income for the oil industry.

10. The oil embargo which precipitated the crisis was caused by the Arab view that the U. S. was pro-Israel and anti-Arab.

11. Much of the future energy from oil and gas, uranium, coal and oil shale must come from lands belonging to the Federal Government. If they continue their policy of too little and too late, the energy situation will grow worse.

12. And finally, our public image and the results of our good public service for many years has been destroyed. The destruction was primarily by those Congressmen wanting quick votes, quick publicity and wanting to blame the oil companies to keep the blame for the energy crisis from justly falling on them. It has been good politics for many years to falsely find something wrong with the oil companies and then curing it with punitive legislation. This could not be done without your public support. The communications media must take their share of the blame through their need for sensationalism to spread to the public in their biased doses of 30-seconds wisdom.

This climate creates our legislative and economic problems and physically impairs our work. These help cause our energy crisis.

Most of the news media foster sensationalism, hysteria and fear, under the guise that this is news. This is also fed to the public several times each day in small doses in their home. The presentations are biased or, at best, do not and cannot give the full story or even a balanced dose. Most of the news is slanted toward fault finding and on the politically "liberal" side. We in business who have to deal in facts are not news because facts are dull. The news media make their contribution to the energy crisis.

Much of the news media are sincerely trying to understand the complex energy situation. There is encouragement that some of the press is getting beyond the "contrivance" and hysteria stages to the true facts of the situation. Whether this will develop fast enough to get to the public and Congress before punitive action is taken in Congress is very doubtful.

III. ECONOMIC CAUSES

The historically depressed prices for oil and natural gas have already been discussed. The industry's profits expressed as a percent of return on our investment for 20 years 1953-1972 averaged 10.1% compared to 10.8% for all manufacturing industry. The results for 1973 looks like we may have caught up with or slightly exceeded industry.

The effects of our depressed profits are best expressed by John Winger of the Chase Manhattan Bank:

"For the past decade and a half, the net income of the petroleum industry has been too small relative to its capital needs."

"Because it was not able to invest enough in the past, the petroleum industry is now faced with an enormous task. Not only must it try to satisfy the world's growing needs in the future, but it must also overcome the deficit created in the past by under investment."

"Clearly, in terms of the world's current and future needs for petroleum, the industry's earnings positively are not excessive—on the contrary, they are still subnormal. And, unless they can be improved in the years ahead, the world is faced with the prospect of devastating shortage of petroleum."

This was stated November, 1973.

The investment required by the petroleum industry between 1970 and 1985 is a minimum of \$1.350 trillion. An increase in profits of at least 30% is required in 1974.

In 1954, there were about 35,000 to 40,000 independent oil producers. Today, there are under 10,000. If the oil industry has been

so profitable, where did those 25,000 independents go?

IV. PHYSICAL CURES

The cure of our energy shortage seems so simple physically and so impossible politically.

There is enough petroleum in the world to provide growth for another 8 years more or less. In the United States, it is estimated that 47.5% of our oil and 63.4% of our natural gas remains to be discovered. This will be much harder to find, will be at higher costs and will require greater economic incentives.

Coal supplies, again at higher costs, could last for a thousand years. Oil shale reserves in the United States are about equivalent to all the natural gas reserves past and future.

Nuclear reserves with the present technology is about equivalent to all the oil reserves past and future. . . . If the breeder reactor is commercialized, then nuclear fuel is probably as large or larger than coal reserves. If the fusion process is ever developed, we cannot see the end of this energy.

Because of timing and political impossibilities, we will not see the end of the energy shortage in our generation. For this reason, we must take certain short, medium and long term steps.

Short term steps: Energy usage must be reduced and we must develop a savings ethic. Engineers will have a major place in alleviating the shortage. They must seek every possibility to increase energy efficiency through new designs, building construction, new smaller automobiles, mass transit and other ways that we cannot now see.

Short term and medium term steps: More oil and gas must be found, more coal developed, more nuclear plants built; all with the present technology.

Longer term steps: Research into new energy sources must be pressed with new technology. Next on the horizon must be coal liquefaction and gasification, oil shale production, tar sand extraction and geothermal development.

Further long term steps: Still further coal development, the breeder reactor hopefully, nuclear fusion and solar and wind power.

V. ECONOMIC CURES

Growth has been synonymous with increased energy supplies. Without increased supplies we will go through a severe economic situation until supplies grow again. The economic solution is again rather simple. Allow the free market system to work and remove the innumerable government controls. This is the only solution and has worked many times before.

The public has been fed so much propaganda on government intervention and controls that they are apprehensive about freedom. It is true we can't get something for nothing and the consumer will have to pay the price either way. The free enterprise system is less costly because it is more efficient than government and it stimulates creativity and ingenuity for solution of problems and will bring the costs to the lowest possible level.

Economically the costs will rise to equal the costs of finding adequate alternate sources of energy. The cost of coal liquefaction and gasification in 1973 dollars are about \$10.00 to \$11.00 per barrel of oil equivalent. Oil shale, tar sands and imported liquefied natural gas are in the same order of magnitude. This is a little higher than the average at current U.S. controlled and uncontrolled prices of about \$6.50 per barrel and a little less than most of the oil sold directly by the Arabs. This would be roughly equivalent to gasoline at 60 to 75 cents per gallon.

These figures are inaccurate because increasing costs of labor and supplies for the industry cannot be foretold and the inge-

nulty of free enterprise sometimes has the effect of decreasing prices over time, dependent on inflation. These figures can only be an order of magnitude related to present conditions.

VI. POLITICAL CURES

The most immediate help would be the lifting of the oil embargo. However, even if this is done there is no indication that production levels will be increased above that of last fall. The Arabs have said they will not increase the production beyond those 1973 levels unless their countries are industrialized so they will have economic well being after the oil is exhausted. This industrialization may take many years.

The most immediate help could also come from the Congress ceasing all punitive legislation of the industry such as price roll-backs, elimination of the depletion allowance and an excess or "windfall" profits tax. Steps should be taken to deregulate natural gas and ease the environmental requirements. All of the political causes listed herein must be reversed before real progress can be made. The problem is that the politicians, with the apparent support of the public, are still marching down that same old tired legislation road that caused the problem in the first place. The liberals are still advocating all of the harmful legislation they can imagine including a new Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, anti-trust action and divestitures. This legislation and constant pressure is bad. Whether Congressmen are passing and supporting this legislation to promote their "liberal" ideology, to get votes, from a lack of knowledge or from fear, the results are still harmful. Many of the Congressmen have worsened the crisis by false accusations, distortion of facts and construction of cases against the companies that are absurd to those who know and understand the facts.

The leaders in Congress who oppose the oil industry are like those leaders who incite a mob so as to use its power for punitive purposes. The leadership of Congress should have the courage and wisdom to lead the people to accept those hard decisions and actions required to solve the energy crisis.

Many Congressmen feel they have a mandate from the people to reduce the profits of the oil companies. Many will not have the courage to inform their constituents that this is the wrong course and will reduce the energy supply.

Psychologically people want to believe the energy crisis is contrived. If it is contrived, it can be easily cured and the people will not be hurt. If it is real, people know they will be hurt.

Washington is an Alice-in-Wonderland world these days where white is black, black is white, truths are lies and lies are truths. Anyone having knowledge and experience in a subject is prohibited from contributing to a solution on the excuse of "conflict of interest." Until this attitude (which apparently is supported by the public) is reversed, there can be no solution to the energy problem.

Some Congressmen instead of taking a long-range courageous leadership in solving the energy crisis are leading in denouncing the oil companies and carrying the public to hysterical reactions. They are pandering to our worst traits of greed, envy and fear to arouse emotion they can use in getting publicity, votes, and moving their ideology through the legislative process.

There is a minority of Congressmen who realize these conditions and are a valiant and courageous band in fighting these trends. Most of our Texas Congressmen are among them. These people must be supported and the others replaced.

There is a great unease in our country with a loss of confidence in all our institutions.

People do not know where we are drifting or the solutions. It has been said that historically the normal paths of regression for a country is from democracy to socialism to chaos to dictatorship. We are well down the road to socialism. The liberals, afraid that the public would rebel if they call it socialism, call it "government intervention," and they intervene at every opportunity. The socialization process is simple. Increasing doses of "government intervention" or taxation until the industry is crippled. Then the industry is nationalized, replaced by a government corporation, or fully controlled by some bureaucracy. This procedure works best during times of crisis, chaos and fear. Knowingly or unknowingly this is the road we are on. If this trend is not reversed, then the energy crisis will be only the first of many crises to come. The mistakes of freedom are less than the mistakes of controls.

Although the liberals act as if socialism is a bright, new and shining future, history has shown that it has been tried and failed miserably many times in the past. It has been said that if we do not learn from history we repeat the mistakes and repeat and repeat and repeat.

Will and Ariel Durant spent 40 years in studying and writing their 10-volume "The Story of Civilization." After they had finished their monumental work they culled through history to see if they could condense any lessons history has revealed. They then wrote their book, "The Lesson of History." I close by quoting one paragraph from that book.

"The experience of the past leaves little doubt that every economic system must sooner or later rely upon some form of profit motive to stir individuals and groups to productivity. Substitutes like slavery, police supervision, or ideological enthusiasm prove too unproductive, too expensive, or too transient. Normally and generally men are judged by their ability to produce—except in war, when they are ranked according to their ability to destroy."

FERTILIZER REPORT

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, fertilizer has long been a topic of conversation in Washington. In fact, the story most often told is that of how Bess Truman, in apologizing for Harry's public reference to manure, explained how long it had taken her to get him to say that.

Talk of fertilizer these days, however, is no laughing matter. Its availability has suddenly become one of the crucial determinants as to whether the world will go hungry or not.

Arkansas farmers, as their fellow farmers throughout the Nation, are confronted with a paralyzing dilemma. On the one hand, they are urged to "plant to the fenceposts," yet find in their enthusiasm to do so that suppliers cannot provide them with the fertilizer to achieve this increased production.

USDA reports that the net supply of fertilizer available to farmers this year will be about 21 million tons or 9 percent more than in crop year 1973. Yet

even this record level of supply cannot meet the demand, which has been estimated to be 12 percent greater in nitrogen, 9 percent greater in phosphate, and 8 percent more in potash fertilizers than were used in 1973.

The economic implications of such fertilizer shortages are obvious. As yields drop, so does producer income. Reduced fertilizer expenditures of \$5 per acre can reduce gross income to the farmer by \$10 to \$15 per acre in grain value. And if the grain is fed to animals this figure could rise \$20 to \$30 per acre.

Most perplexing of the questions that pervade discussions of the fertilizer shortage is the "why?" Over-exporting of American fertilizer has been blamed for the "pinch" placed on our agricultural sector, prompting several proposals in Congress calling for temporary embargos on fertilizer export until we get through the current planting season.

Transportation difficulties, a traditional problem for the fertilizer industry, certainly have accounted for the tight supply in some areas. Again this year there is a shortage of railroad and covered cars.

And at least part of the apparent shortage of fertilizer available for spring application is due to the unusually high rate of application during the first 5 months of 1974 crop year. A USDA survey of 14 States indicated a 44-percent increase in July-November 1973 sales of the three major fertilizer nutrients, compared with sales a year earlier.

And lest we forget the fuel shortage which has certainly left its mark on the fertilizer industry. Adequate fuel to operate both nitrogen and phosphate manufacturing facilities has not been available due in part to the fact that fertilizer production has not had a priority classification in the mandatory allocation program scheme.

So the big question is how we go about combating this problem. To begin with, fertilizer production must be given a priority classification in the fuel allocation program. We must promote production at full capacity by insuring that the industry has its full natural gas needs met.

Our farmers must make full use of soil tests, as encouraged by USDA, to get maximum benefits of fertilizer supplies available.

We must encourage branch line refurbishment to solve the industry's transporting headaches to relieve dependence on truck transport that is unsuited for rural road conditions.

And the Congress must thoughtfully contemplate export controls. I have proposed legislation that authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to control the export of fertilizer in emergency situations. Similar proposals are currently under consideration by Congress.

A world food crisis is seen by many authorities to be looming ominously on the horizon. Whether or not this grim forecast becomes a reality depends largely on the response of the world community to increased agricultural production, which is so closely tied to fertilizer availability.

Delays in coordinating Government policies to assist the farm and fertilizer production sectors will stifle the achievement of our national agricultural production goals.

Decisive action must be taken now, as planting season is already upon us, to help the American farmer meet the needs of American consumers.

Perhaps Jonathan Swift in his "Gulliver's Travels" best sums up the farmers' predicament:

He gave it for his opinion, that whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together.

How true, if he could only get the fertilizer.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am not one of the Members of this body clamoring for an immediate impeachment of the President of the United States. Neither have I been in the ranks of those defending the President in the face of allegations of illegal acts.

I have a strong feeling which I believe I share with the majority of Americans. I simply want to know the real truth about the so-called Watergate affair.

So far I have been unable to sort out the truth from the flackery, a frustration I believe I share with millions of citizens. There has been a confusing barrage of White House statements, staged question-and-answer sessions, press reports, congressional press conferences, and news releases—all professing to "enlighten" us about this unfortunate incident.

Mr. Speaker, this short speech is not intended to chastise my present colleagues in politics or my former colleagues in the press.

It is simply to state one man's strong opinion:

Enough of this junk is enough.

This is a nation of laws. We have laws to deal with any criminal activity on the part of any citizen. We have a Constitution which provides for dealing with any Presidential improprieties.

The processes of law do not move quickly. But I, for one, believe that it moves fairly, deliberately, and correctly. I, for one, am completely convinced that the people involved in this case are taking special care that it moves correctly in this historic instance.

In the last year, the press and the politicians seem to have joined in participating in a trial by popularization, not by law.

I know my former colleagues in the press are in the business of selling news, and they print and air what the people will read and watch and listen to. That is good business.

I know my colleagues in politics speak out on issues which identify them with

the voters who elect them. That is good business on their part.

And it is good business for the President to defend the Office of the Presidency, which must survive this or any other crisis.

Unfortunately, business on all three fronts has been too good during this past year—with the result that we are about to bankrupt this Nation.

The Watergate matter has not been conducted with the principal goal of punishing the guilty and absolving the innocent. It has been conducted to sell news and buy public acclaim. If this is not stopped, and stopped soon, the American people—press, politicians, Presidents, and private citizens alike—are going to be big losers.

Mr. Speaker, we all read the polls. They show both the President and the Congress are held in extremely low esteem by the public.

That should tell us something. No one is winning.

I am a freshman Member of this body, and still learning the ropes. Many here know more about the Congress than I may ever know.

But having never been in politics until I ran for this office, I do have recent experience at being an expert citizen. And I have been listening hard to the other expert citizens whom I represent.

I believe the basic question in the minds of the people of the United States is this. Is the President of the United States guilty of wrongdoing?

This question cannot be answered in the newspapers or on radio or television. It cannot be answered in any politician's press release. And it cannot be answered by Richard Nixon's orchestrated appearance before a friendly crowd.

It can only be answered, finally, by due process of law.

If a President is suspected of wrongdoing, the Constitution clearly provides that the House of Representatives may impeach him and that the Senate shall try him. That is process of law.

If others are suspected of wrongdoing, they may be indicted and tried in courts. That is due process of law.

Nowhere in the Constitution or the law is there any provision for trial by public opinion. That is what we have been conducting, and I am sick and tired of it.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent Committee on the Judiciary of this House has been assigned the difficult task of seeking out any evidence which would determine whether or not an impeachment hearing is needed. I believe they are pursuing this assignment with diligence and propriety.

So let me call on any Member of Congress or other politician who has real evidence of Presidential wrongdoing to present that evidence to the Judiciary Committee.

Let me call on any member of the press who has real evidence of Presidential wrongdoing to present that evidence to the Judiciary Committee.

And if the President of the United States has real evidence of innocence, let me call upon him to come forward and present that evidence to the Judiciary Committee.

This is due process of law. As I said

earlier, it is not swift. In fact, by its very nature it is deliberate and thorough. And because of this, it produces correct decisions.

I share with many Americans some serious doubts concerning the conduct of the President. But I also share a sincere desire to have these questions answered properly.

I am—proudly—a member of a different political party than the President's. I voted against him, and I disagree with much he has done in governing.

But he was elected by the American people, and he is the President.

The fact that I disagree with him is not grounds for impeachment.

The fact that he has a running feud with the press is not grounds for impeachment.

The fact that the polls reflect that many people have changed their minds about Mr. Nixon is not grounds for impeachment.

When the Judiciary Committee reports to this House clear evidence of Presidential wrongdoing, I shall not hesitate to vote to impeach.

On the other hand, if this clear evidence is not forthcoming, I shall freely vote to absolve him.

But I do want to know, one way or the other. And I want to know from the committee, and not from the newspapers or networks. I want to know by due process of law.

Let us all join together—press, politicians, President, and public—to resolve this issue the way it must be resolved.

If anyone refuses or declines to participate in this course of action, I would warn all citizens to be alert for the possibility of self-interest which probably has nothing to do with the real problem we are facing, or its solution.

NEARLY 20,000 FAMILIES RESPOND TO QUESTIONNAIRE IN POLL OF FOURTH DISTRICT IN MICHIGAN

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in every year since 1965 I have mailed questionnaires to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan seeking their views on the major issues before Congress at that time. The response to this year's poll has exceeded the previous record by several thousand, reflecting the great concern with which Americans everywhere are viewing the issues and problems which we now face.

Thus far, nearly 20,000 families have responded and—because this year's questionnaire provided space for three persons in a household to express their opinions—the results, as tabulated by an independent data processing service, reflect the feelings of more than 45,000 residents of the Fourth District.

Mr. Speaker, in the belief that other Members of Congress might find the results of this survey especially valuable at this time, I would like to include in the RECORD the tabulation which I received this morning:

RESULTS OF THE 1974 PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY, 4TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

[In percent]

Question	No answer	Yes	No	Question	No answer	Yes	No
Should gasoline be rationed now?	.009	8	90	If we were to have a national health insurance program, which of the following basic concepts would you prefer:			
Do you believe an energy crisis actually exists?	1	35	62	A Government plan covering medical care for everyone?	1	45	53
Should wage and price controls be removed?	3	48	47	A Government plan covering only long-lasting illness?	24	31	43
Should Federal election campaigns (President, senatorial, and Congressional) be financed by tax dollars rather than private contributions?	2	34	63	Continued reliance on private health insurance with Government paying premiums for the poor?	24	33	42
Should the President be impeached?	2	29	67	Requirement that employers provide health insurance for employees?	21	47	31
Should the President resign?	3	30	65	No new program	32	31	35
Should the President remain in office?	2	60	36				

CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE'S 1974 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of my recent questionnaire survey to my constituents in the Ninth District of Missouri. This poll produced over 35,000 responses, which indicates a great concern about some of the controversial national issues. I believe the results will be of interest to the public and to the Members of the House.

Almost 67 percent of the Ninth District constituents who responded to these questionnaires voiced the opinion that President Nixon does not have their trust and respect. Nixon carried the Ninth District with 65 percent of the vote in the 1972 election. One-fourth of the 35,000 people replying said they believe the President is doing a good job, while 7.6 percent had no opinion.

Over 40 percent expressed the belief that a sufficient question has been raised to justify an inquiry by the House of

Representatives, although they are not certain as to his guilt or innocence. More than one-third or 34.6 percent replied that there is no doubt in their minds at this time that the President is guilty and should be impeached, while 24 percent believe he has been unfairly maligned and see no reason for the House inquiry.

On the question of revenue sharing, a substantial majority or 62.1 percent do not think there has been a noticeable improvement in local governmental services since that program began in 1972. There were 21.5 percent who believed there had been such improvement. An unusually large percentage or 16.4 percent was undecided on this issue.

On the energy crisis question, 55.8 percent blamed the "major oil companies' exclusive control on production and distribution" for the shortage. Almost 29 percent said the cause was ineffective Federal regulation; 1.9 percent attributed the major cause to low oil import quotas, and 3.3 percent, a worldwide oil shortage. Another 3.4 percent blamed self-serving interests of foreign oil-producing nations, 5 percent had other opinions, and 1.7 percent expressed no opinion.

The energy crisis was most strongly

felt by 30.9 percent as it affected transportation, 27.9 percent in home use, 10.1 percent in business or employment, 9.2 percent in leisure, 1.3 percent services, 10.3 percent in other fields, and another 10.3 percent stated there was no effect whatsoever. This relatively large number expressing no inconvenience or effect of the energy crisis would seem to indicate the regional and localized nature of this problem.

Nearly half the people in the Ninth District—48.4 percent—thought we should give economic aid to Israel, while 44.8 percent thought the United States should take a neutral position. Of those favoring providing aid, 30.2 percent thought we should give all aid necessary—excluding American troops—while 18.2 percent said that aid should be limited to economic assistance. Only 6 percent think the United States should support the Arabs' position that Israel return all Arab land won in the 1967 conflict, and 0.8 of 1 percent feel the Arab land should be given back and the Arabs should be supported in imposing higher oil prices.

The summary was conducted in March 1974, and the question-by-question results of the survey follow:

CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE'S 1974 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[In percent]

	His	Hers	Total		His	Hers	Total
I. Energy crisis:				4. Support the Arab position that Israel return all Arab land won in the 1967 conflict.	6.3	5.7	6.0
A. In what area has the energy crisis most severely affected you?				5. Support the Arab position on returning the land (in No. 4) as well as support the Arabs as justified in imposition of higher oil prices.	.8	.7	.8
1. Transportation	34.9	27.1	30.9	III. The President:			
2. Home use (i.e., heating and other utilities)	22.2	34.2	27.9	A. With which of the following statements do you most closely agree?			
3. Business or employment	13.2	6.5	10.1	1. There is no doubt in my mind that the President is guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanors"; he should be impeached	35.0	33.8	34.6
4. Leisure	7.8	10.6	9.2	2. I am not certain whether or not the President is guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanors," but sufficient questions have been raised to justify inquiry by the House of Representatives	41.0	40.6	40.4
5. Public services	1.3	1.3	1.3	3. I believe the President has been unfairly maligned, and I see no reason for an inquiry by the House of Representatives	23.0	24.3	23.8
6. Other	10.8	9.6	10.3	4. No opinion	1.0	1.3	1.2
7. No effect whatsoever	9.8	10.7	10.3	B. President Nixon has my respect and trust:			
B. What do you believe is the major cause of the energy crisis?				1. Agree	25.3	25.9	25.6
1. Ineffective Federal regulations, planning and administration	30.2	27.3	28.9	2. Disagree	67.2	66.4	66.8
2. Major oil companies' exclusive control on production and distribution	57.2	54.8	55.8	3. No opinion	7.5	7.7	7.6
3. Low-oil import quotas	1.7	2.1	1.9	IV. Revenue sharing:			
4. Worldwide oil shortage	3.5	3.0	3.3	In your opinion, has there been a noticeable improvement in local government services since revenue sharing began in 1972?			
5. Self-serving interests of foreign oil-producing nations	2.7	4.0	3.4	1. Yes	21.0	19.8	21.5
6. Other	3.4	6.7	5.0	2. No	62.3	61.8	62.1
7. No opinion	1.3	2.1	1.7	3. No opinion	16.7	18.4	16.4
II. Middle East:							
The recent outbreak in the Middle East has again involved the United States. I would like your opinion on our future relationship with Israel and the Arab nations. The United States should:							
1. Give all necessary aid, both military and economic, to Israel (excluding American Armed Forces) to help guarantee her independence	34.6	24.8	30.2				
2. Limit aid to Israel to economic assistance	19.1	17.2	18.2				
3. Take a neutral position on the Middle East situation	39.2	51.6	44.8				

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE, SECOND DISTRICT OF IOWA

HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, this year as during my previous years of office in the House, I sent a questionnaire on a number of issues of leading interest to my constituents in the Second District of Iowa. More than 17,000 questionnaires were filled out and returned. I am pleased by the size of the response, which has increased each year, and particularly by the extensive comments which so many of my constituents added in their replies.

No public official should be guided by the results of polls alone. Indeed, it is

sometimes the highest obligation of an elected representative to vote his own conscience despite an aroused public feeling, or a sudden turn in public attitude. One's highest obligation is to one's oath of office and to the constitutional order.

However, polls of this nature provide very helpful indications of citizen concerns. Because the Second District of Iowa is diverse and is composed of a broad cross-section of interests, a questionnaire of this sort has real value to me and to my colleagues in the House. In turn, I believe the results are revealing and informative for all those whose views were solicited and on whose judgment and confidence all legislators rely.

I include the tabulated results at this point in the RECORD. I hope that the findings will be of interest to Members and to the wider public.

To those of us serving in Washington we are again given a sharp reminder by this poll that there is widespread dissatisfaction with our two most vital institutions—the President and the Congress. We can take little satisfaction that the Congress rates the better of the two, for it too lacks a broad consensus of support. This is why we must renew our efforts to communicate with the voter credibly and candidly; and why we must refashion the machinery of Congress so that its performance is better attuned to the public's expectations and needs.

This questionnaire is one small way of providing a better flow of views and concerns between the citizen and the legislator—so vital to the fabric of our democracy.

The tabulated results of my questionnaire follow:

TABULATED RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE, 2D DISTRICT, IOWA

[In percent]

	Yes	No	
1. Economy: Do you think the administration's economic program has been reasonably successful in curbing inflation and reducing unemployment?	14	86	
2. Energy: In light of the fuel shortage, which of the following actions do you favor:			
(a) Major new Federal investment in the development of alternative sources of energy?	86	14	
(b) Restrictions on the size of car engines or a tax on high-powered cars with low fuel economy?	62	38	
(c) Government rationing of gasoline?	29	71	
(d) An increased Federal tax on gasoline?	8	92	
(e) An excess profits tax to prevent energy suppliers from reaping windfall profits as a result of shortages?	90	10	
(f) Relaxation of environmental standards?	41	59	
3. Agriculture:			
Do you approve of the new farm bill establishing a floor under agricultural prices in place of the former system of payments to hold land out of production?	74	26	
Do you favor establishment of a strategic grain reserve seeking to stabilize farm income and provide a guaranteed source of supply in times of emergency?	86	14	
4. Watergate: The Watergate affair and related events have dominated public attention this year. Assuming no new action by the President to bring out the truth, which of the following do you favor:			
(a) Continue the investigations by the Senate Watergate Committee	57	43	
(b) Continue the investigations by the Special Prosecutor	74	26	
(c) Continue the impeachment investigation by the House Judiciary Committee	72	28	
(d) Stop all of the above investigations	33	67	
5. Public confidence:			
Do you approve of the way the President is doing his job?	21	79	
Do you approve of the way the Congress is doing its job?	32	68	
Do you approve of the way the news media are doing their job?	57	43	
6. Campaign finance: Both Federal and Iowa income tax forms now allow each taxpayer to allocate \$1 to the party of his or her choice to help finance election campaigns without reliance on large contributions. Use of this dollar checkoff does not increase the amount of tax to be paid. Do you favor this type of public financing plan?	75	25	
Which, if any, of the following additional proposals do you favor as a means of improving our system of financing Federal election campaigns:			
(a) Limits on expenditures a candidate is allowed to make?	94	6	
(b) Making contributions above a certain amount illegal?	88	12	
(c) Matching each small individual contribution to a candidate with an equal amount of public funds?	20	80	
(d) Total public financing of elections?	33	67	
7. Pension reform: Should Congress place private pension plans under Federal regulation to guarantee retired persons receive all the benefits they have earned?	79	21	
8. Tax reform: Which, if any, of the following proposals for tax reform should be adopted by Congress:			
(a) Equalize the income tax rate for single and married persons?	56	44	
(b) Require persons with high incomes to pay a higher minimum tax, regardless of their deductions?	83	17	
(c) Eliminate tax deduction for certain interest payments?	36	64	
(d) Reduce the oil depletion allowance (tax deduction for exploration by oil companies)?	68	32	
9. Rural communities: Do you favor H.R. 11350 which I introduced to provide Federal funds for small towns to assist in fixing up business districts and providing a center for community activities?	68	32	
10. Health: Which of the following systems do you favor for providing medical care at an affordable cost to all Americans:			
(a) Comprehensive national insurance funded by general tax revenues and a social security-like payroll deduction?	40	60	
(b) Tax credits for premiums paid for private health insurance?	78	22	
(c) Tax incentives to encourage employer-run insurance plans, with the Government subsidizing premiums for the poor?	53	47	
(d) Publicly subsidized insurance to pay for catastrophic medical expenses while relying on private insurance and personal resources for ordinary medical expenses?	70	30	
(e) Continuation of the present system?	33	67	
11. Preparing for the future: The Select Committee on Committees has, at my recommendation, proposed that all House committees shall include a subcommittee on oversight as well as foresight to more effectively review the present value of enacted legislation and to anticipate and determine future legislative needs. Do you agree with this proposal?	81	19	
12. Budget priorities: Inflationary pressures and budget deficits require restraint and difficult choices about priorities for Federal spending. Please indicate those areas of the budget which you feel should be increased, decreased, or remain the same:			
	Increase	Same	Decrease
Control of drug abuse	49	43	8
Education	45	45	10
Health	57	37	6
Military	8	35	57
Foreign affairs	3	24	73
Agriculture and rural development	33	51	16
Transportation	59	34	7
Community development and housing	30	49	26
Social security	40	50	10
Social services	20	46	34
Space exploration	8	27	65
Consumer protection	52	39	9
Pollution control	37	44	19
Crime control	68	29	3

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON THE RANDALL REPORT ON U.S. TROOP COMMITMENTS IN EUROPE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 the Armed Services Committee approved an ad hoc report concerning U.S. troop commitments in Europe. Since that report—which is the result of the Peyser amendment to last year's Defense authorization bill—ostensibly will use as the basis for all arguments this year in Congress that our troop levels in Europe are sacrosanct, I think that it is important that Members realize that the Randall subcommittee which made the report proceeded questionably and presented a perspective which overlooks several critical areas and questions on this critical issue.

I. PROCEDURAL ERRORS

It is clear that the effect of the subcommittee's work has not been to provide Congress with an "independent," comprehensive and balanced view of the question of American troops in Europe, but merely to back up the administration positions with authoritative-sounding pronouncements.

The investigations by the subcommittee were seriously deficient. No public hearings were held. Only administration officials were invited to testify. There were no public witnesses at all, much less anyone who supports reevaluation of our troop commitments in Europe.

The subcommittee did not engage in any direct investigation of conditions in Europe, but relied completely on descriptions from people committed to carrying out an existing specific policy. No one doubts the good faith of these witnesses, but it is unfortunate that no allowance was made either for persons with a different perspective or for honest differences in opinion.

The authority of this report is not increased by the hurried manner by which full committee approval was sought. The subcommittee's failure to seriously consider objections to administration policy is compounded by the failure to allow for careful consideration and substantive discussion of the conclusions of the report by members of the committee.

Under these circumstances, the subcommittee's report can only be considered as a friendly summary of the current administration position, and not as an independent investigation.

II. THE ISSUE OF AMERICAN COMMITMENTS AND NATO CONVENTIONAL ABILITIES

The conclusion of the report is that there should be no cut in the level of American troops in Europe. For documentation, the subcommittee mainly relies on assertions by the makers of present policy.

However, a basic question is not even discussed.

Although the subcommittee makes

many allusions to the NATO alliance's ability to "give a good account of itself" in a conventional conflict, there is no clear statement or assurance that current NATO conventional force levels can successfully defend the shallow NATO theater of operations from the kind of fast-moving, overpowering, and mobile conventional combat that the Warsaw Pact forces are structured and positioned to conduct.

This is the central question that the entire report never really discusses: whether or not the NATO conventional military forces can in fact actually defend the NATO area for an extended period, without the probable need to make early use of tactical nuclear weapons.

Yet only by starting with an answer to this central question is it possible to conduct a substantive discussion on the merits of administration policy. MFR talks and the Jackson-Nunn amendments, both of which the subcommittee places at the center of discussion, are only peripheral issues.

Briefly stated, the fact is that NATO is now—and long has been—vulnerable to a Soviet conventional attack.

It is vulnerable to conventional war because the NATO allies over the past 15 to 20 years have not been willing to expend the money and manpower necessary to structure a truly adequate combat-effective conventional ground force of sufficient size to offset the superior Warsaw Pact ground forces.

This is not the fault of the United States. NATO is secure in a strategic and tactical nuclear sense only because of U.S. guarantees and positioned weapons. The United States for 20 years has made a sizable and costly contribution to the NATO conventional ground forces. But the conventional area continues to be the Achilles heel of NATO. Besides the United States, only the Federal Republic of Germany has provided a significant conventional combat to the NATO Central Europe front. The French have withdrawn their forces from the NATO military command. The French foreign minister indicated on March 10, 1974, that although France wanted the U.S. forces to remain in Europe, the matter was not "fundamental to France."

If the matter of improving or maintaining even the present marginal conventional security for NATO is not "fundamental" to one of the principal members of the Atlantic alliance, why is it then incumbent on the United States to attempt to find military, political and diplomatic reasons why the central question should not be faced?

Yet that is exactly what this report attempts to do. The United States certainly has fundamental security reasons for desiring to assist the NATO alliance in defending itself. But these U.S. national security considerations and costly efforts cannot surmount a persistent apathy on the part of the European members of the alliance in regard to the longstanding critical conventional weakness of the NATO ground forces.

This is the gut problem of the alliance. We only obfuscate the answer by vague

rhetoric about constantly improving conventional capabilities which have always been marginal. We cannot avoid the central issue by delaying tactics such as the mutual force reduction talks, or the Jackson-Nunn amendment. This latter legislation puts us in the position of making cuts for economic reasons that can be justified perfectly well for security reasons; namely, the lack of a European will to sacrifice toward creating a truly deterrent conventional force.

In conclusion, this report does not address this long-standing problem of the weakness of NATO conventional deterrence. I believe it should. Why should the Congress place itself in the position of alibing—even with good intentions—the consistent failure of our NATO allies to put up sufficient conventional forces to end the conventional combat weakness of the Alliance? Why should this Congress sacrifice our independence of initiative toward reducing the excessive number of American conventional ground troops stationed in Europe, when our European allies continue—as they have for nearly 20 years—to refuse to provide a sufficient number of their own ground troops to do something effective about the conventional vulnerability of NATO?

Contrary to the implications in the report, no one is advocating a precipitous withdrawal of large numbers of U.S. troops in Europe. Let us be clear on what is at issue. What has been proposed is a carefully-phased thinning-out of the large number of noncombat U.S. military personnel currently assigned in the multitude of headquarters and support units located in central Europe. These personnel would be followed by a phased withdrawal of 1 or 2 of the mechanized infantry divisions. This independent pruning-back of our overgrown forces would serve to streamline and strengthen their overall combat capability as restructured forces were also moved to more viable battle positions. Any realignment of our forces would be done in consultation with our allies. It is entirely compatible with the past and present action that the European countries themselves have taken in regard to their ground forces.

III. UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

In relation to other issues raised in the subcommittee report, the following questions would have to be asked and answered if a complete examination of the problem is desired.

First, it is assumed in the report that the presence of Soviet forces in Central Europe poses a continuing threat to Western European independence. Yet the Department of Defense military threat statement for Western Europe in 1974 indicates some contrary assumptions:

While we do not consider aggression by the USSR likely in the present political climate, the fact remains that the Soviets have a vital interest in preserving the status quo in Central Europe and in retaining their hold on Eastern Europe. A crisis that could lead to conflict could arise if the political situation substantially changed in a way that threatened the USSR or its hegemony over Eastern Europe. (Italic supplied.)

Can this contradiction be explained?

Second. The Soviet Union stations a large number of troops in Eastern Europe even though, as we are assured by the subcommittee, there exists a "powerful" NATO conventional force which "could give a good account of itself" and thereby protect Western European independence. Therefore, these troops are not presently effective as a credible means of our pressure. Furthermore, withdrawal of troops behind the Soviet border probably would cause no basic strategic disadvantage to the Russians, but would presumably accelerate a process of political relaxation in Western Europe. Why, then, if troops are effective only in provoking West European hostility, does the Soviet Union feel that it is in its interests to keep troops in Eastern Europe? Is it not because they are essentially occupation troops, and not really credible as a "threat" to Western European independence? This seems to be what is assumed by the people directly concerned—the Western European public.

Third. While it is true that U.S. forces in Europe serve the United States as well as Western European security interests, is it not also a fact that the level of U.S. forces in Europe is rightfully an independent decision of the U.S. Government, rather than a commitment specified in an article of the NATO Treaty which is the foundation of U.S. foreign policy in regard to the Atlantic Alliance? What treaty article or congressionally approved commitment specifies that the current level of U.S. military forces must be stationed in Western Europe? What congressionally approved military policy statement specifies that the present level of U.S. forces are required in Western Europe in order to assure the national security interests of the United States?

Fourth. The report indicates that the Warsaw Pact has superiority in numbers of men and armor. A recent Rand study on NATO military policy indicates the pact forces are also superior in numbers of tactical aircraft, missiles, artillery and mortar tubes. In view of this evident superiority in practically all areas of a conventional contest how can it be said that the NATO conventional force "is not a tripwire"? How many days is it estimated the NATO conventional forces can hold on—without using nuclear weapons—to the east side of the Rhine River against a full scale Soviet attack?

Fifth. Is it not true that our European NATO partners have, to some extent or another, been "continuing to improve their forces" and "increasing their defense budgets" for most of the past 15 years, yet these "increases" have not alleviated their continuing vulnerability to Soviet conventional forces? Are the quantities of tanks, armored vehicles and modern combat and patrol aircraft mentioned as "additions" in the report actually additional items of major equipment or are they replacement items for older obsolete weapons that are being removed from the NATO forces inventories? Does the statement "NATO is moving forward on its aircraft-shelter program, higher levels of reserve stocks and improved air defenses around rear depots and airfields" mean that these long-standing

weaknesses in the NATO defense structure have been corrected or that our NATO allies continue—as they have been doing for 12 years—to merely "move toward" correcting these deficiencies?

Sixth. Although the report mentions improvement in the U.S. overall balance-of-payments position, it does not mention the DOD estimate that the fiscal year 1974 BOP deficit relating to NATO deployments will be approximately \$2.1 billion—an increase of \$600 million over the reported fiscal year 1973 deficit. Is not this the more relevant statistic?

Seventh. The subcommittee, in order to demonstrate progress being made at the MFR talks, stresses the fact that position papers have been prepared by both sides. Yet from their summaries it is clear the two positions are diametrically opposed. The Soviet "joint draft" proposes mutuality in aggregate reductions of the armed forces and armaments—including ground forces, air forces, and nuclear weapons—of all the countries with forces in Central Europe; while the U.S. "working scheme" stresses a two-phase reduction with only the first phase spelled out as consisting of solely ground force reductions by only the United States and the U.S.S.R., and with the United States reducing at an aggregate rate of two and a half times fewer troops than the U.S.S.R.

It is precisely this difference of view that the report refers to when it says that "offsetting these—Soviet—advantages is central to the proposals of the Western Allies." How is it expected that such an impasse of purposes and views will be compromised in the next year or even the next 5 years? Is not MBFR an elusive objective which must be thoroughly pursued but not be permitted to delay an urgently-needed, independent pruning-back and improvement of U.S. military forces in Europe?

In other words, how long can we allow mutual force reduction talks to completely tie our hands in relation to military policy toward Europe?

Eighth. The report says that any independent pruning-back of our conventional forces in Europe "would not be made up by the allies and in all likelihood would be followed by similar reductions by many of them." Why would our NATO allies take such an unreasonable attitude? Do not they see the Soviet conventional threat in the same terms as the report assumes for the United States? Is not this indicated allied proclivity to rush to reduce their forces a further indication of a fundamental difference in their perception of the need for conventional forces? And should not the United States be sensitive to the implications inherent in this different perception, in regard to the safety of our own forces in Europe?

Ninth. How can the Jackson-Nunn amendment be construed as an indication of a commitment on the part of the United States not to reduce its forces in Europe? On the contrary, on September 25, 1973, during Senate debate on the amendment, Senator MANSFIELD indicated that he would vote for the bill and stated that "in my opinion, the amendment is not at all inconsistent

with efforts to remove substantial U.S. troops from Europe and elsewhere for that matter."

Tenth. Please explain the apparent contradiction between the statement in the introduction of the report which indicates that "there has been an improvement in the morale and readiness of U.S. Forces in Europe" and the recent testimony by General Davison CINCUSAEUR that rated morale in the U.S. 7th Army as no more than "good" and discipline—essential to effective combat readiness—as only "fair." Is it to be assumed from the improvement reported in the committee report that the morale and discipline of our soldiers in Europe was so low 2 years ago as to have bordered on being unsatisfactory?

Eleventh. It is indicated in the report that there has been improvement in the combat-to-support ratio of the U.S. Army in Europe and that it has increased from a previous 58 to 42 percent up to 61 to 39 percent. Is it not true that these percentages are only accurate if all the Europe-based signal, engineer, aviation and special mission units—such as the long-range strategic missile units, Berlin Brigade, theater air defense units, army intelligence, and communication units—are included with the infantry, artillery and armored elements as "combat" forces? How many of these so-called "combat" units are intermediate units such as battalions that actually engage in combat? What percentage of the personnel in these so-called "combat" units are assigned in a combat skill MOS?

Twelfth. The report findings and recommendations say that the Army and Air Force have made "notable" reductions in headquarters personnel; is it not a fact that in the 1,067-man U.S. Army Europe/7th 1973 headquarters, only 58 reductions had been made in the past year, and that in the 1973 overall total of 3,285 personnel assigned to Army headquarters in Europe only 182 reductions had been made through February 1974? Is it not correct that the headquarters of the Army's Southern European Task Force in Italy actually increased by 48 personnel—188 to 236—during the same period that "notable" reductions were reportedly taking place?

Thirteenth. The subcommittee report seems contradictory on the concept of troop rotation. It states in one place that "U.S. Forces in Europe have improved because of the increased stability * * * represents." And yet later the report states that one of the serious personnel problems existing among our troops is the extended tour in Europe. The subcommittee report views a reduced tour of 18 months as "the single most important change that could be made to improve enlisted morale in the Army in Europe." But it is precisely the extended tour in Europe that permits the stability of assignment that has caused the improvements in readiness and morale noted by the subcommittee. How can the subcommittee laud improvements resulting from stability of assignment while at the same time stressing a shortened tour which will create the very kind of personnel turbulence which destroys that stability?

IN GOOD COMPANY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the April 13 issue of Human Events carried a detailed treatment of the controversy over the present situation in South Vietnam as it has developed through exchanges between U.S. Ambassador to Saigon Graham Martin and the New York Times. One can appreciate the lopsided contest which ensues when a far-away U.S. official seeks to clarify U.S. policy vis-a-vis a large metropolitan newspaper with daily access to the public.

Ambassador Graham finds himself in good company. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the recently exiled Russian author, was reported—dare I quote the April 1 issue of the Times—as stating:

My "Letter to the Soviet Leaders" was, even before its publication in the United States, subjected in the press, beginning with the New York Times, to primitive and even mistaken interpretations in contradiction to its real meaning. . . .

I insert at this point the Times item on Solzhenitsyn, followed by the Human Events article mentioned above.

The material follows:

SOLZHENITSYN SAYS SOME MISINTERPRET HIS IDEAS

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND, March 31.—Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, the exiled Russian author, said today that he had no plans now to visit the United States and was concerned that Americans did not understand his vision for the Soviet Union's future.

In his first interview since his family joined him in exile here two days ago, Mr. Solzhenitsyn said: "My 'Letter to the Soviet Leaders' was, even before its publication in the United States, subjected in the press, beginning with The New York Times, to primitive and even mistaken interpretations in contradiction to its real meaning.

"My program set down in the letter is a deduction from that general belief that nations and people can attain their supreme spiritual results only at the price of voluntary self-limitation in the outside world, concentrating exclusively on their internal development."

Mr. Solzhenitsyn said that American commentators had described his views as "nationalism," "utopianism," and "a call to return to the past." He added: "In this way the press is capable of introducing incomprehension between distant parts of the planet rather than mutual understanding."

KENNEDY RENEWS CAMPAIGN AGAINST SOUTH VIETNAM

Sen. Teddy Kennedy (D.-Mass.), the favorite presidential candidate of rank-and-file Democrats has once again become the spear carrier for that peculiar element in the United States lusting to cut off South Vietnam at the knees.

Teddy vigorously battled President Nixon's plan to give South Vietnam a shot at survival, even while the President was withdrawing the U.S. troops initially placed there by Teddy's brothers, John and Robert. Now that the Administration has brought home the troops and the POWs—and Saigon is still standing—Teddy is again resourcefully working to pull the plug on the 17 million non-Communist inhabitants of South Vietnam.

Hardly a day seems to go by when the Massachusetts solon isn't raising a fuss about U.S. economic and military aid to our ally, chastizing Secretary of State Henry Kissinger for backing President Thieu or bawling out America's tough-talking ambassador to Saigon, Graham Martin.

Currently, Teddy is leading a drive in the Senate to block a proposal to increase for this fiscal year the ceiling on military assistance to South Vietnam from \$1.126 billion to \$1.6 billion, and was undoubtedly encouraged by the narrow defeat of the aid hike in the House last week. (Rep. Otis Pike of New York led the battle for the doves in the lower chamber.)

Moreover, Teddy is battling the \$474-million supplemental request, even though the secretary of defense made a special plea for it and insisted the lower ceiling—largely because of inflation and Hanoi's hyper-activities in the South—is insufficient to provide Saigon with the ammunition, petroleum and other war materials essential to ensure its survival. Teddy, however, seems more determined than ever to whittle down U.S. support.

The Massachusetts solon recently garnered some publicity when, on April Fool's day, he released an exchange of correspondence between himself and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. He was dismayed and disturbed at what many observers thought was a rather non-controversial statement by Kissinger in regard to Saigon.

"The United States has no bilateral written commitment to the government of the Republic of Vietnam," stated Kissinger, but under the Paris agreement, "The United States committed itself to strengthening the conditions which made the ceasefire possible and to the goal of the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination. With these commitments in mind, we continue to provide to the Republic of Vietnam the means necessary for its self-defense and for its economic stability. . . ."

While clearly standard policy and hardly surprising, Teddy was quick to take offense. He called this a "disturbing clarification" of our Indochina policy. "I am distressed," he contended, "that the secretary's statement seems to propound a new rationalization for our continued heavy involvement in Indochina."

Kissinger's statement "shatters the hope of most Americans" who thought the Paris accords would get us out of Southeast Asia. "In light of pressing needs and inflation at home, and other urgent priorities overseas, the Administration's course in Indochina borders on fiscal irresponsibility, and is contrary to the new directions set by Congress last year."

While Teddy was condemning Kissinger for refusing to apply the aid tourniquet to South Vietnam, the Democratic party's would-be presidential candidate blithely ignored commenting on Kissinger's reasons as to why military and economic assistance was still important.

"The fundamental problem," said Kissinger, "is that the North Vietnamese are still determined to seize political power in the South, using military means if necessary. To this end, they have maintained unrelenting military pressure against the South Vietnamese government and have continued widespread terrorism against the population."

In what can only be termed a "flagrant violation of the agreement," Kissinger continued, "North Vietnam has persisted in its infiltration of men and material into the South, bringing in more than 100,000 troops and large quantities of heavy equipment since the cease-fire began." Yet Teddy chose not to offer one word of criticism of Hanoi's conduct.

While pressing his anti-South Vietnamese offensive—in which he has been joined by Representatives Bella Abzug (D.-N.Y.) and

Ronald Dellums (D.-Calif.)—Teddy has also decided to wage a holy war against America's ambassador to Saigon, Graham Martin. Martin has infuriated Teddy—as well as the Washington Post and New York Times—for several reasons, including his recent and unfortunately phrased confidential cable to the State Department that was leaked to the senator last week.

Asked by the department how it should respond to Teddy's questions, Martin said he shouldn't be given an "honest and detailed answer to his questions of substance." But it is clear from the context of the letter—despite Teddy's distortion of its meaning—that Martin was not recommending that the senator should not receive factual information or should be deceived.

Indeed, Martin said that Kennedy had a right to raise his questions, but that he was not entitled to have them immediately and fully responded to since "they are not questions which either fall within the purview of his subcommittee or which should be answered to him as an individual senator so close before the full Administration position is presented to the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committee."

Since Kennedy was spearheading the opposition to the Administration's aid program to Vietnam, argued Martin, it would not be wise to give him a "tactical advantage" by providing him with responses to his questions before the Administration had a chance to present its entire case before the Foreign Relations panels.

While Teddy seized on the "honest and detailed answer" remark, the truth is that Teddy was after Martin before the cable incident. And a major reason seems to be the tough-talking ambassador's vigorous defense of our commitment to South Vietnam—a commitment that Teddy would like to perceptibly weaken.

Just how committed Martin is can be discerned in the blunt language he used to dissect a New York Times article on the U.S. role in South Vietnam. Paragraph nine of David Shipper's article of January 16, argued Martin in a 17-page critique to the Department of State, "is another classic example of disguising propaganda under the protective rubric of 'investigative reporting.' Shipper now alleges that U.S. military aid is indispensable to what is categorically described as 'the South Vietnamese government's policy of resistance to any accommodation with the Communists.' The implication is glaringly obvious, although unstated, that the GVN [Government of Vietnam] should do so.

"Beyond doubt, that is Hanoi's position. In the next sentence, Shipper states that militarily, the existence aid has enabled President Nguyen Van Thieu to take the offensive at times, 'launching intensive attacks with artillery and jet fighters against Vietcong-held territory.'

"Shipper does not think it important to inform the readers of his paper that the 'at times' in the above sentence were retaliatory strikes such as the ones made after the Communists shelled the Bien Hoa Air Base and later destroyed the Nha Be petroleum storage tanks, and that the GVN has a publicly announced policy of taking retaliatory action whenever the NVA/VC forces so attack GVN installations. Since there is no mention of the thousands of NVA/VC violations of the cease-fire, the only logical assumption is that Shipper considers it a violation of the Paris agreement only when the GVN responded to these attacks."

Teddy has complained of Martin's response to Shipper, and he is thought to be no more pleased with the memoranda of conversation between Martin and visiting American "peace activists" in Saigon. According to the memoranda, America's ambassador to Saigon used rhetoric not often employed by diplomats. When the Rev. George Webber, president,

New York Theological Seminary, told Martin that he was "distressed" that President Thieu had noted that the intensity of violence was increasing, the ambassador said that it was a cold hard fact that the fighting was continuing and he was glad that the Rev. Webber was distressed.

"The ambassador," according to the memoranda, "said he trusted Dr. Webber's 'distress' was over the fact of the fighting itself and was not the 'distress' of some of his colleagues in the 'Peace Movement' that the GVN [South Vietnam], by daring to resist the continuing attacks of the North Vietnamese, was interfering with a complete North Vietnamese victory, in which so many of those colleagues had such a deep emotional involvement.

"The ambassador said," the memoranda continued, "that when Dr. Webber returned to the United States he might report that President Thieu shared his 'distress' that the war 'was escalating'; that he might report no one was fighting in North Vietnam, that it was the North Vietnamese who were still continuing their infiltration, it was the North Vietnamese who were stepping up the subversive activities and attacks on innocent civilians by the planting of mines and mortaring of villages with no military objective but to strike terror.

"But, said the ambassador, if one were really 'distressed,' the proper place to complain would be Hanoi. The mere fact that a guerrilla campaign was in progress in South Vietnam, the ambassador said, was in and of itself a denial of the violent criticisms by some of their colleagues of South Vietnam as a repressive, closed society. By definition, no guerrilla action of any consequence can be carried on in a repressive, closed society." The memoranda then has the ambassador accusing North Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Red China and Cuba of having closed societies. Martin was indignant, the memoranda states, at "those addicted to the narcotic of 'selective outrage'."

Asked about the corruption issue by John Boone, the former commissioner of the Massachusetts State Department of Corrections, Martin struck another blunt note. "Noting that Mr. Boone had been a public official in Massachusetts," the memoranda of conversation records, "the ambassador said that, for purposes of comparison, he thought the general level of corruption in the RVN [Republic of Vietnam] might be roughly but fairly equated with that existing in Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts around the first decade when 'Honey' Fitzgerald was mayor of Boston." (Honey Fitzgerald, Teddy's grandfather, presided over an administration that was honeycombed with corruption. When he was elected to Congress in 1918, the House bounced him from his seat, declaring it had been won through fraud.)

"The ambassador noted," the memoranda went on, "that we might take some comfort as well as hope by noting that things were now better in Massachusetts and that one of Mayor Fitzgerald's grandsons had become President, another attorney general of the U.S., and a third, now a United States senator, was regarded by some of Dr. Webber's colleagues in the 'Peace Movement' as the White Knight in Shining Armor, tilting his lance to battle corruption, and the sole guardian of the great American liberal and humanitarian tradition. Although other Americans did not quite accept that accolade from Dr. Webber's colleagues in the 'Peace Movement' as the 'revealed truth,' the ambassador thought the analogy did perhaps put the problem in a clearer perspective."

So far as South Vietnam's police system, said Martin, it has become a central target of Hanoi and the Communists, because an "effective police system" is the greatest danger to a successful guerrilla operation. The full

weight of the Communist propaganda machine has been turned on it.

"The ambassador said," the memoranda of conversation continued, "that he had been watching the evolution of events in Indochina for more than a quarter of a century. During that period he said he had become utterly fascinated by the success of Hanoi in fashioning a propaganda apparatus which in its efficiency, in its pervasiveness, and its sheer perfection of technique has no parallel in recorded history. Herr Goebbels would whirl in his grave, the ambassador thought, in complete frustration at the realization that he was the most callow, unsophisticated neophyte in comparison.

"Of course, Goebbels did not have at his disposal the base of the worldwide Communist apparatus with its ability on certain issues to co-opt the non-Communist parties of the left and use this base for the formation of front organizations ostensibly without Communist or leftist connections."

There is one basic fact that Martin tried to impress upon this peace activist group: "For the entire period of this conflict, whenever people have had a choice amid the disruptions of the war, they have come only one way, to territory controlled by the South, never to the territory controlled by the North." Why, when given a choice, said Martin, have they never gone to the Provisional Revolutionary Government's area? Why, when given a choice, do they always come to the areas controlled by the government of South Vietnam?

AMERICAN RED CROSS PRESENTS ITS HIGHEST AWARD TO TOMMY WHITTAKER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that most of us will agree with the words of William Wordsworth when he stated that—

The best portion of a good man's life, His little, nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love.

However, it is gratifying when someone does receive recognition for an unpretentious act of kindness.

On January 7, 1974, Mr. Tommy Whittaker, of Long Beach, Calif., was at his place of work when an explosion occurred. Seeing that a fellow employee, Pedro Camparero, was suffering from a traumatic amputation of his leg and was bleeding profusely, Tommy unselfishly rushed to his aid.

Fortunately for the victim, Tommy Whittaker had been trained in Red Cross first aid and, therefore, possessed the necessary skills to support his generous intentions. Using the belt of another employee, this fine American immediately applied an improvised tourniquet to the victim's leg. And, as the attending physician at the hospital stated:

Mr. Whittaker's prompt action was instrumental in saving the life of the man.

For his meritorious actions, the American National Red Cross has chosen to honor Tommy Whittaker with the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American National Red Cross. It is given to persons

who save or sustain a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course.

Mr. Speaker, Tommy Whittaker will be presented with this outstanding award through the Los Angeles Chapter of the American Red Cross by the Torrance city council. Arrangements for this presentation are being made by the commander of Torrance Paramedics, Stan Sellers.

We are indeed fortunate to have people like Tommy Whittaker who are willing and able to assist their fellowman. I am sure that his wife, Dorothy, and his two daughters, Carolyn and Michelle, are as proud of him as we are in southern California.

FACING THE COSTS OF A COLLEGE EDUCATION—PART II

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 I noted that even though both Houses of Congress have acted to improve the guaranteed student loan program, the price of college tuition remain a major problem.

In the April edition of the Washington Monthly, one of the magazine's editors, Walter Shapiro, presents a thorough discussion of the tuition problem. I include the remainder of Mr. Shapiro's article as part of my remarks, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NEW HOPE FOR PARENTS—A WAY TO BEAT THE COSTS OF COLLEGE (PART II)

LOW EARNINGS, LARGE DEBT

Loans with repayment to be made out of future earnings represent the only realistic way for students to take financial responsibility for their own educations. Most loan programs, however, have drawbacks that extend far beyond the difficulties of finding a lender willing to commit funds for educational borrowing. Loans for non-reposable items like a college degree are inherently short-term. (Under current regulations, government-backed loans must be repaid within 10 years of leaving school.) This means that recent college graduates are confronted with the burden of making fixed loan payments during their twenties when their earnings are apt to be the lowest of their careers. The first years away from college should be for many a time of vocational experimentation. The logic behind the establishment of programs like the Peace Corps was that these post-college years represent the only period in the lives of many when the demands of self-sacrifice do not seriously conflict with the responsibilities of home and family. The burden of educational debt, however, may convince many recent college graduates that they cannot afford idealism. Students who worry about this debt may be channeled into purely vocational programs, recognizing that academic experimentation is an expensive luxury for which they will be paying all too soon.

Almost all of these problems could be circumvented through a program of income-contingent, deferred college loans, first suggested by Milton Friedman in 1955. Such a plan would spread repayment of room, board, and tuition costs over most of a student's earning life—especially the later working years when one can most easily afford repayment. Just lengthening the term of student loans would lessen the burden that borrow-

ing places on recent college graduates. Ideally, these deferred loans would carry the principle of scholarships one step further and make a student's repayment schedule contingent on future earnings. College graduates might be required to repay two or three per cent of their annual earnings (depending on the amount borrowed) over a 25-to-35 year period. Under such a plan, educational debt would not be a significant burden to students at any point in their lives. If borrowers were freed 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 non-aspirations) 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.

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME CAME—AND WENT

For a while in 1971 deferring college costs looked like an idea whose time had finally come. Yale and 21 other leading educational institutions were discussing the prospects of jointly adopting a modified deferred tuition arrangement (under the aegis of the Ford Foundation) to cover, at least, the most recent tuition increases. Meanwhile, newly elected Ohio Governor John Gilligan was proposing to the legislature that the state adopt deferred tuition as a way of paying for higher education.

Yet somehow deferred tuition failed to catch on. The Ford Foundation pulled out as the funding agent (worried about how it would look if it directly subsidized students at elite universities) and Yale decided to go it alone. Due to their unwillingness to tie up too much capital in what they call their "tuition postponement" plan, Yale limits a student to borrowing only \$1,400 a year (it will rise to \$1,900 with a new tuition increase in the fall). At the end of his senior year a student who has borrowed money under this plan (to a current maximum of about 35 per cent of the cost of his education) can decide whether he wants to treat this as a standard loan or whether he wants to defer repayment. If he chooses to defer repayment, the student is obligated to pay Yale four-tenths of one per cent of his yearly taxable income for each \$1,000 borrowed. This obligation lasts until his "tuition group" (participants in the plan who left college the same year he did) has either repaid its collective loan (which Yale expects to take about 27 years) or until 35 years have elapsed. There is, however, an escape clause for a Yale graduate who finds himself in a high-income bracket and grows weary of tithing a fraction of his income to his alma mater. Anyone can "buy out" of the plan at any

time by paying Yale 150 per cent of the outstanding loan and interest.

The Yale plan is obviously somewhat limited. A \$1,400 deferred loan does not alleviate the serious problem that many middle-income families have in sending their children to high-cost institutions like Yale. The Yale experiment demonstrates the limits of trying to establish an effective and comprehensive deferred tuition program without the financial backing of a government agency. (Yale may modify its plan somewhat this year to enable students to qualify for the interest subsidy in conventional federally supported loan programs.) If Yale, one of the richest schools in the country, can only afford to allow students to defer \$1,400 a year, then it is obvious that this plan is impossible at less affluent institutions without significant government aid.

AS POPULAR AS AN EDESEL

What happened to Gilligan's deferred tuition plan is an illustration of what happens when an innovative idea threatens the educational status quo. College presidents and teachers saw it as endangering their privileged position. Most students and parents denounced it as a way of masking tuition increases. Even labor unions (who theoretically should have seen its potential for relieving the tax burden of the lower middle class) attacked the proposal as antithetical to the liberal tradition of low-cost or free college education. Shortly after the program was sent to the legislature, John Gilligan, a man who understands political realities, threw in the towel. In the ensuing three years, deferred tuition has not been seriously revived in Ohio.

Gilligan shouldn't have been surprised by the ferocity of the opposition to deferred tuition. In 1967, a White House task force. Under the direction of MIT physics professor Jerrold R. Zacharias, proposed establishing a deferred income-contingent loan program in the form of an Educational Opportunity Bank which would allow students to "sell participation shares in their future earnings." The response was immediate. In a joint statement, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of Junior Colleges denounced the proposal and charged that its intent was to let society "abandon responsibility for the higher education of its young people." That was the end of the Zacharias plan.

A new deferred college loan plan was recently offered by James Jung, head of the Wisconsin Higher Education Aids Board. The proposal was in response to "the new 18-year-old age-of-majority which . . . essentially changes the nation's post-secondary education systems from child-oriented systems to adult-oriented systems." Jung argues that this shift may invalidate the use of family income as a gauge in determining eligibility for student aid, since parents are not legally obligated to support adult offspring. If an 18-year-old's own financial resources become the only relevant factor in allocating educational assistance, almost all students, except for those with trust funds, would demonstrate financial "need." Since conventional student loan programs with fixed repayment schedules are a regressive form of taxation for low-income individuals (they must pay back a much higher percentage of their income than the more affluent), the Wisconsin report recommends that the state begin to move toward some form of long-term deferred loan arrangement under which at least the interest rates would be keyed to future earnings. Not surprisingly, Jung described the initial reaction to the plan, which is to be taken up by the Wisconsin legislature next year, as "just disastrous."

State governments are obviously in a much better position than private universities to set up deferred loan programs. Both the

Ohio and Wisconsin plans suggested borrowing from state pension funds until the loan program became self-sustaining. Such a firm financial foundation would enable students to borrow enough to cover most of their college expenses. The Wisconsin report projects an average yearly student loan of more than \$4,000 by 1980. But state deferred loan programs are something like state-wide gasoline rationing—they are no substitute for a national system. With so many students crossing state lines to attend college, it seems a bit impractical to make deferred tuition a state responsibility.

The 1967 White House task force estimated that a National Educational Opportunity Bank could be self-sustaining if students paid one per cent of their income over a 30 year period for every \$3,000 borrowed. The income-contingent pay-back provisions of such a plan could be easily added to the federal income tax forms. Although such a program can—and should—be justified on other grounds, there is no reason to minimize its potential as a limited form of income redistribution by following Yale's model and allowing high-income individuals to "buy out" of the repayment program. These income-contingent loans could also be modified to meet the needs of graduate and professional students.

THE COURAGE TO SAY "NO"

The benefits of such a national loan program are not just financial. Too many 18-year-olds go off to college out of a feeling of social obligation to their parents rather than any real desire to immediately pursue their education. Students like these tend to regard college as a nuisance that must be endured in exchange for continued parental support. Intergenerational tensions are exacerbated when disinterest leads to poor grades and parental laments of "I'm paying \$5,000 a year to send you to that school and you bring home a C—."

Such an expansion of educational loan programs would force students to take responsibility for their own educations. The temptation to ignore classes would be somewhat reduced if students knew that they were wasting their own money rather than that of their parents. This financial obligation might also give many 18-year-olds the courage to say honestly, "I'm not ready for college yet." But these same students would still have the opportunity to attend college at any point later in their lives. (Since the total amount of repayment made by a healthy 20-year-old would be potentially much greater than a 55-year-old's, equity would require some adjustment in the formula to take age into consideration.)

Like the voucher system, deferred college costs might introduce some element of competition into the educational system. Colleges and universities are almost as free from the rigors of the marketplace as public elementary and secondary schools. As long as financial considerations continue to play a major role in dictating college choice, many public institutions (and private schools that can still afford to make beguiling scholarship offers) do not have to worry about attracting students. Their moderate cost and the inability of many students to afford to go elsewhere provide an almost captive enrollment. Institutional torpor is often the result of the easy existence that comes from the assurance of full classrooms and continued public subsidy.

If such a plan were adopted, a student who is willing to make the necessary long-term financial commitment should be able to afford any school to which he has been admitted. Public institutions that have taken their enrollment for granted would suddenly have to work to attract qualified students. Such competition might actually produce some of that educational diversity that has always been alleged to be one of the strengths of American higher education.

EDUCATIONAL BARGAIN-HUNTING

Competition may also work to prevent a too-rapid escalation of educational costs. When the government began picking up the tab for programs like Medicare and Medicaid, health costs soared because of a phenomenon known as "third-partying"—once doctors knew that individuals would no longer be absorbing the costs, many abandoned their scruples about padding the bill. A significant increase in traditional government aid to higher education would merely stimulate college administrators to inflate their costs, since they know they would be repaid from the federal or state treasury. On the other hand, a national system of income-contingent deferred loans would force colleges to compete for students and thus keep expenses down. Since the percentage of annual income to be repaid would depend on the size of the educational loan, borrowers would continue to be extremely cost-conscious. Students might be able to afford expensive private institutions like Harvard, but the onus would be on the school to prove that it is worth the additional money. Deferred loans will not remove price competition from higher education. Rather, they will enable students to consider all price levels in a quest for the best educational value.

Since the ill-fated Zacharias proposal, there has been no income-contingent deferred loan proposal considered by Congress, nor analyzed by the federal bureaucracy. This may be less of an indictment of the merits of the idea than an illustration of the political power of educational traditionalism. Although the Carnegie Commission has officially dubbed this era "The New Depression in Higher Education," academic bureaucrats are reluctant to tamper with traditional patterns of funding higher education. Government education officials and influential legislators remain wedded to the liberal tradition of low-tuition higher education—conveniently ignoring that this means that the poor and the lower middle-class are left with a large portion of the tab. Many students regard parental subsidy as a God-given right and are not enthusiastic about a system that makes them responsible for their own education. Only parents with college-age children—far from an unimportant electoral bloc—have the potential to fully appreciate the benefits of a national system of deferred college costs. So, when it is time to write your daughter a check for another semester at Bryn Mawr, just remember, it doesn't have to be this way.

ABORTION

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my colleague, Mr. FROELICH, and 12 new cosponsors reintroduced House Resolution 585 to create a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court's decision on abortion.

I am a cosponsor of that resolution and strongly urge the House Rules Committee to take note of the bipartisan support this resolution has received.

I recently wrote to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and

to the distinguished ranking minority member urging them to take action in committee on this resolution.

The text of the letters, both of which are similar, is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1974.

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

The purpose of my letter is to urge prompt Rules Committee consideration of H. Res. 585 and identical resolutions, creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion.

There are at least 65 separate bills pending in the House of Representatives dealing with the "pro life" issue. Most of these bills are languishing in the House Judiciary Committee and it appears that there is little likelihood they will receive attention this Congress.

I firmly believe that each issue pending before this Congress deserves a fair and open hearing, including the scrutiny that can only be achieved through the Committee process.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. REGULA,
Member of Congress.

SENATOR MCGOVERN SPEAKS IN
NEW YORK

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN came to speak before a group at New York University. He talked about the same issues that he raised in the campaign, the same issues that confront us today. He talked about the defense boondoggle, the dirty tricks, the nature of the Presidency. He spoke in a way that we can all understand and he spoke with conviction.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a news report of that speech from the April 4 edition of the Village Voice:

[From the Village Voice, Apr. 4, 1974]

GEORGE MCGOVERN, SURVIVOR
(By Marlene Nadle)

The audience waiting for Senator George McGovern was pacified with the only movie NYU had in the house, "Dr. Strangelove." Many Washington shuttles later McGovern arrived. "I understand you've been watching 'Dr. Strangelove,'" he said, glancing regretfully at the disappearing screen. "During the entire '72 campaign I tried to get Richard Nixon to debate me. Tonight is the closest I've come."

The evening would in fact be a debate with the Strangelove mentality that created Nixon's \$99 billion defense budget, but first McGovern detoured into the bizarre post-electoral world.

His touch was light, as if he, like Kubrick, had learned that the comic spirit was the best defense against life's madness. Mockingly he summed up the events of the 16 months since the election, jabbing at the irony of the President most publicly committed to law and order running an administration riddled with 28 convictions and in-

dictments. Circling closer, he tossed out Nixon's quote, "We will get to the bottom of Watergate," and cut it with the fact that the President fired the prosecutor who got to the top.

"In this astonishing period," he continued, "we have seen Operation Candor, an announcement that the President would tell the truth for a period of time. After 30 days the experiment was over. Then there was the judicial order for Nixon to produce the tapes and instead he produced a secretary capable of the most remarkable acrobatic feats in Washington. Then there was General Haig explaining away the erasures by saying there were sinister forces at work, and I certainly didn't argue with that. Now we have Nixon pledged to cooperate with the judiciary committee and he is carrying his cooperation so far he wants to select the evidence for them."

McGovern was relaxed and radiant behind the podium. Suntanned, sure, so unlike Eugene McCarthy whose hands shook almost spastically during a speech after the '68 debacle. McGovern left no doubt that he was one of the survivors.

Concluding his history strongly, he said "We have arrived at the point where we may need a new President to save the Presidency." He did not want resignation. His call for impeachment was clear and correct, without hints. It was only later, standing with friends on the windy sidewalk, that he predicted Nixon would be impeached.

"And convicted?" someone asked as he slid into his car. "I hope so," he exhaled quietly, his smile edging between principle and malice.

If there was some ill will tucked away in the prairie preacher, who could blame him? Certainly not anyone in the audience who heard him describe the mysterious phone call from someone claiming to be his campaign manager to AFL-CIO president George Meany ordering him to get himself to New York fast because McGovern was waiting to see him. This particular bit of insanity out of the dirty tricks department was repeated often enough to irritate Meany's gigantic ego and seed much of the antipathy that may have cost McGovern the labor vote.

McGovern's glance back to the campaign was only brief. Most of his time was spent dealing with reforms needed for the present. "It looks as if," he continued wryly, "besides needing a new President and a new Congress we could use a new citizenry. According to a recent poll, only 27 per cent of the people believe in the President, only 21 per cent believe in Congress, but 51 per cent believe in flying saucers."

From flying saucers it was only a short trip back to "Strangelove." The line between the movie and reality has grown thinner in the years that have seen its main character, General Ripper, step off the screen, change his name to General Lavelle, and on his own initiative, start bombing North Vietnam and Cambodia.

At the point just before McGovern walked into the auditorium Dr. Strangelove was orgasming over the possibilities of the doomsday machine and working himself towards a frenzy of joy over all the fear it would cause the enemy. McGovern simply continued Strangelove's speech as a satire of Nixon and the General's arguments for more and more overkill and more and more toys for their arsenal.

"I remember," he said, getting to particulars, "when the Generals were touting the B-70 to Congress, claiming they had to have it for safety's sake because it could fly over 70,000 feet. It was only after it was built at a cost of \$2 billion that some low level technician pointed out that the Rus-

sian missiles flew higher than 70,000 feet. Now anybody who wants to can see the B-70 in the Wright Patterson Museum in Ohio.

"Then there were other little trinkets the military convinced Congress to buy, like The Goat. It was an army vehicle that was supposed to cost \$5 million and float, but cost \$15 million and sank."

In attacking the inefficiency and greed that bloated this year's defense budget to a record \$99 billion, McGovern, and the film both seemed to be proving it was not the weapon's ability to function, but its mere possession, and the sense of power it gave, that was nine-tenths of the pleasure for the Strangeloves.

In urging the people in the audience and Congress to confront a military budget that is inconsistent with a foreign policy pledged to withdrawal from Vietnam, detente, and strategic arms limitation, McGovern was daring them to enter the twilight zone—the technological reality, or more precisely unreality, in which arms planning goes forward. It is the "could do, would do," world of war games, of theoretical encounters and symbolic clashes, or bargaining chip investments and early leadtime hedges against some remote future prospect that is no less hideous for being improbable. It is a world where it is easy to get carried away with the need for offensive weapons as they do in the '75 budget or to urge an all-out attack as they do, in the film. For Strangelove's cloistered world makes winning all that matters and leads both to war and Watergate.

In trying to bring a little light to the twilight zone, to make people realize we were just wasting money on a useless doomsday machine, McGovern pulled out quotes from those few in the defense establishment who were able to maintain some sense of proportion. He used McNamara's statement that 400 deliverable warheads were all he could use as a deterrent force, and added the fact that we were now building 10,000. He used Paul Warnke's remark that in the '74 budget, \$14 billion could have safely been cut, and reminded the audience that instead, \$19 billion was added. He even went back to Eisenhower for his central theme, quoting in his soft, nasal, twangy voice the former President's speech which begins, "Every gun made, every warship launched, is a theft from those who hunger," and ends, as in Strangelove's technological Wonderland, with "humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

As he pleaded for a change of priorities, his earnestness became more evident. If wiser and wittier, it was the same essential McGovern plodding on with the same message as unflinchingly now as he was when he stood at three per cent in the polls and nobody listened. The circle seeming to have come round again, for unlike the days of Time covers there was no major press in the audience, only the faithful who were addicted to hearing McGovern speak.

And yet, even the faithful seemed wiser, more aware of the fact that they had invented McGovern to fill their need for a radical candidate then as he filled their need for hope now. "He may have disappointed us," they would say sadly, "but he is all we have against Nixon. He is all we have."

If there was an element of the fantastic on their part, it was a time trip. For a few seconds in the opening applause it was June of '72 and he was about to capture the nomination and go on to win the election. It was like re-living a love affair—the sweetness more intensive, the limitations sharpened by perspective, the pain of being so close again to

the person who might have made your world beautiful, the knowledge that despite all the faults there was something extraordinary in him, in the pure doggedness with which he keeps fighting for the issues that are his, and not pinned to him like someone else's pro-pot or abortion button.

For the audience watching him out of its lost innocence, the question period was a time of testing—of him, of its own mood of despair. "Doesn't it make you feel cynical," one young man said, asking for confirmation, but silently begging for denial, "when you see the Democrats in Congress putting up so little resistance to the defense budget?"

"It's as frustrating as the long effort to end the war," he answered with some of the weariness showing, "but eventually we'll do it. So far we have about 42 votes to limit the military. About the same as we had for the Hatfield-McGovern, or, as we like to say in South Dakota, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to withdraw the troops from Vietnam." He kept urging them to keep the pressure up and saying eventually Congress would come around.

Yet hearing was not believing, and later, on the sidewalk, someone would ask incredulously, "How can you stay an optimist in Strangelove's America?"

"Oh, I can manage until about this time of night," he answered laconically, "then I get up in the morning and start all over." After a pause in which he took a quick dive into memory, he added, "You know I come from a state where every day is a struggle to just stay alive. So you have to keep going."

Maybe it's that prairie grit that keeps him fighting the position General Lavelle took in real life and General Ripper took on the screen. "War is too important to be left to the politicians," he said. "They do not have the time or the capacity for strategic thinking."

Maybe it is that South Dakota strength that makes him, despite his personal misfortune, keep pushing his 56-page alternative military budget, keep refusing to buy the technological snowjob, keep refusing to fall in line with presidents and congressmen willing to approve anything the military dreams up while starving the human agenda.

Or maybe he, like so many in the audience, is haunted by the scene in "Strangelove" in which the wonder weapons go out of control, the scene where the General, explaining in technocratese why the bombers cannot be recalled, keeps sputtering defensively, "You remember, gentlemen, it was all in Plan R. You approved it, gentlemen. You approved it."

MARYLAND'S FIRST DISTRICT VOTERS POLL RESULTS

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent almost 500,000 Marylanders in a district that stretches from the suburbs of Baltimore on the north, around the Chesapeake Bay including all of the Eastern Shore, as well as the three southern Maryland counties south of Washington, D.C.

In response to a poll sent to my constituents in February and March, I re-

ceived a very gratifying 12-percent return with some rather revealing results. I would like to share these with my colleagues. At this point I insert a summary of the poll:

MARYLAND FIRST DISTRICT POLL SHOWS MAJORITY AGAINST PRESIDENTIAL RESIGNATION, IMPEACHMENT, REPRESENTATIVE BAUMAN REVEALS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A districtwide poll conducted in Maryland's First Congressional District by Rep. Robert E. Bauman (R-Md.) during February and March shows that by a comfortable majority, residents oppose President Nixon's impeachment or resignation. More than half, however, said that they do not approve of the way he is doing his job.

Congressman Bauman said that he mailed out 96,252 polls and had received 12,135 returns by the end of March. The response rate of over 12% was considered very good, he said.

When asked whether the President should be removed from office by impeachment and conviction, 28% said yes, 60% said no, and 10% were undecided. Similarly, when asked whether Mr. Nixon should resign, 30% said yes, 61% said no, and 8% were undecided.

Nevertheless, First District residents were not particularly pleased with the President's performance in office. When asked whether they approved of the way he has done his job, only 36% said yes, and 51% answered no.

By a heavy majority, the First District citizens said they would favor oil exploration off the Delmarva Coast if adequate safeguards against spills were required by law. Exploration was favored by 79% of those responding, and only 14% were opposed.

Another heavy majority of district residents oppose a federal guaranteed annual income. Only 11% favored such a program, while 79% were opposed. Respondents also opposed public campaign financing, with only 26% expressing support, and 63% saying they were against public financing of political campaigns.

A majority, 68%, said that the federal government should not become involved in land use planning, a policy favored by only 16% of First District citizens. The biggest majority, 82%, said that they have less confidence in government officials now than they had in the past, and only 8% said they had greater confidence today than before.

By a narrower margin (37% in favor, 44% opposed) respondents opposed a tax-financed program of national health insurance for all citizens. And they divided evenly (41%-41%) on a question asking whether they believed there really is an energy crisis.

On other subjects, First District citizens believe there will be an economic recession this year, that environmental laws should be eased temporarily to help cope with energy shortages, that Congress has been too preoccupied with Watergate, and would favor rationing of gasoline if fuel shortages become severe.

The poll also asked that respondents rank several major issues in order of their importance to them. Inflation/high prices was ranked number one, corruption in government was second, the energy crisis third, and high taxes fourth.

Rep. Bauman expressed his thanks to the thousands of citizens who took the trouble to reply, and added that he is grateful for the assistance provided by a number of high school classes which helped tabulate the poll responses.

DISTRICT-WIDE POLL RESULTS, 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MARYLAND, REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT E. BAUMAN

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you believe that there really is an energy crisis today?	41	41	16
If fuel shortages do become severe, would you favor a federally imposed system of gasoline rationing?	57	32	9
Do you think that environmental laws (such as auto emission controls) should be eased temporarily as 1 means of solving the energy problem?	64	27	8
Would you favor oil exploration in the Atlantic Ocean off the Delmarva coast if adequate safeguards against spills are imposed by law?	79	14	6
Based on all you have heard so far, do you think that President Nixon should be removed from office by impeachment and conviction?	28	60	10
Do you think the President should resign from office?	30	61	8
Do you approve of the way the President has done his job?	36	51	11
Do you now have greater confidence in government officials than you had in the past?	8	82	8
Do you think that tax dollars should be used by the Government to finance the campaigns of candidates for public office?	26	63	9
Do you think that Congress has been too preoccupied with the "Watergate Affair?"	65	29	4
Do you favor a Federal law to guarantee a minimum annual income for everyone at the taxpayer's expense?	11	79	8
Do you favor a tax-financed program of national health insurance for everyone?	37	44	18
Do you believe the Federal Government should become actively involved in land use planning and control in Maryland and other States?	16	68	14
Do you think there will be an economic recession in 1974?	49	24	25

Note: Percentages may add up to slightly less than 100 percent, because not all respondents answered every question.

EDWARD J. COTTER, JR., HONORED

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Cotter, Jr., of Derby, Conn., a constituent of mine and a valued friend, has recently been singled out by his fellow citizens of the five-town Lower Naugatuck Valley area for one of the most prestigious awards granted in our area.

In recognition of his many years of selfless service to his fellow man, Ed has been presented with the annual Charles H. Flynn Memorial Award for Humanitarian Service, given each year by the Valley United Way for service to the people of Ansonia, Derby, Seymour, Shelton, and Oxford, Conn. It is hard to conceive of a more deserving recipient.

Ed Cotter is chief photographer and Derby reporter for the Ansonia Sentinel, the area's daily newspaper, and has been a familiar figure throughout the valley for years. Other members of the Cotter family have also contributed to making the name an honored one in the community.

But in the words of Simeon Isaacson while presenting the award for the Valley United Way:

Ed's reputation through the five towns has always been based primarily on his unstinting service to others.

He also accurately described Ed as:

One of the most formidable candidates ever presented for the honor.

Born November 11, 1920, Ed Cotter is the son of retired motor vehicle inspector Edward J. Cotter, Sr., of Derby and the late Mrs. Cotter.

An employee of the Ansonia Evening Sentinel since 1939, he served in the U.S. Navy during World War II from 1942 to 1946.

Cotter has been a volunteer fireman in Derby since 1939 and chief of the department from 1946 to 1954. He is a founder of the Storm Engine Ambulance Corps, the first of the Valley's volunteer ambulance units since 1948. He has served as co-chairman in charge of operations and was recently honored by the Storms for not having missed a night assignment in 25 years.

He served as Civil Defense director in Derby from 1956 to 1960.

An organizer and past president of the Valley Fire Chief's Emergency Plan and

an organizer and past chairman of the Valley Civil Defense, he was also one of the organizers of the Valley Fire Chief's Training School and its coordinator since it opened 10 years ago.

Cotter was a member of the committee that set up and secured funds for the New Haven Fire Chiefs Emergency Plan radio system that covers towns in the New Haven County.

He has represented New Haven County on the Governor's Advisory Committee on fire fighting problems during the Korean War; has served as an instructor for the Connecticut State Fire College for the past 27 years, and been disaster chairman for the Valley Chapter, American Red Cross for four years.

During the floods of 1955, he served as a volunteer fire coordinator for Derby. During that period he was responsible for securing federal funds.

An organizer and former president of the Valley Fire Chief's Emergency Plan, he also organized and was chairman of the Valley Civil Defense Council.

Before the service was taken over by the American Red Cross, he served as chairman of the Valley Fireman's Blood Bank.

He is now chairman of the Board of Directors of the Veterans Memorial Center in Derby; member of the Board of Directors of the Valley Health Department representing Derby, and had served as a volunteer umpire in the Derby Little League for 12 years.

For 25 years he has served as an unpaid Derby police photographer.

Married to the former Eleanor Wilhelm of Ansonia, they have two children, a daughter, Ellen Jane and a son, James Edward.

This is truly an exemplary record by an outstanding citizen and I want to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues and to add my personal congratulations and best wishes to Ed on the occasion of this richly deserved award.

SALUTE TO THE CHAMP—HANK AARON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, on last Monday outfielder Henry "Hank" Aaron of baseball's Atlanta Braves hit

his 715 career homerun—eclipsing the homerun record of the illustrious Babe Ruth.

Henry Aaron is a great baseball player. His batting swing is among the smoothest in baseball, a beautiful rhythm to watch as he glides his bat almost effortlessly into the ball, which then explodes into orbit.

However, he is a modest man whose primary reaction to all the fanfare and acclaim was, "I'm glad it's over."

We salute Hank Aaron—and the new American hero. Congratulations to the new champ.

WASTED TAX DOLLARS

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are crying out for the reform of our tax codes. Loopholes such as the oil depletion allowance permit multimillion-dollar corporations to pay significantly less taxes proportionately than the average workingman. The problem is clear—our tax laws are full of loopholes for the benefit of the rich and the corporate giants. Yet the people who need tax reform find nothing.

Single people are discriminated against by the tax laws. Senior citizens need legislation providing a basic \$5,000 tax exemption for retirement income. The tax treatment accorded persons who rent their principal residence should be equal to the treatment given people who own their homes. The tax system should be simplified for America's small businessmen.

And when we consider how the taxpayers' dollars are spent, the need for tax reform coupled with an effective budget control procedure is clear. It is a small wonder that taxes for the average workingman are so high when one considers what these taxes are being spent on and when one considers that the Nation's tax burden is not being shared equally. To illustrate my point about the wastage of tax dollars, I would like to call the attention of the House to an article written by Mr. James Davidson, executive director of the National Taxpayers Union, that was printed

in a recent edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The article follows:

WHERE DO TAXES GO? WELL, \$117,250
FOR TEA TASTERS . . .

(By James Dale Davidson)

WASHINGTON.—Sitting down with their scratch pads at tax time, people comfort themselves with the notion their money is going to pay for activities which are at least hypothetically good: purchasing weapons to fend off the heathen, helping to clean the slums, curing cancer, "establishing a lasting structure of peace" and so on.

The more cynical among us may have more gruesome theories, but our doubts are seldom equal to what really goes on.

Some examples of Government spending are so implausible that they make the Congressional Record second only to National Lampoon as a source of comic material. One man in Texas who spent several years gleaming fiscal funnies from the Record thought the material was so hilarious he was demanding \$25,000 from a book publisher for his findings.

Chances are that he'll never get the money, not because his examples aren't good reading, but because they are so easily duplicated. They're like mosquitoes in a swamp. Anyone who cares to wade in can come away with as many specimens as he can stand.

For instance, how many of your typical taxpaying shoppers who complain about the cost of bacon know they are footing a \$35,000 bill for one year of chasing wild boars in Pakistan?

Just as ridiculous is the \$70,000 which went to study the smell of perspiration given off by the Australian aborigines.

No doubt some money could have been saved on the aborigine project if only the State Department had prevailed upon Turkey to lend the Australians the odor measuring machine we purchased for the Turks for \$28,361.

But we haven't stinted our benevolence toward some of the world's other peoples. Studying the life-views of the Guajiro Indians in Colombia cost us \$50,000.

The Bedouins got \$17,000 for a dry cleaning plant to spruce up their djellabas (garments).

Morocco's economy got an unexpected boost from U.S. taxpayers in the form of a \$37,314 potato chip machine. All that left the Moroccans in need of was potatoes.

Here at home, Richard Nixon gave the public a graphic account of the idiocy of expending funds to support the Federal Government's Board of Tea Tasters. Mr. Nixon said: "At one time in the dim past, there may have been a good reason for such special taste tests, but that reason no longer exists. Nevertheless, a separate tea tasting board has gone right along, at taxpayer's expense, because nobody up to now took the trouble to take a hard look at why it was in existence."

Having taken that hard look soon after beginning his first term, Mr. Nixon has since looked in the other direction while the Board of Tea Tasters sipped away \$117,250 a year. This doesn't count the extra sipping done by the Board of Tea Appeals.

Another interesting and little known domestic program is the so-called "Condom Stamp Program," which achieved the distinction of distributing the world's first and only \$23 rubbers.

As part of this same space-age effect to control social disease, HEW asked the Office of Management and Budget for fiscal year 1974 funds to launch an anti-V.D. satellite.

Closer to earth, the Queen of England received \$68,000 for not planting cotton on her plantation in Mississippi. This put her far beyond the Ford Motor Co., which got only \$14,000 for not planting wheat, and Libby McNeil, which garnered \$19,000 for growing no cotton.

But Queen Elizabeth came off like a proletarian compared to Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who received \$2 million to purchase a luxury yacht.

Tito travels in even better style than Mr. Nixon's drinking buddy Leonid Brezhnev, whose stake in solving the oil crisis was increased when American taxpayers picked up the tab on his 12th limousine.

Not all of our largess was lavished on royalty and foreign potentates: \$31,650 went for the new carpet of House Speaker Carl Albert's office, \$21,000 for draperies and \$44,000 for chandeliers. Another \$65,000 went to finish the furnishings.

Another piece of furniture, not in Albert's office, also claimed a lot of tax money. The zero gravity toilet—developed by the space program to function under such conditions—cost \$80,000. But that was nothing compared to the tab for "environmental testing" of the same toilet, which came to \$230,000.

The interdepartmental screw thread committee, established as a temporary agency to speed the end of World War I, is still laboring to make nuts and bolts fit together. The cost: \$250,000 a year.

Meanwhile, the bureaucrats who devise all these important projects need a break once in a while. The Alaskan Chateau in Anchorage is maintained for their exclusive use (providing they make \$22,000 or more, or they're members of the military above the rank of major).

For a tab of \$3 a day, these "public servants" can unwind in steam rooms, sauna, sunrooms, massage rooms, a gym and cocktail lounge. The bill for salaries alone of the government employees who act as servants at Alaskan Chateau totals more than \$100,000 a year.

The cause of higher learning has been bolstered in ways that would have dazzled Gulliver more than his visit to the Grand Academy of Lagado. For reasons unknown, governmental research has located the frontiers of man's knowledge in three remote countries: Poland, Burma and Yugoslavia.

Six thousand dollars went to study Polish bisexual frogs, \$85,000 was consumed learning about the "cultural, economic and social impact of rural road construction in Poland" and \$20,000 was devoted to study the blood groups of Polish zlotniks pigs.

In Burma \$5,000 went to collect a rare moss, and another \$8,000 went to track down specimens of a certain Burmese ant.

The Yugoslavians were good for another study of "cultural, economic, and social impact of rural road construction." Five thousand dollars went to learn about Yugoslavian intertidal hermit crabs. The bounty for finding Yugoslavian lizards was \$15,000.

But geography is no barrier to the search for knowledge. We spent money like mad in other areas too: \$5,000 went to tabulate the differences between native American and Indian whistling ducks, and \$20,000 was the cost for investigating the German cockroach.

A history of comic books cost \$71,000, making it far more costly than the Dictionary of Witchcraft which was compiled for a measly few grand.

Five thousand dollars went for an analysis for violin varnish, while 10 times that amount went for analysis of the fur trade between the U.S. and Canada between 1770 and 1820.

In another area of great concern to average taxpayers, \$20,324 was expended to learn all there is to know about the mating calls of Central American toads.

The toads' problems were only one-tenth as pressing as those of the City of Los Angeles, which received \$203,979 to extend travelers' aid to migrants lost on the freeway.

Culture also benefited from an infusion of government funds. Five thousand dollars was paid to some genius who thought to

write the poem "light." That's not the title by the way, that's the poem. The whole thing comes to seven letters worth \$714.28 each.

HEW spent \$19,300 to find out why children fall off tricycles. The answer: "Unstable performance, particularly rollover while turning."

Not to be outdone, the Pentagon spent \$375,000 to study the Frisbee. This, of course, is less discouraging than having them spend \$375,000 to buy a Frisbee.

That could have happened if Frisbees were large enough to be pitched as tents. When Air Force engineers decided to "invent" a device to cover the lips of missile silos, they spent \$1 million to come up with a prototype which looked for all the world like a tent. Within hours after the newly invented tent had been fastened down, it disappeared. Later, investigators found it blowing head-over-heels across the prairie.

Experts investigating the construction of the C-5A cargo plane found proof of the Defense Department paying \$111 for a pin. Over-all construction was so inefficient that if your family car were built on the same methods with similarly inflated labor cost, it would have to be priced at \$100,000.

Congressional spending watchdog Sen. William Proxmire heard testimony about another bit of fiscal mischief with true human interest. I am not referring to Proxmire's discovery that Pentagon bigwigs routinely spend \$600,000 outfitting executive jets for themselves, but to the testimony of Herbert J. Frank, president of Aeronic Corp.

Frank told the Joint Economic committee that the government once canceled one of his contracts because he was one day late in delivery. The Pentagon then let a new contract for the same items to a giant aerospace contractor who failed to deliver for more than a full year.

When McDonnell-Douglas made square holes in an airplane instrument panel designed to house one of Frank's round altimeters, he saw a chance for revenge. "We figured we were really going to take the government this time," he testified.

"They needed the plates (to cover the square opening and leave a hole the shape of the instrument) desperately. So we came up with a price of \$15 for each plate. We were actually ashamed to ask so much, for it was a little \$3 stamping plate, but we figured we were really going to take them."

Frank and his small company were disappointed in their effort to rip off your tax money. The Pentagon turned down his bid of \$15 a piece. The accepted bid, from McDonnell-Douglas was \$230 per plate.

Other highlights of tax spending: \$121,000 to find out why people say "ain't." \$33,101 to the Israel Institute of Applied Science to conduct "a test of the husband-wife relationship."

The Department of Transportation gave extensive and expensive psychological tests to Polish truck drivers, which seems a bit more useful than the metric and morphological study, paid for by Uncle Sam, of the evolution of the chin of Polish skeletal populations between 2000 B.C. and the year 1800.

\$15,000 to find out how fishing boat crewmen cause conflicts in Yugoslavian peasant towns.

\$3,000 to search for Indian lizards.
\$25,000 to study biological rhythms of the catfish in India.

\$8,500 to study Medieval Spanish satire and invective.

\$14,000 to learn about cave beetles.
\$2,458 to train 18 Good Humor peddlers.
\$70,000 to classify and determine the population biology of Indo-Australian ants.

\$12,000 to study the chromosomes of chipmunks.

\$159,000 to teach mothers how to play with their babies.

CHANGING CONGRESS: THE
COMMITTEE SYSTEM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in its January 1974 issue, entitled "Changing Congress: The Committee System," the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* has taken a comprehensive look at our current organizational arrangements in Congress.

Two of our colleagues, RICHARD BOLLING and BILL BROCK, have contributed insightful articles, along with a group of scholarly and journalistic observers.

The January issue of the *Annals* is edited by Norman Ornstein, an assistant professor of political science at Catholic University and a former congressional fellow on my staff. In an article of his own, Ornstein outlines some structural reforms he feels are needed to make Congress function more adequately as a policymaking body.

Particularly now, as we are about to consider the Committee Reform Amendments developed by the Select Committee on Committees, I know that House Members will find "Changing Congress: The Committee System" useful and informative reading.

I am inserting excerpts from the Ornstein article at this point in the RECORD:

RESTRUCTURING THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

(By Norman J. Ornstein)

PAST REFORMS

Any examination of committee structures must first be put into the context of the origin and the enactment of past reform proposals. Most recent efforts at internal reforms have focused on aspects of committee operations. The seniority system arose from the 1910 revolt in the House. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act's most sweeping provision greatly reduced the number of standing committees in both House and Senate. In the Senate the most significant change of the 1950s was the Johnson rule, which guaranteed each Democrat a major committee assignment. In the House the Rules Committee was the major focal point of the late 1950s and early '60s, with reformers attempting both to enlarge it and to bypass it—via the twenty-one day rule. Recent reforms in the House in 1971 and 1973 have significantly altered the subcommittee system, the selection of committee and subcommittee chairmen and the conduct of committee meetings.

What have these reforms tried to accomplish? By examining some of them more closely one may be able to better understand how future structural changes might affect congressional behavior and legislative outputs.

POWER AND COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN IN THE
HOUSE

The seniority system arose as a way of shifting power from an omnipotent Speaker of the House, whose greatest formal weapon had been his ability to appoint committee members and chairmen. The seniority custom was devised as an automatic, nonpolitical method for selecting committee chairmen and preventing a subgroup of legislative actors—in this case, a subgroup of one—from using accumulated power to dictate outcomes to the larger body membership.

The enlarging role of the federal government in American society and, to a lesser extent,

the 1946 reduction in the number of committees greatly increased the importance and power of the standing committees. Much of this power went to the handful of committee chairmen. Chairmen had formal powers—control over hiring and firing of committee staff, control over formation and jurisdiction of subcommittees and appointment of subcommittee chairmen—as well as the informal influence of prestige and expertise. Most importantly, the technical operation of the seniority system in the House meant that chairmen achieved their positions automatically and retained them without being directly responsible to any larger authority. The important step, ratification of the appointment by the majority party caucus, was done by a single vote for all committee assignments and chairmanships, making it virtually impossible to challenge any particular chairman.

Working mainly through the House Democratic Caucus, contemporary reformers in 1971 and 1973 moved, through a series of changes, to rectify this latter day power imbalance in which smaller concentrations of power, rather than being eliminated, were centered in the hands of committee chairmen. First, the Democrats attempted to get automatic voting by the party caucus on each individual chairmanship. They partially succeeded in 1971 at the start of the 92nd Congress; a vote was permitted on a chairman if ten members demanded it. At the beginning of the 93rd Congress in January of 1973 an automatic vote procedure was implemented. No chairman lost his position in either of these years, but, as Peabody has noted: "all were put on notice that their conduct would be subject to bi-annual examination with the threat of caucus removal at least a possibility."

At the same time vast changes have been implemented in the structure of the subcommittee system, also accomplished largely via the Democratic Caucus. Subcommittee chairmanships were limited to one per member in 1971, thereby spreading out these positions to younger members. In 1973 a Subcommittee Bill of Rights was implemented by the Caucus: it enlarged and specified the powers of subcommittee chairmen, enabling them to hire their own professional staffs and to handle legislation on the floor. The selection of subcommittee chairmen was formalized, as well. All of these reforms strengthened subcommittees and subcommittee chairmen at the expense of committee chairmen. Importantly, these changes were made subject to ratification by the individual committee caucus of the majority party.

There is little question that, although the specific recommendations came from an ideologically and regionally balanced Democratic committee on reform headed by Representative Julia Butler Hansen of Washington, these changes were instigated by liberals who felt the committee system of the 1960s—especially through seniority—favored Southern conservatives. Nevertheless, an examination of them, on paper at least, shows that these 1971 and 1973 changes were sensitive to the unrestricted accumulation of power brought about through the 1910 reforms. Some power was taken from committee chairmen and spread out to subcommittee chairmen, which meant a broader distribution of power in terms of region, ideology and seniority. However, unlike the previous reforms, checks were put on committee chairmen, via the party caucus, and on subcommittee chairmen, via committee caucuses. In theory, at least, one of the major problems of the committee system in the past was ameliorated, although it will take several years before the real impact of these reforms can be assessed. Nevertheless, as nearly as can be determined and as far as structural reforms can go, the House Democrats have arranged safeguards against the possibility

of a substitution of one hundred fifty fiefdoms for twenty.

These safeguards can break down, especially through individual committees and their majority party caucuses. While committee chairmen have had their formal powers curbed, they and their subcommittee counterparts are now responsible to the full committee membership, especially the majority party caucus. Should a committee decide to defy the full party membership there are few direct remedies. One cannot easily restructure an entire committee; thus, a problem which remains is ensuring that an individual committee does not become biased in some fashion relative to the full body membership—the representativeness problem again.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

How, then, can committees reflect the makeup of the entire body as a microcosm of the nation without drastically affecting their capacity for knowledgeable formulation and oversight of public policy? A series of structural modifications might be able to achieve this goal, while at the same time building in an increased flexibility for future change; possible reforms are discussed below. It should again be emphasized that such changes are not likely to be implemented soon, if ever. For one thing, their inception would involve success in several separate forums. Committee assignments are handled by individual party caucuses; proposals to implement uniform criteria, such as a limitation on continuous service on a committee, would have to be accepted by each of the parties, or would not work. Other proposals, such as a reduction in the number of standing committees, could be implemented through the House as a whole, but would involve large scale changes which would encounter opposition from many sources—not the least being many of the current committee chairmen and other high ranking members.

Finally, these changes operate under the assumption that the House is attempting, first and foremost, to pass and oversee good national governmental policy. Congressmen, however, have other goals as well—some personal, such as getting reelected or having personal influence within the House, and some constituency-related, such as seeing that particular interests of one's own district are well represented. To the extent that these goals predominate, major changes which might conflict with them will have little chance of success. Nevertheless, discussing significant structural reforms is a useful method of understanding how Congress, through its committees, operates.

Consolidation of committees

The first, and greatest, step in making committees representative would be to consolidate committees in the House; the final total should be perhaps seven or eight standing committees, each with approximately fifty-five members and with each representative having one assignment. Our concern here is less with the specifics or rejurisdiction or with the problems of appropriation, taxation and authorization—questions which have been discussed in detail by others—than with the broader implications of this type of innovation. Elsewhere in this volume Robert L. Peabody outlines one system, which we will utilize for analytic purposes. In a modification of this type one could consolidate committees with very different incentives and, thus, broaden the natural base of each new committee. For example, a Committee on Natural Resources could include interior, public works, environmental and agricultural jurisdictions, appealing to both urban congressmen concerned about pollution and rural congressmen concerned about farm problems. A Committee on Human Resources could include the areas of education, health,

welfare and labor. A Committee on Defense and Foreign Policy could encompass armed economic concerns. The other committees suggested by Peabody are Government Operations, Technology and Sciences, Ways and Means, Appropriations and Judiciary and Constitutional Rights.

House committees now range in size from nine to fifty-five; with this reform all committees would be composed of about fifty-five members. Thus, to some extent, the diffusion of workload which a committee system makes possible would be countered—it is extraordinarily difficult for fifty-five people to work as a unit, and the tendency would be strong for a greater division of labor. As was the case following the 1948 consolidation of committees down to nineteen, subcommittees would continue to proliferate. The recent House Democratic reforms which increased subcommittee chairmanships suggest that this proliferation would not necessarily be bad. Giving out more subcommittee chairs can encourage congressmen to do their legislative work; furthermore, by giving each member a piece of the action, legislative activity and oversight can be enhanced. Once one reaches the point of overlap at which members must chair several different units, the effects of subcommittee proliferation become negative. Until that point is reached, more subcommittees may be beneficial. With fifty-five-member committees, the major work would be done at the subcommittee level; therefore, great care would be required to make subcommittees both representative and responsive. The problem of creating one hundred fifty autonomous and autocratic subcommittee chairmen is a real one which is reduced, but not eliminated, by the principle of committee caucus review.

Limitation of chairmanship tenure

Secondly, the problem of the chairman's power must be considered—both for committees and, as indicated above, subcommittees. Committee chairmen retain considerable influence within their bailiwicks; a reduction in committees would enhance the influence of the smaller number of new chairmen, in spite of the steps which have been taken to curb the powers of chairmen. An essential corollary of committee consolidation would be limitation of the tenure of committee chairmen, for example, to six years in their House careers. Such a step would decrease the influence of chairmen and would discourage any long term individual accumulation of power. Exceptional individuals could still make significant contributions through subcommittee chairmanships and other legislative activities. Chairmanship of any single subcommittee would have to be limited in the same fashion, for the same reasons; yet, to give continuing incentives to members for legislative work, the future opportunity to chair other subcommittees should exist.

In a practical sense, this proposal—or some variation—could be implemented through the majority party caucus; the proposal could exempt current chairmen and allow them to complete their careers in order to diffuse a major source of opposition. Indeed, a similar proposal was suggested this past year to the Democratic Caucus committee on reform by Florida Representative Charles Bennett; however, it was not acted upon.

Rotation of assignments

Another way of ensuring committee representativeness is rotate, in some fashion, committee assignments. Currently, continuity on committees is encouraged, primarily by rewarding continuous committee seniority rather than overall seniority. Thus, when Representative Edith Green—Democrat, Oregon—moved last year from the Education and Labor Committee to the Appropriations Committee, she sacrificed eighteen years of seniority and a second ranking position on

Education and Labor to become thirtieth ranking member of thirty-three Democrats on Appropriations. Lateral moves of this sort are not often taken.

On the other hand, the new House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee has built in a procedure which ensures a steady rotation of members, while limiting the overall turnover each two years to permit required continuity. A similar system could easily be adapted for the standing committee system. For example, continuous service on a committee could be limited to six years before returning, if he desired. Ranking on each committee, and subcommittee chairmanships, could be decided by a combination of overall tenure and committee seniority—ratified by committee caucuses—as could committee chairmanships; if the most senior member had already served six years as a committee chairman, the next ranking member would be recommended to the majority party caucus. Finally, to ensure a continuing influx of fresh viewpoints, preference for some, perhaps half, of contested vacancies on desirable committees could be given to those who have never served on the committees could be given to those who have never served on the committee, so long as the overall turnover on the committee did not exceed one-third for a given Congress.

A rotation system of this type would have several consequences. First, it would prevent any small group of legislators, whatever their ideologies, from becoming entrenched in the same formal power positions for extended periods of time. Also, by diluting internal vested interests, it would enable Congress to restructure itself more easily as policy areas and problems changed—legislators would have less stake in preserving their own congressional status quo.

Secondly, it would broaden the knowledge base in Congress by giving each legislator a wider range of experiences in several issue areas, without penalizing him for doing so. This would not drastically impair member expertise, for members could still spend several years during their legislative careers working on a single committee or dealing with a single problem. As most legislators would attest, a good grasp of the issues facing a particular committee or subcommittee can come after a short period of time; the outlines, if not the specifics, of policy proposals are usually quite similar from term to term. A legislator who has served on a committee for thirty years is little more expert than one who has served on the same committee for fifteen years—if they are matched in perseverance and intelligence. In fact, by allowing congressmen to examine issue areas from different perspectives, a rotation system could enhance expertise. Moreover, by building in mechanisms to limit the turnover on a committee at any given time to one-third or one-half, one could prevent the admittedly improbable situation of a committee composed entirely of inexperienced newcomers.

Finally, each committee would, at any given time, more accurately reflect the overall membership of the body—regionally, ideologically and in seniority. A regularized change of membership would give each committee a wider range of legislators; rural congressmen would be spread more broadly throughout the committee system and would no longer be so concentrated in the Agriculture and Public Works Committees, while big city congressmen would no longer be as heavily represented on the Education and Labor and Foreign Affairs Committees. Policy outputs formulated by a wider spectrum of legislators would be more likely to reflect national needs and desires.

This innovation would, however, have significant side effects as well. Larger proportions of members would have served on each committee and would be less hesitant about speaking out on the floor about a

committee's recommendations. All committees would become, in Fenno's phrase, more permeable, and floor debate would become more significant. Most likely, amendments would increase, and the efficiency of floor debate and decision making would decrease correspondingly. This type of environment exists to an extent in the Senate, which by virtue of its smaller size can react more flexibly; it might create chaos in the House. On the other hand, floor procedures could be created to streamline debate and deliberation, and vigorous and meaningful floor debate—if not efficient—might well produce better decisions.

Presumably, also, committee staffs—having the continuity on committees which legislators would lack—would increase in importance, particularly in crafting legislation. This is not a serious problem, however. Legislators would not become wholly dependent on their staffs; they are intelligent and capable individuals with control over the direction and substance of policy concerns. Elliott Richardson's successful administration of the Defense Department—Richardson being no expert in technical defense topics—is an example of limitations of staffs in dictating or shaping outcomes.

Consolidation of committees deals with many of the same areas; perhaps, given its implementation, a built-in rotation of committee assignments would be unnecessary. A better solution might be merely rotation among subcommittees, limiting chairmanships and tenure in a similar fashion. This approach would check the erosion of specialization and expertise caused by committee rotation; however, it would limit the interchange of ideas and viewpoints across policy areas and would make a future re-jurisdiction of committees more difficult by giving members more stake in protecting their particular committee's interests.

CONCLUSION

Standing committees are not Constitutionally mandated structures; they are congressional responses to heavy workloads and unwieldy decision making. The reforms mentioned above are an attempt to make committees and their policy outputs reflect the larger legislature membership and, thus, the nation. Enacting these changes in the House or the Senate is, to say the least, unlikely—in the near future, at any rate. Nevertheless, the implications of modifications of this type should be seriously contemplated by both scholars and legislators. At the least, by discussing them we shed light on the underlying assumptions, behavior and limitations which characterize contemporary committees.

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution which would, if adopted by the House, require most committees of the House to estimate the cost to the nonpublic sector of the economy of any measure it plans to report.

We all recall that the requirement of an estimate of the cost to the Federal Government of a reported bill is of recent vintage. It was the fruit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That addition to the rules of the House, accomplished in January of 1971, was a welcome one and has proven very help-

ful to me, and, I think, to most of my colleagues. The cost estimate has provided me with an additional, semiobjective factor to consider in evaluating the merits of a particular piece of legislation. I clearly would oppose, for example, a court reorganization plan which would cost the Public Treasury \$5 billion next year regardless of its merits. I would have no trouble supporting an otherwise meritorious plan that would cost the taxpayers \$150,000. The fact that an estimate of the cost to the taxpayers is required to be a part of the committee report makes the information readily available to all of us, and clearly makes for wiser legislation.

However, I do not think that the above rule goes far enough. We all recognize that almost every bill we vote on will have a cost effect on the private sector of the economy as well as on the public sector. That is to say, when we as legislators seek some social good by requiring a particular industry or industries to take some action, none of us is naive enough to think that the cost of taking that mandated action will completely be absorbed by the industry involved. Rather, the cost will be passed through to the ultimate consumer in one form or another.

When, for example, the Congress passed the so-called Bank Secrecy Act, in 1970, requiring banks and other financial institutions to maintain additional detailed records regarding both domestic and foreign transactions because such information had a "high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax and regulatory investigations and proceedings," we were all aware or should have been aware that such requirements would increase the cost of financial services to the consumers of those services. I think it would have been useful to all of us if the Banking and Currency Committee had submitted a formal estimate of the cost these additional recordkeeping requirements would have on the consumer when it reported the bill. In this era of evaluating many programs in terms of cost-benefit analyses, I consider such an estimate almost essential.

I fully recognize that such forecasts of the price tag to the consumer will be extremely difficult in many cases. However, it seems to me that some estimation is better than no estimate at all—or rather only that of the affected industry, usually overstated, which is largely all we receive now. I, for one, would like the committee that reports the bill to undertake the task of making this estimate, since the members and staff of that committee are likely to be more expert in matters affecting that portion of the nonpublic sector which is influenced by legislation produced by that committee.

Some may contend that my proposal is inherently unworkable, I do not view it as such, but I think at a minimum, it should be seriously discussed by the membership of this body. If a majority believe, as I do, that the benefit to be derived outweighs the problems it pre-

sents and that an estimate of the cost of legislation to the consumer by the committee that is expert in the field would be an improvement over the "gut" feeling or limited industry-prepared information on which we must rely at present, then I think the legislative process can be significantly improved. I urge all of my colleagues to at least think about this proposal, and hopefully, vote for its adoption.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE STORY OF DAN LYONS, S.J.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Pan American Day in the course of its 30th consecutive celebration in the U.S. Congress, I would like to include a review of the biography of Father Dan Lyons, S.J., described by one of our friends, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., as a "magnificent human being" and a "loyal son of Loyola," meaning that Father Lyons is a devoted apostle of truth, as he has seen events unfold around the globe. The book review by Dr. Thorning speaks for itself and reads as follows—National Review, April 27, 1973:

The story of Dan Lyons, S.J., by John D. McCallum (Guild Books, 443 pp., \$7.95).

That Father Dan Lyons is a magnificent human being becomes clear in the first part of this biography. In the second section the priest-journalist emerges as an indefatigable, globe-circling leader armed with eyewitness knowledge about international personalities and events. His reports and judgments, although occasionally oversimplified, are more concise, colorful, and responsible than those of numerous critics of U.S. policy. Fortunately for the family of nations, Father Dan inspires boundless trust among Jewish and Christian benefactors. The latter, including Frank Malina, Mrs. Roberts Blount, and Patrick J. Frawley, "passed the ammunition," money enough to enable a modern Paul to finance charitable and educational projects at home and abroad. Every centavo invested in good causes produced considerable impact on public opinion from Melbourne to Djakarta to Damascus. An index to the Lyons influence may be gleaned from the notices he has drawn in *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and the *Daily World*.

For those familiar with Marxist psychology "the rage of Tass" suggests how vulnerable the men in the Kremlin feel themselves to be. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that, as early as 1966, Richard M. Nixon listened with respect to "Father Owl" when this loyal son of Loyola advised the future President to "mine the harbor of Haiphong." Action followed in 1972, when the subject of this biography praised the port closing as "the first decisive action in ten years," apt to end the war. In a revelatory chapter, "Behind the Iron Curtain 1972," the roving correspondent, accompanied by a colleague, Father Cletus Healy, got a first-hand glimpse of the Soviet empire.

En route to Moscow, they found that in Czechoslovakia "300,000 members of the Com-

munist Party have been purged, . . . 40 per cent of the writers have been forced out of their profession," while "fifty thousand union members were liquidated." In Moscow itself, a clue to freedom is supplied by the two Jesuits: "Father Joseph Richards, an Assumptionist, . . . has a nice but tiny chapel in his apartment, where about thirty persons attend Mass on Saturday night. . . . He offers three Masses in the cafeteria of the American embassy on Sundays, attended by worshippers from various legations." In such wise are the 1933 treaty provisions fulfilled. Excellent photographs illuminate the text.

—JOSEPH F. THORNING.

"MIRANDA: WORLD CITIZEN"

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Pan American Day in the course of its 30th consecutive celebration in the U.S. Congress, I would like to include several reviews of the book "Miranda: World Citizen," written by my good friend and our Acting Chaplain, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning.

The book reviews follow:

"MIRANDA: WORLD CITIZEN"

(By Joseph F. Thorning)

Introduction by President Galo Plaza of Ecuador.

Foreword by Sumner Welles.

"This is an unforgettable portrait—objective, scholarly, profound, yet warm and vibrant with life." Ambassador Rafael de la Colina of Mexico.

"The human personality of Miranda; his romantic adventures in all parts of the world; the prodigies of his curious intellect; his philosophical and scientific knowledge; his military talent; his friendship with the leading statesmen of Europe and America, from Catherine The Great to George Washington; his gifts as a statesman and General, as a humanist and as an apostle of liberty constitute the vivid pages of this authentic biography . . . it appears to be definitive."

VISION

"Miranda: World Citizen epitomizes even better than Benjamin Franklin the strength and weaknesses of the 18th century gentleman—his sensuality and religious coolness, combined with a vigor of intellect, which for catholicity has been matched only in the age of Pliny and Plutarch." Dr. Paul H. Hallett, *The Register*, Denver.

"Dr. Joseph F. Thorning has told this fascinating story of one of the first 'citizens of the world' in a compact, scholarly book. He has had access to new documentation which complements, improves upon and rectifies, in part, the work of William Spence Robertson (1929), which was the first important contribution of North American historians to the study of Miranda." German Arciniegas in *The New York Times Book Review*.

"I regard this biography of Francisco de Miranda by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning as an immensely valuable contribution to the cause of inter-American understanding." Sumner Welles, onetime Under Secretary of State.

The University of Florida Press, Gainesville, Florida.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH AND
INSURANCE BENEFITS**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would amend certain sections of title 5, United States Code, relating to the Federal employees health benefits plans and the Federal employees group life insurance program. This bill would reduce the number of years of creditable service that an employee must have accumulated to be eligible to continue his insurance protection under these programs after he retires. The bill would also delete the present requirement that an employee must have been enrolled in the Federal employees health benefits plan for 5 years immediately prior to retirement to be eligible to continue his coverage under that program as an annuitant.

I believe that there is considerable justification for the prompt enactment of this bill. Under present law, an employee may be eligible for an annuity after completing at least 5 years of creditable civilian service. However, present law also requires that an employee must have at least 12 years of creditable service to be eligible to continue his insurance protection under these programs as an annuitant. Thus, by requiring an employee to have at least 12 years of service for insurance purposes and only 5 years of service for retirement purposes, an employee who may otherwise be eligible to retire may elect to continue in Government service solely for insurance purposes.

The purpose of my bill, simply stated, is that any Federal employee who is eligible for an annuity and who is also enrolled in either or both of these insurance programs should also be eligible to continue his enrollment in these programs as an annuitant. To accomplish this, it is both necessary and proper to require that the minimum number of years of creditable service required for an employee to continue his enrollment in these programs after he becomes an annuitant should be equal to the minimum number of years that an employee must have in order to qualify for an annuity. This would negate the present incentive for Federal employees who are otherwise eligible to retire from continuing their employment solely for insurance purposes.

The bill would also delete the present requirement that an employee must have been enrolled in a Federal employees health benefits plan for at least 5 years immediately prior to the date upon which he becomes an annuitant to be eligible to continue his coverage under the program after he becomes an annuitant. There are many employees who, due to circumstances unrelated to their Government employment, do not enroll in a Federal employees health benefits plan. For example, an employee may derive health insurance benefits through

a spouse who is employed in the private sector. Then, principally through the retirement, death, or divorce of the spouse, the Federal employee loses this health insurance protection and subsequently enrolls in the Federal employees health benefits plan. This employee, under present law, must continue working for at least 5 years if he desires to continue his health insurance coverage as an annuitant. Thus, an employee who might otherwise be eligible to retire and who would retire elects to continue his Federal employment solely in order to qualify to continue his health insurance protection as an annuitant.

I do not believe, and I am sure that my colleagues agree, that an employee's decision to continue working should not be predicated upon his eligibility to continue his health insurance protection after he retires. However, under present law, that is exactly the situation in which many Federal employees find themselves. My bill would correct this situation and would allow many employees to elect immediate retirement without consideration to eligibility for insurance protection.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce from twelve to five years the creditable service requirements under the Federal employees group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance and health benefits programs, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 8706(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by deleting in subparagraph (2) "12 years" and inserting "5 years" in place thereof; and

(2) by deleting the second sentence thereof.

(b) Section 8714a(c)(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by deleting "12 years" and inserting "5 years" in place thereof.

(c) Section 8901(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by deleting "12 or more years" and inserting "5 or more years" in place thereof.

(d) Section 8905(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) An annuitant who, at the time he becomes an annuitant, was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter, as an employee, or as a member of the family of the employee or annuitant, may continue his enrollment under the conditions of eligibility prescribed by regulations of the Commission."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the ninetieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE VETERANS HOSPITALS

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration, under Donald E. Johnson's leadership, has been the recipient

of some very vocal criticism of late, both from veterans and Members of Congress. I feel that we need to maintain a sense of perspective regarding some of the very fine accomplishments of this agency in its continuing efforts to provide the best possible medical and rehabilitative services to our veterans. I would like to call your attention to the excellent way the VA is carrying out its dual congressional mandate—a program of education and training so as "to provide a complete medical and hospital service for the medical care and treatment of veterans" and under recent Public Law 93-82, its secondary mission "to assist in providing an adequate supply of health manpower to the Nation."

Twenty-eight years ago, Veterans' Administration hospitals were considered "backwaters of American medicine" by medical professionals. With strong backing from Congress, the VA announced an extraordinary new policy of association of veterans hospitals with medical schools, because regardless of the best organizational structures and finest of facilities and equipment, they are of no consequence without highly qualified health care professionals.

In the past 10 years, more than 400,000 students preparing for health careers have received all or a portion of their training in VA hospitals. This year, VA will help train 67,000 prospective health workers, at all technical and professional levels, in over 60 different health care specialties, including physicians and dentists at the undergraduate and graduate level.

Today, 107 VA hospitals are affiliated with 90 medical schools and practically all VA hospitals participate in joint education, research, or patient-care activities with over 1,200 non-VA institutions. This includes 57 of the Nation's dental schools, 312 nursing schools, 45 schools of pharmacy, 88 psychology programs at the doctorate level, 80 schools of graduate social work, and 710 other academically based programs for the allied health professions and occupations.

Both hospital and outpatient care for veterans are setting alltime records. The 985,300 patients treated in the VA hospitals during fiscal year 1973 is the highest for any year in history. The VA has met the challenge of this change and growth of the patient care load by the addition of seven new hospitals in the past 5 years, all with medical school affiliations, with three others in planning stages.

Quality patient care for our veterans being its primary mission, the VA through its medical school affiliations achieves a part of this goal from mutually beneficial education and training programs. For VA, patient care is improved through the advice of the university's deans committee, the presence of medical students and house staff, the use of medical school faculty as VA consultants, and the general upgrading of the VA's professional staff. At the present time, over 3,000 VA physicians and dentists hold active faculty appointments at affiliated medical and dental schools,

while full-time university faculty teach and consult regularly in our hospitals. For the medical school, affiliation with the VA provides a large clinical facility and a general expansion of their education and research resources. Medical research programs are also carried on directly and indirectly with research groups in medical schools and other institutions. Through this policy and practice of teaching affiliations, VA hospitals now serve a major role in the development of health manpower, not only for delivery of health care to veterans, but for the benefit of the American public.

The VA has a fine record of achievement in meeting the tremendous challenge of the 1970's in maintaining first rate medical care for this Nation's veterans in the face of the explosive growth rate in the number of veterans requiring such services. We again suggest that we need to maintain a sense of perspective in the face of so much criticism.

NOTES FROM CUBA AND CALCUTTA

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the following review which I am sure my colleagues will find of interest.

[From America, Nov. 6, 1971]

NOTES FROM CUBA AND CALCUTTA

CUBA: THE PURSUIT OF FREEDOM

(By Hugh Thomas Harper, 1,718 p. \$20)

This is an encyclopedic approach to the geography, history and culture of Cuba. The period treated, 208 years, stretches from the British capture of Havana (1762) to the administration of Fidel Castro (1959-70). The dividing line, a somewhat arbitrary choice, is Fulgencio Batista's second seizure of power (1952).

At the time of its occupation by Lord Albemarle, Havana was described by the Abbé Guillaume Raynal as the "boulevard of the New World." Although Santiago de Cuba was still the headquarters of the Captain General, Havana was the port of rendezvous for treasure ships from Vera Cruz and Portobello. The galleons, laden with gold and silver, were convoyed under the protection of the Spanish grand fleet to Seville and Cadiz. Since thousands of seamen and soldiers had to wait from four to six weeks in Cuba for the treasure ships to assemble, they tended to transform Havana, not yet the "Paris of America," into a maritime roadhouse. The city, with its gorgeous tropical setting, overflowed with deserters, escaped slaves, gamblers, smugglers, and crooks on the run, sailors looking for ships, prostitutes for sailors and "frails without fixed destination." The future capital early acquired that "unique, easy-going, brilliant but semi-criminal and cosmopolitan character that has marked it ever since."

British rule, fleeting as it was, proved the signal for an immediate descent on the island by English merchants. Dealers in grain, wool, linen, horses, and sugar equipment established flourishing businesses. The slave

trade, already horrendous, received a powerful impetus. While tobacco, hitherto the principal crop, continued to grow famous for aroma and flavor, its cultivation dropped to second place in the Cuban economy. Thomas emphasizes that the stepped-up import of slaves, combined with the long-term commercial arrangements then established (including debts), was the distinguishing mark of Albemarle's expedition.

The author, professor of history at the University of Reading, adds that, after Albemarle departed in January 1763, the increase in cheap labor hastened the trend toward the creation of a stubborn master, the sugar industry. Thereupon Thomas poses the question: Did dependency upon an overdeveloped export commodity make Cuba "a sugar palace or a sugar prison?"

Moreover, in the 1770's, the desire of the North American colonists to trade with Cuba and the French West Indies became "a fundamental cause" of revolt against Britain. A lucrative three-cornered commerce developed: smugglers carried rum from Havana to Africa for the purchase of slaves, whereupon the blacks were exchanged in Havana for molasses, which had been processed in New England as "juice of the cane," and exchanged for more slaves. For two generations, Thomas relates, Massachusetts produced the best "Antilles rum." And John Adams confessed that "molasses was an essential ingredient in American independence."

Equally detailed information is supplied by the author about the struggle of Cuban patriots for independence for many decades of the 19th century. Familiar names adorn the narrative: Carlos Manuel de Céspedes; José Martí; Antonio Maceo; Máximo Gómez and a host of other leaders. Participation by U.S. armed forces accelerated and ensured victory.

A number of men who held office in the young republic, however, failed to reflect the noble ideas of the Founding Fathers. Politics soon surpassed agriculture, animal husbandry and mining as a short-cut to easy money. Tourists flocked to the hotels, beaches, casinos and bordellos of Havana. Night clubs such as Sans Souci, La Tropicana and Montmartre acquired world renown. Cuba seemed a tropical paradise, teeming with delicious fruits, luxuriant foliage, fresh seafood, vegetables raised by industrious Chinese gardeners, beef, pork and poultry, washed down by rum, whiskey, beer and brandy. Side by side with a growing middle class, enjoying the highest standard of living in Latin America, there existed a multitude of unemployed, undernourished, largely uneducated *campesinos*. Some clue to the food habits of Cubans may be gleaned from the fact that they had the biggest per capita consumption of lard throughout the globe.

Major events in Cuba under the Republic are recounted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and fairness. Biographical sketches of the principal figures, whether planters, bankers, entrepreneurs, lawyers, doctors, artists, poets or politicians, military men and gangsters, are presented in colorful detail. A number of U.S. diplomats are characterized as "proconsuls." In his discussion of U.S. policies from 1933, when Batista emerged as the "Strong Man" of Cuba, Hugh Thomas quotes at length from contemporary witnesses, including Sumner Welles, Jefferson Caffery, Earl Smith and subordinate officials in the State Department. Fulgencio Batista and Fidel Castro bulk large in this part of the narrative.

Harsh as are the author's appraisals of old-line Cuban politicians, the British scholar, widely acclaimed for his study of the Spanish Civil War, essays an even-handed evaluation

of the Castro dictatorship. Thomas credits the regime with support for "a minimum wage, universal schooling and medicine," and a reduction in rural poverty. He also reports "the brutality of the gaolers, the arbitrary character of an unpredictable but ubiquitous tyranny, the tedium of an inefficient bureaucratic style and the melancholy of a society where eccentricity and private experiment . . . are damned."

Religion gets scant notice. Praise, however, is accorded to Santiago Archbishop Antonio María Claret (now on the calendar of saints); Félix Varela, priest-teacher of philosophy and pioneer in social reform; and many men and women once active in education, charity and health care.

Cuba's search for freedom continues.—
JOSEPH F. THORNING.

THIS WEEK'S REVIEWERS

Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is the United States Honorary Fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil.

Rev. Msgr. James A. Magner, former director of Catholic U. of Am. Press, has written extensively on Latin America.

Quentin Lauer, S. J., is a professor of philosophy at Fordham University, New York City.

Keith J. Egan, O. Carm. teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in mysticism at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.

MIRALESTE HIGH SCHOOL COMES TO WASHINGTON

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the visit to our Nation's Capitol by a group of students from Miraleste High School, California.

Through a high school sponsored tour of the east coast these students visited my own home of Boston before coming to Washington where they observed their Congress in action. Certainly one of the highlights of their whole tour was the luncheon in their honor sponsored by Senator JOHN TUNNEY and Representative JEROME WALDIE.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of those participating in the tour be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIRALESTE HIGH SCHOOL AMERICAN HISTORICAL TOUR, APRIL 4-14, 1974

BOYS

David Samloff, Brian Karr, Doug Yoshida, Mike Wyman, Paul Goden, Bill Clark, Chris Volk, Robert Allen.

Mark Ericson, Brian Curry, David Dorff, Bill Resensweig, David White, Rick Barnard, and Ted Dykceul.

GIRLS

Lori Yoshida, Barbara Bridges, Donna Cox, Cathy Hines, Betty Suidmak, Susan Kawahara, Peg Ribley, Mary Matthews, Chris Green, Ann Hubbell, Polly Plakos, Cindy Ricks, Judy Wendorff, Lori Briggs, Linea Mills, Alice Davis, and Peggy O'Hara.

CHAPELONES

Mrs. Barbara Franklin, Mr. Rae Wyman, Mr. Howard Lawrence, and Mr. Patrick Smith.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it seems inherent in legislative bodies that members react to crises rather than prepare in advance for problems that can be foreseen and anticipated.

In this respect, I fear that our Congress is again guilty of not having enacted sufficient legislation guarding our citizens rights of privacy. Such legislation is past due in our Nation.

Yet, even as we continue to delay our response to this need, there is emerging the need to deal with the complex problems posed by multinational computers and data banks.

This matter is discussed in the January 16 issue of Computerworld in an article by Mr. E. Drake Lundell, Jr., and at this point I would like to insert this into the RECORD in connection with the special order on privacy arranged by my distinguished colleague, Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH, and others:

MULTINATIONAL DATA BANKS REQUIRE SPECIAL SAFEGUARDS

(By E. Drake Lundell, Jr.)

MONTVALE, N.J.—As multinational data banks become more common, "new institutions will be required at the multinational level to resolve disputes over the transmission of data across national boundaries," according to a recent publication from the American Federation of Information Processing Societies (Afiips) here.

In addition, the publication said these new institutions would have "to develop regulations concerning the activities of multinational data banks, to provide individual safeguards, and to deal with problems of standardization of data transmission facilities and capabilities."

The publication, written by Burt Nanus of the University of Southern California, Leland M. Wooten of Southern Methodist University and Harold Borko of the University of California at Los Angeles, is based on the admittedly imperfect Delphi technique, but represents, the authors said, a first attempt at coming to grips with the problems likely to be raised by multinational computers and data bases.

TIME IS COMING

"The use of computers in this manner at the present time is certainly not widespread," the authors admitted. "However, as one projects ahead 10 to 20 years and contemplates, on the one hand, the rising tide of multinationalism in both corporations and governmental organizations, and, on the other hand, the rapid increase in capabilities and decrease in cost of computer/communications networks, one can conjecture it is only a matter of time (and probably not very much time) when these kinds of applications will proliferate."

Within the next 10 years there will be some major multinational networks in existence, the group predicted, but added the nature of the impact of such development is "still only vaguely perceived."

"On the technical side, there appear to be few barriers to the development of these systems that are not now already close to solution," the report noted.

"The problems that do exist are more in the nature of political or socio-cultural," the report added, indicating the most profound effects of these systems will be on this level.

MULTINATIONAL DECISIONS

"Within the highly industrialized societies, many people will find themselves in some form of man-machine relationship, often involving multinational communications, within the next decade," the authors predicted, which might lead to situations where "individuals will be asked to make decisions in a multinational context that may not be consistent with the policies of their own governments."

At the same time the group predicted that while in the short run the use of multinational computers might tend to enhance the prospects of the "information-rich, wealthier nations at the expense of the information-poor," in the long run the use of such systems will increase the "technological options" open to the lesser-developed countries and "speed their ability to industrialize and to take advantage of the latest developments in education, management, medicine or public administration."

"The danger to the developing nations is that the MNCs (multinational computers) may distort their investment priorities or lead to policies that favor multinational as opposed to national patterns of socio-economic change," the group said.

DELPHI TECHNIQUE

The Delphi technique polls a selected group of people—in this case from several different disciplines, with a series of questionnaires, each succeeding one based on the previous and developed in order to refine the opinions expressed there.

In this group it was found that 50% of the people (all of whom were familiar with computers) felt that multinational computer systems would help "to enhance the power of multinational organizations whose interests transcend national interests and which are generally the creatures of the industrial nations."

In all, 83% felt the use of computers across national boundaries "will contribute to homogenization of cultural values and attitudes," and 60% agreed "the use of computers across national boundaries contradicts the present trend to put 'people' ahead of things."

In all, 83% of the group agreed that political considerations were the most important barrier to the growth of multinational computer systems and 59% said the lack of political or legal mechanisms to determine who controls such data banks was the most important political consideration.

MINOR BARRIER

However, 56% indicated the refusal of nations to lower restrictions on the trade of computers was a relatively unimportant barrier to the growth of multinational systems.

Afiips also outlined five areas where future policy is necessary:

"It is likely that the right to individual privacy vis-a-vis the use of various forms of information technology will have to be defined in terms that provide safeguards to individuals in different cultures. That is, the cultural determinants of this right must be transcended in order to adequately protect the right of privacy at the global level."

"Organizations and nations will need a common understanding regarding the fraudulent uses of data by multinational organizations. Protection against these fraudulent uses of data must be safeguarded at the global level."

"Nation-states are likely to begin to formulate policies that enlarge the public arena of control over the use of MNCs."

"Multinational organizations will need to

formulate policies regarding the access to information contained in multinational data banks and information systems.

"Multinational organizations and nation-states will need to agree on policies strengthening the position of the LDCs (less-developed countries) in all arenas where the use of MNCs is prevalent."

AMBASSADOR IDAR RIMESTAD

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoyed an item I recently read in the November 1973 issue of the Phoenix concerning some close friends of mine. They are the former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Idar Rimestad and his lovely wife, Ann. I first met Ann at their apartment in the Embassy Chancery in Moscow after returning from Holy Communion. Believe me, there is nothing that hits the spot like good old American orange juice, bacon, eggs, and toast, together with American coffee, when you are overseas.

Following that tour of duty in Moscow, Idar served as the Chief Counselor for Administration of the huge Embassy in Paris, and then as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration here in Washington. His career ended in Geneva where he served as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting the article:

THE VALLEY'S FIRST CAREER AMBASSADOR

(By Christopher Case)

The Valley is a popular spot to retire for all kinds of people. Businessmen, professionals, entertainers, sports personalities, mafia, all agree this is the place to settle down.

Last June the Valley gained its first ambassador when Idar Rimestad and his wife Ann started building their new home in Fountain Hills.

Rimestad, a young retiree at 57, called it a career after three decades of public service, half of which was spent overseas. His government career began in Oak Ridge, Tennessee with the Manhattan District, the project that developed the atomic bomb, and ended in June in Geneva, Switzerland, where he served for four years as United States ambassador to the United Nations.

His first overseas job was as Director of Personnel for the U.S. High Commission in Bonn, and later in Frankfurt, during the postwar occupation days.

Idar says he didn't go into government service with any specific goals. "It just happened. My parents both traveled a lot, so I'm naturally inclined that way. And it was a good way to see Europe."

"In the beginning, I didn't think I'd spend more than a couple of years in a foreign country, but it just grew from there. I was lucky. Every new place I found myself in was exciting. There was always plenty of action, and that's the only kind of a job to have."

Most people don't realize how much goes on in Geneva. Actually, there's more inter-

national activity there per capita than in any other city in the world, according to the ex-ambassador. Ninety countries have permanent UN representatives there, and 80 international organizations (Red Cross, etc.) have headquarters in Geneva.

"My primary function as ambassador was to explain and promote United States policy," Idar says. "I was the channel of communication for all of these other countries and organizations."

The over-riding diplomatic consideration during the Geneva days was the question: should East Germany be admitted to the UN? "It was a highly complex matter, but most of the smaller nations come there with a simplistic view. It's all 'black hats and white hats, good guys and bad guys.' But it doesn't work that way, and eventually they come to realize that."

Part of the action came in the form of conferences. In his last year in Geneva there were some 400 conferences dealing with such matters as laws of the seas, world health, meteorology and labor, to name a few. Keeping up on everything meant wading through two inches of paper work from Washington each day, plus supervising a staff of 175.

And then there was the social life. Every country has a "National Day." Ambassadors are expected to attend. Rimestad and some of his closest counterparts would ask each other, "How can we get out of this one?" But there was no way. "You had to make them all," he says. "There were parties and parties and parties." Idar received at least 100 invitations a year.

"It gets impossible after awhile," he laughs. "And you have to throw parties of your own, too."

But it's glamorous and fun and "you enjoy it all, because you are in Paris and Bonn and Moscow and Geneva. You can't help but enjoy it."

Being an ambassador, Idar explains, is in many ways like working for a large corporation. Even an ambassador doesn't have much opportunity for initiative or decision-making.

An ambassador, of all people, has to be diplomatic. He has to be careful what he says: "The policy is made in Washington. When you make a speech the key phrase is, 'My government says.' Sometimes you have to say, 'I reserve my position.' That could mean, 'I didn't get my instructions' or 'I don't understand them.'"

The glamour of traveling and working in Europe was dimmed occasionally by personal crises. Idar went to Moscow in 1957 as First Secretary of the U.S. Embassy. That meant he and his wife had to leave their two daughters, 14 and 16, in Frankfurt, because there were no American-operated schools in Moscow.

"We had friends in Frankfurt to look after the girls," Ann says, "and they lived in a dormitory, so we knew they'd be all right. It was just sad leaving them." The girls came to Moscow for Christmas by train, with layovers in Vienna and Warsaw. "When it was time for them to return," Ann remembers, "I let Idar play the 'heavy' and put them on the train. I just couldn't do it."

During his years in Moscow, relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States were good and improving all the time. Rimestad's tour of duty was due to end in March, 1960, but he was asked to stay on because President Eisenhower was scheduled to visit Moscow. Then the roof fell in. Gary Power's U-2 was shot down over Russia. Relations became strained again and Ike had to cancel out.

Idar enjoyed the Russian people. "They are hard-working, hard-drinking, friendly andregarious. And so curious about the United States. They are a proud people and, like all proud people, they are advancing.

But they have a long way to go before achieving a decent level of freedom."

In contrast to the common man, Russian officials are very stand-offish, suspicious. It's a dictatorship, Rimestad observes, "but not a dictatorship of the proletariat, as we're led to believe. Like all dictatorships, this one doesn't like too many ideas floating around. When people get a little freedom it whets the appetite. Freedom is slow in coming to Russia, but there is an evolutionary process going on, and time is on our side."

In Moscow (and everywhere else) electronic bugging is a way of diplomatic life. "We knew our building was bugged, but we tried for years and couldn't find where they were," Idar says. "We took the walls and ceilings out and found nothing. Finally we learned where they were—behind the radiators, which were permanent fixtures and couldn't be repaired. Otherwise, we'd still be hunting."

After a stint in Moscow, the next assignment is usually a good one. Rimestad was called back to Washington by Ike to serve as director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. After four years—in 1964—he was off to Paris as Consul of the U.S. Embassy and executive director of the United States NATO office. He also coordinated all the administrative work of five other agencies there and was responsible for 1400 employees.

Paris was Idar's favorite place. "It's the greatest of all—big and fascinating. The Louvre, the Champs Elysees, the Arc de Triomphe, the Eiffel Tower, Notre Dame—just magnificent. And there was a lot going on then. France wanted to get NATO out of Paris. New developments popped up almost daily. It was something to watch and be involved in."

Ann Rimestad liked Paris, too, but Germany was the place for her. "I think I left a part of me there," she says. "It was beautiful; the country, the people, everything. And it was our first overseas home. Idar left for Germany six months before the girls and I did. So it was like a homecoming when we got there."

While in Paris Idar was given a special assignment. He was made control officer in charge of logistics and protocol for President Johnson's trip to New Zealand. "I had to arrange for accommodations in Wellington and there was nothing available," he remembers. "I finally managed to rent a ferry boat for ten days and put 400 people on it. That included 200 from the press."

Idar was due to go back to Paris after Wellington, but was asked to stay on for the rest of the trip, which included stops in Australia, Thailand, the Philippines and Alaska.

On Christmas Eve, 1966, he received a telegram. LBJ wanted to see him. Rimestad knew he was in the running for a big promotion, but didn't think the President himself would do the interviewing. He learned, however, that Johnson liked to do things his way, regardless of what protocol dictated. Idar got the job—Under Secretary of State, and became the fifth ranking officer in the department.

"President Johnson was a much-maligned man," Idar says. "I guess the 'Texas image' rubbed people the wrong way, but he was great to work for. He could be tough on you, but the next day he would be sugar-sweet."

LBJ phoned Idar at 11:30 one evening: "I'm calling about that appointment you made today," said the President.

"I think it's a good appointment, Mister President."

"I think it's a bad one," LBJ answered. He then proceeded to chew out his naive Under Secretary and dropped a few suggestions on how to operate in the future.

Happily, the appointment proved to be an excellent choice and Johnson knew it. When he saw Rimestad a few months later, he said, "You lucked out on that one, Idar."

Rimestad says career diplomats don't see much of the heads of states, at least not until they reach the ambassador level. Below that you associate with those on your level. He never saw Adenauer. "I was too far down the line then." He shook hands with De Gaulle twice in reception lines and the Frenchman said the same thing both times. "How are you? How are you enjoying Paris?" He saw Nikita Khrushchev twice, but only once close up. He held a chair while the Russian climbed onto it to make a speech at a party.

Idar gets very diplomatic when asked to comment on the Russia-China split, or the continuing Mideast crisis, or any international situation. "It's too complicated, too complex. I wouldn't want to speculate."

He's sure of one thing, though. "Our country is in good shape, politically, economically, anyway you look at it, despite what you hear from the purveyors of gloom and doom. We are still the Utopian place for hundreds of millions of people all over the world."

Now that they're back in the United States the Rimestads plan to enjoy the good life here. "We'll miss it all, I'm sure," Idar says, "especially the excitement and the action." That's one reason he didn't retire in Washington, D.C., where many of his colleagues have settled. "I just couldn't sit on the fringes and not be in the mainstream."

The Rimestads (both transplanted Norwegians from North Dakota) looked around the country before choosing Arizona. "We came to Phoenix three times," Ann says. "The first time we were appalled. We rented a car and drove down a street where there was nothing but billboards. In two hours we were back on the plane."

Friends convinced them to come back and got them on the right streets. In November, 1972, they came for the third time, stayed two weeks, and decided on Fountain Hills. Their retirement site had to have three things, and they found all three—climate, cultural advantages and a large airport nearby.

"We still plan to travel some," Ann says. "We have two married daughters in Washington, D.C." Idar reminds her, "and three grandchildren we want to see more of."

The retired ambassador hopes to get into something to occupy his time, "but not a nine-to-five job. I want to stay active. I'd like to spend a lot of time in some worthwhile volunteer community work."

But for the time being, Idar and Ann Rimestad are content being "free as birds."

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, here is an extract from the April 8 letter by the Acting Secretary of the Interior to Chairman Haley, of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, about that notorious H.R. 11500:

As now drafted, Title II would result in serious adverse energy impacts which the Administration finds unacceptable. H.R. 11500 would impair current production of this vital fuel resource and seriously impede the reaching of the goals of Project Independence . . .

That is because the environmental extremists have managed to write title II in an unbalanced way which almost totally ignores the Nation's need for coal.

You can dig coal and respect the en-

vironment, too. That makes sense. In contrast, H.R. 11500 makes nonsense. It is as nutty as trying to grow bananas on Pikes Peak.

THE REGIONAL RAIL REORGANIZATION ACT

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the regional Rail Reorganization Act, passed by the Congress in December 1973 and signed by the President on January 2, 1974, marks the beginning of a new Federal policy toward railroad transportation. It provides for a means of bringing back to health the eight important railroads in the Northeast and Midwest region which are now in bankruptcy reorganization. It provides also for a means of restructuring, modernizing, and improving all rail services throughout this vast area.

The act establishes the U.S. Railway Association which has the basic responsibility for designing a restructured rail system in the Midwest and Northeast. It establishes also, within the interstate Commerce Commission, the Rail Services Planning Office which has the responsibility of insuring that the views of the public are fully developed and considered in the course of the planning process.

On February 1, as required by the act, the Secretary of Transportation issued his report on "Rail Service in the Midwest and Northeast Region." The Rail Services Planning Office has held hearings on the Secretary's recommendations at 17 cities in the region, also as required by the act. Under the statutory timetable the Office has only 90 days in which to hold those hearings and issue its report and analysis of the Secretary's report.

The response to the Office's public hearings has been overwhelming. In one city alone, Columbus, Ohio, the hearings ran 6 days and 5 nights to accommodate the 266 individual witnesses who appeared. At several other cities, including Boston, Indianapolis, and Chicago, there were over 200 witnesses. Most of them were critical of the Secretary's report and were able to point out many places in which the report's conclusions were erroneous because of mistaken factual information.

In holding these hearings, the Office heard from a great many people interested in and concerned about the future of rail transportation. Many of those who testified complained that delays in obtaining copies of the Secretary's report did not allow them sufficient time to study it carefully enough to present their positions at the hearings.

The act requires the U.S. Railway Association to issue its preliminary system plan on October 29 of this year. The Rail Services Planning Office is again required to hold public hearings on that plan, but this time it must complete those hearings and issue its own report within only 60 days. Not only is this an exceedingly

short period, but because of the date of enactment this period falls at the holiday season, so that the Office may have to schedule hearings even on Thanksgiving Day in order to hear all those who will want to participate.

It is clear that there is an overwhelming public interest on the part of individuals and local, State and regional government officials in the proposed railroad restructuring. Our democratic processes require that each citizen with something to contribute to the restructuring plans be given the opportunity to take his part.

In order to provide sufficient time for adequate public participation in the planning process established by the Regional Rail Reorganization Act, I am today introducing a bill which would extend the period for public participation, following the issuance of the Association's preliminary plan, from 2 months to 5 months. This will mean that interested persons will have ample opportunities to obtain copies of the plan and to prepare their cases before the Rail Services Planning Office schedules the hearings required by the statute. It will provide ample time for the hearings themselves, and it will give the Office the time it needs to review and evaluate the public testimony which it receives before it must issue its report commenting on the preliminary system plan.

While the extension of time at this stage of the planning process must postpone the date of completion of that process, this is a small price to pay for the assurance that all of our citizens will have ample opportunity to participate in this important undertaking. Moreover, it should mean that the final system plan will be a better product than it would otherwise have been, and greatly lessen the likelihood of its ultimate rejection by the Congress.

TABLED BILLS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I and all of the members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT, introduced two clean bills which were unanimously reported by the subcommittee late last month. This action in effect tables H.R. 11511 and H.R. 11845, which were the subjects of the subcommittee executive session.

The first bill, H.R. 14214, the "Health Revenue Sharing and Health Services Act of 1974," revises and extends five health service delivery programs—block grants to the States, family planning programs, community mental health centers, migrant health programs, and community health centers—formerly called neighborhood health centers.

The second bill, H.R. 14215, the "De-

velopmental Disabilities Amendments of 1974," was originally a part of H.R. 11511 and H.R. 11845. Because developmental disabilities legislation is the responsibility of a different Senate subcommittee than are the laws amended by H.R. 14214, it was separated so as to facilitate Senate consideration of these measures.

As the authorizations for all six of these programs expire on June 30, I am hopeful that both of these measures will receive early and favorable consideration by the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and by my House colleagues.

TRIBUTE TO MARION OFFICER

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 16, Marion Officer, one of the most successful and respected businessmen in the St. Louis metropolitan area, was honored at a testimonial dinner by his fellow citizens.

This well deserved tribute paid Marion Officer reflects the universally high regard for him and his family. One of the leading citizens of East St. Louis, Marion Officer has proven dramatically that an urban community such as East St. Louis can be very rewarding to private enterprise and initiative.

But Marion Officer's success is not based solely upon his solid business accomplishments. He and his family have provided needed leadership and have contributed a great deal of time and effort to revitalizing their community and their profession. He has earned the respect of his neighbors and professional colleagues because of these efforts.

As part of the tribute to Marion Officer, I include the Metro East Journal interview with Marion Officer in conjunction with the testimonial dinner:

OFFICER SUCCESSFUL, RESPECTED
(By Courtney Barrett)

Marion E. Officer, his 52-year-old eyes narrowed with intensity, leaned forward and said, "It isn't what you have, it's what you do with what you've got."

What he has is one of the most successful businesses in Metro-East, a devoted family and the respect of nearly everyone who knows him.

Saturday evening, hundreds of persons turned that respect into action by honoring him at a testimonial at East St. Louis Senior High School.

Earlier in the week, Officer sat in his office and talked about gratitude, respect and his hopes for East St. Louis.

"East St. Louis has a great deal to offer. If I did not think that, I would not have spent my life here," said the graduate of Lincoln Senior High School, East St. Louis.

"I have a great deal of hope for the city's future. With the infusion of young people, there is hope for change. But I think that change can come only through our youth."

Officer is a member of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, a director of the Union National Bank of East St. Louis, and a member of several other organizations.

His funeral home, which was started by his father in 1918, was accepted this week

into the International Order of the Golden Rule, one of the leading organizations of funeral directors. Officer's is the second black firm in America to enter the 40-year-old organization.

"You have to earn respect," he said. "It isn't bought; you have to earn it. The great majority of the people I deal with know that I try to set an example and try to treat them as considerately as I know how. Basically, I just have a lot of love for people.

"Life has been good to me, and I know of nothing that I wish for or hope for, except to live happy and free," Officer said. "My entire life has been a happy one, though there have been hard times."

Officer is a graduate of the College of Mortuary Science in St. Louis. His wife, Myrtle, is a graduate of Worsham College of Mortuary Science, Chicago.

The couple's children also plan to enter the mortuary business. Mrs. Bernadette Officer Welch has graduated from Worsham. Carl Officer will soon graduate from the embalming school at Western University in Ohio.

Officer said his youngest son, Marion Jr., has indicated an interest in the business.

"As far as younger parents are concerned, there needs to be a more closely knit pattern of family life. But for older parents, that feeling of closeness has always been there," Officer said.

"The last thing I wanted to be in college was a funeral director," he said. "When * * * wanted to buy the businesses out from under us, who said we couldn't possibly make it. I made up my mind then that that would never happen."

Officer's father, William, died in 1950, Mrs. Annette Officer, the mother, died four years later.

"My basic decision for remaining here had nothing to do with the business. If we're going to make this a better community, everybody can't leave home.

"I wish that blacks, and particularly those in East St. Louis, could work together to make this a model town in America, forgetting their political differences and individuality," Officer said.

"What we need are young ideas . . . we need young people. They can't do it alone—there's no substitute for experience—but with the older people behind them, they can change things.

"They may not do any better than we are doing, but they certainly cannot do any worse."

SSI: IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining several of my New York colleagues in sponsoring corrective legislation remedying some of the inequities we have found in the new supplemental security income program.

This new program, which became effective on January 1, 1974, transfers the responsibility for payments under aid to the aged, blind, and disabled from the States and counties to the Federal Government. While the basic thrust of the program is sound, providing for uniform administration and benefits to all of our eligible elderly, blind, and disabled, several glaring inequities have emerged in the first few months of its administration.

Having taken a look at some of these legislative defects, we have joined to-

gether to correct several oversights—assuring that SSI recipients are eligible for food stamps—authorizing cost-of-living increases in both Federal benefits and State supplements—providing for expeditious handling of any administrative difficulties experienced by eligible recipients.

Additionally, I have included a section correcting an inequity in providing aid to retarded children; Federal guidelines having reduced payments to retarded children by one-third where the child lives at home and receives in kind support from a parent or guardian. If the child, on the other hand, lives in an institution his payments are made in full.

No one can deny the benefit of deinstitutionalizing the retarded child, of keeping him in a home environment and allowing him the kind of existence afforded the normal child. However, the costs of keeping a retarded child are extremely high, very often the child's special care being such a burden that the family is forced to institutionalize the child, creating not only an alien environment for the child, but also adding this child to the roll of State dependents.

Any incentive we can provide for keeping the retarded child in a home setting where he is given the best attention and most normal environment, will be a boon not only to the child's development, but will also alleviate the overburdened State welfare roles.

Accordingly in the package of measures I am introducing today, I have included a provision which decreases the amount of support and maintenance reduction mandated under Federal guidelines from 33 1/3 to 10 percent—a far more realistic figure if we consider the expensive care required by the retarded child whether he lives at home or in an institution.

Mr. Speaker, this package of legislation is not a definitive answer to all of the problems we have encountered in the administration of this new program. It is, however, a step toward recognizing the need for oversight and review. I hope that my colleagues will examine these proposals and will come forward with their own ideas and suggestions to assure that the SSI program will be responsive to the needs of the people it is designed to help, those who are least able to help themselves—the aged, blind, and disabled.

CONGRESS REDUCES ACCESS TO ABORTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, while many of us are aware of the movement which seeks to declare abortion illegal by constitutional amendment, other moves to limit access to abortion are less well known. In the past year, amendments have been added to the medic-aid, foreign aid, and legal services bills which effectively limit the availability of this procedure.

The following article by Spencer Rich, reprinted from the April 1, 1974, Washington Post, is a good summary of this legislation:

CONGRESS REDUCES ACCESS TO ABORTION

(By Spencer Rich)

Spurred by a coalition of Catholic and Protestant spokesmen, legislation substantially narrowing women's ability to obtain abortions is making strong progress in both the House and the Senate.

While most public attention has focused on broad constitutional amendments banning abortion, sponsored by Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Md.) and Sens. James L. Buckley (Cons.-R-N.Y.) and Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), Congress has quietly been passing a series of antiabortion provisions attached to other legislation.

Last year, in a routine bill extending a group of federal health programs, Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) tacked on a provision declaring that no physician and no hospital can be required to perform sterilization or abortion when it violates their moral convictions or religious beliefs—even if the hospital is supported by federal funds and is intended to serve as a community health facility. The provision, which was enacted into law, struck down a court ruling that a Montana hospital receiving public funds had to perform a sterilization because it was the only community facility in the area.

Also last year, the Senate wrote into the foreign aid bill a Helms prohibition on use of aid money to perform abortions. This provision has become law.

Amendments to the legal services bill in both the House and the Senate barred legal services lawyers from helping women obtain non-therapeutic abortions. Put into the House bill by Hogan and Harold Froehlich (R-Wis.) and into the Senate bill by Dewey Bartlett (R-Okla.), the provision is certain to survive conference.

To the Social Security technical amendments bill, which is still in conference, Buckley attached a ban on use of Medicaid funds to pay for abortions for poor welfare mothers.

While these amendments have removed the general support of anti-abortion groups, they have drawn sharp criticism from women's rights organizations.

"The impact of the Church amendment and the legal services provisions is to make abortions less available to poor women who can't afford to go to other communities if the only hospital in their area denied them abortion," said Carol Burris, director of Women's Lobby.

"Nothing is said here about the difference between private and public hospitals, and in many socially conservative areas the board of a public hospital might simply disapprove abortions on private moral grounds of their own," she said.

The abortion issue is becoming one of the most intensely fought domestic issues before Congress.

The dispute arose when the Supreme Court, in a Jan. 22, 1973, 7-to-2 decision in *Roe vs Wade*, held that a woman's right to privacy and to the control of her own body gives her the right to obtain an abortion for any reason, in effect, at any time within the first six months of pregnancy. The decision appears to permit state anti-abortion laws during the last three months of pregnancy, provided the prohibition doesn't endanger the mothers' health.

The decision struck down a nationwide system of state laws outlawing abortions except for genuine therapeutic purposes or abortions following rape.

Since then, there has been strong pressure from both Catholic and fundamentalist Protestant organizations, as well as some Orthodox Jewish groups, to reinstate curbs on abortion, and one result has been the series of amendments passed in the last year.

However, despite the pressure from such groups as the National Right to Life Committee, the Life Lobby which organized a series of Capitol Hill demonstrations in January, and the U.S. Catholic Conference, the proposed constitutional amendment flatly banning abortions has made very little progress.

Sen. Birch Bayh's (D-Ind.) Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has held two days of hearings on the Buckley amendment, which bars all non-therapeutic abortions, and the Helms-Hogan amendment, which bars any abortion whatever. It plans added hearings but doesn't seem likely to approve either amendment this year.

In the House, a Judiciary subcommittee headed by Don Edwards (D-Calif.) is studying the matter but hasn't any plans for hearings. Hogan is sponsoring a discharge petition to take the amendment away from Edwards and send it to the House floor, but has only about 60 of the required 210 signatures.

At the Senate hearings, the U.S. Catholic Conference backed a constitutional amendment to bar any abortion including therapeutic, and Buckley, Helms and others stated the basic principle of the anti-abortion movement: Once fertilization of the ovum has taken place, it marks, in Buckley's words, "the beginning of a distinct human being" whom it is wrong to kill.

Buckley's constitutional amendment would forbid abortion by granting fetuses the status of persons protected by law "at every stage of their biological development." The Helms-Hogan constitutional amendment grants fetuses legal protection "from the moment of conception."

Lined up against the amendments and supporting the Supreme Court ruling are such groups as the United Methodist Church, United Church of Christ, American Ethical Union, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Presbyterian Church Abortion Task Force, National Organization of Women and American Civil Liberties Union.

Many of these groups take the view that a fetus cannot be considered to have viable life until the sixth or seventh month of pregnancy, and that to ban abortion under these conditions is to interfere with the mother's rights.

WELFARE AND THE COURTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Post regarding the Supreme Court decision in the Edelman against Jordan case. This case involved the question of whether residents of a State can sue State officials for violating the regulations laid down by Federal agencies or Congress. The Court ruled that this could not be done.

The decision made by the Supreme Court in this case will, I believe, have long-range effects on the manner in which many States will administer Federal aid programs. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the Washington Post's thoughtful editorial on this decision:

WELFARE AND THE COURTS

John Jordan, an elderly Chicago indigent, made a simple assumption about equitable justice in the United States and went to

court to test it. Last week Mr. Jordan learned that his assumption was wrong. What he assumed is that if a state is conducting a program that involves federal funds, and if the state violates the federal regulations under which the program was established by Congress, then those who are entitled to the benefits of the program are also entitled to sue the state officials and receive the benefits that had been withheld.

What the Supreme Court said in the case, *Edelman v. Jordan*, is that the 11th Amendment to the Constitution bars the federal courts from ordering state officials to pay retroactive benefits, even if it recognizes that the state officials acted unlawfully in withholding the benefits. The Court said it could order the state officials to behave legally in the future, but it could not order the state to pay back benefits.

Mr. Jordan was eligible for benefits under the Assistance to the Aged, Blind and Disabled program. He applied for them, only to discover that Illinois had a regulation that resulted in long delays before such benefits were paid. The federal regulations called for payment to Mr. Jordan within 30 days. Mr. Jordan was told he would have to wait much longer. And so he sued. His class action was intended to do more than recover the \$195.00 he would have received if Illinois had obeyed the federal regulations. He wanted to protect the interests of others in the state who had also been victimized by the delays.

Mr. Jordan won in the federal district court and in the Seventh Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals. At the Circuit Court level, Illinois asserted its rights under the 11th Amendment, which has been held to bar suits in federal courts brought by residents against their states. The amendment, adopted in 1798, was originally designed to prevent the federal courts from being able to enforce the claims of foreigners against individual states. It has since become a tricky current in the law and has produced a variety of conflicting holdings.

The Supreme Court's most recent interpretation in *Jordan* is that residents of states who are eligible for aid from federally assisted programs cannot sue the state officials in federal court for violating the regulations laid down by federal agencies or by Congress. The Court held that it could enjoin the state officials from future violation of the regulations, but it could not grant the back benefits that had been denied. The Seventh Circuit held that Illinois waited too long to assert its 11th Amendment right, but the Supreme Court ruled that the 11th Amendment is such a grave bar against federal jurisdiction in such cases that it had to be entertained, no matter how late the hour at which it was invoked.

The implications of this case for the public welfare system are serious. If welfare agencies can withhold funds until the courts tell them to stop, many welfare lawyers fear that delay in the processing of applications could well become the rule rather than the exception. The reason for demanding restitution of lost benefits in the *Jordan* case is to prevent state bureaucrats from discouraging welfare applicants by putting them through long processes. The federal regulations requiring that applications be processed within 30 days for the elderly indigent, the blind and the disabled, were intended to guard against just such bureaucratic delay. The Supreme Court has now removed the federal courts from their equity role in such matters.

The court has said that unless a state consents to such a suit in federal court, the court cannot award back benefits. The court rested its decision on the absence of any specific language in the law requiring states to give up their immunity against such suits as a condition of participation in the program. Since the courts no longer have the power to protect recipients, and since the

Congress has left the bureaucrats so large a loophole, it is the Congress that must make its intent clearer.

We are here concerned with the interests of the poorest of our citizens who are elderly, disabled or blind. To leave them at the mercy of the agencies that have already demonstrated their lack of concern is unfair and cannot have been the intent of Congress. What is required now is an amendment of the Social Security Act that would take a simple step to right a wrong. Congress can require that any state that participates in a federal welfare program must waive its immunity against suit under the 11th Amendment. Otherwise, an illegally operated program can continue to be in violation until it is enjoined. And at that, its officials will feel no pressure to do anything other than to begin operating legally from the point at which an injunction has been issued.

The reason for the welfare program is to assist those who are unable to help themselves. It is designed to grant "minimal subsistence" in cases of indigence, infirmity or disability. We give to the John Jordans of this country just enough to stay alive. We require the states to do a simple thing—assist them promptly when they are in need. Since the Supreme Court in *Edelman v. Jordan* has removed the courts from their traditional equity function in welfare cases, the Congress should act to protect the least among us.

NEW COMPREHENSIVE GEOTHERMAL ENERGY BILL INTRODUCED

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of joining Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, Mr. MOSHER, the ranking minority member, Mr. GOLDWATER, and all of the members of my Subcommittee on Energy in introducing H.R. 14172, to provide a new comprehensive Geothermal Research, Development, and Demonstration Act.

My subcommittee, which has twice held hearings on geothermal energy, once during September of last year and most recently during the month of February, heard extensive testimony on proposed legislation for developing geothermal energy.

Four major recommendations were repeatedly expressed during these hearings:

First, Congress should assume active leadership in developing a comprehensive geothermal energy program for this country, as part of an integrated energy policy, particularly with respect to research, development, and demonstration of alternate energy sources.

Second, The scope of any geothermal bill should include provisions for research on all forms of geothermal energy—and byproducts—for intensive exploration for and assessment of geothermal resources, and for the necessary institutional changes required to insure the full development of these resources.

Third, The agencies of the Government involved must have a mechanism for an effective coordinated effort in geo-

thermal energy research, development and demonstration.

Fourth. The administration must be willing to cooperate with the Congress in developing legislation to set up these programs and the agencies to administer them.

H.R. 14172, the new Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act, which we now submit is in response to these recommendations, would establish a geothermal coordination and management project to direct the research, development, and demonstration of new, untapped geothermal resources in the country. This undertaking will be led by a group composed of members from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Interior, and a chairman appointed by the President. In fiscal year 1975, the AEC, NSF, and DOI will be initiating work in geothermal energy, but without any mandate for coordination and goal determination. By providing a single group with the responsibility for reaching our national goal, H.R. 14172 can provide the focus for accomplishing this goal: The production of electricity from geothermal energy, and the full-scale utilization of other useful geothermal by-products by 1980.

There are four types of geothermal resources in this country:

First. Dry steam, containing little or no liquid water. This is presently the only type of geothermal energy utilized in the United States (at Geysers, Calif., producing electricity for San Francisco). The probability of finding other significant amounts of such dry steam is small.

Second. Hot water, heated to above normal temperatures, and under pressure. When the pressure is released, some of the water may "flash" to steam. This is more common than dry steam, but it is still limited to a few regions of the Nation such as the Imperial Valley in California.

Third. Geopressured fields, which have been identified only along the Gulf Coast of Louisiana and Texas. These fields—or zones—occur where mud, silt, and organic material have sunk to great depths and have been trapped within permeable sands below a sealed, insulating layer of rock. Water trapped in the sands is extremely hot and is under tremendous pressure. Vast quantities of natural gas may also be trapped with this water.

Fourth. Hot dry rock formations which are presumed to exist in large volumes, in some places relatively near the surface of the Earth. It should be possible to drill into and fracture these formations and pump water into them to get steam out.

Mr. Speaker, geothermal energy, along with solar energy and nuclear fusion, is a form of energy which may hold great promise for our Nation's future. Just as the House has indicated—by its vote of 253 to 2—that solar heating and cooling should be an essential element of our national policy of developing viable, economically feasible energy alternatives, so I believe we must cast our vote in favor of a comprehensive geothermal

energy program. In doing so we must not allow our efforts to be delayed by indecision and confusion in the administration.

Our new bill, H.R. 14172, will eliminate many of the bureaucratic roadblocks to effective utilization of geothermal energy, and establish a single, mission-oriented agency to do the job.

Our goal is to have from 6 to 10 demonstration plants on the line by 1980, producing from 1 to 10 megawatts of electricity each from the various types of geothermal energy, while taking into account the environmental impact and social, institutional and legal impediments related to the full development of commercial geothermal energy resources.

The Subcommittee on Energy plans further hearings on H.R. 14172 after the Easter recess. We hope to have the bill on the floor of the House in May.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14172

A bill to further the conduct of research, development, and demonstrations in geothermal energy technologies, to establish a Geothermal Energy Coordination and Management Project, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide for the funding of activities relating to geothermal energy, to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for the carrying out of research and development in geothermal energy technology, to carry out a program of demonstrations in technologies for the utilization of geothermal resources, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

- (1) the Nation is currently suffering a critical shortage of environmentally acceptable forms of energy;

- (2) the inadequate organizational structures and levels of funding for energy research have limited the Nation's current and future options for meeting energy needs;

- (3) electrical energy is a clean and convenient form of energy at the location of its use and is the only practicable form of energy in some modern applications, but the demand for electric energy in every region of the United States is taxing all of the alternative energy sources presently available and is projected to increase; some of the sources available for electric power generation are already in short supply, and the development and use of other sources presently involves undesirable environmental impacts;

- (4) the Nation's critical energy problems can be solved only if a national commitment is made to dedicate the necessary financial resources, and enlist the cooperation of the private and public sectors, in developing geothermal resources and other nonconventional sources of energy;

- (5) the conventional geothermal resources which are presently being used have limited total potential; but geothermal resources which are different from those presently being used, and which have extremely large energy content, are known to exist;

- (6) some geothermal resources contain energy of forms other than heat; examples are methane and extremely high pressures available upon release as kinetic energy;

- (7) some geothermal resources contain

valuable byproducts such as potable water and mineral compounds which should be processed and recovered as national resources;

- (8) technologies are not presently available for the development of most of these geothermal resources, but technologies for the generation of electric energy from geothermal resources are potentially economical and environmentally desirable, and the development of geothermal resources offers possibilities of process energy and other non-electric applications;

- (9) much of the known geothermal resources exist on the public lands;

- (10) Federal financial assistance is necessary to encourage the extensive exploration, research, and development in geothermal resources which will bring these technologies to the point of commercial application; and

- (11) the advancement of technology by private industry for the production of useful forms of energy from geothermal resources is important with respect to the Federal responsibility for the general welfare, to facilitate commerce, to encourage productive harmony between man and his environment, and to protect the public interest.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act—

- (1) the term "byproduct" has the meaning given it by section 2(d) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001(d)) as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act;

- (2) the term "known geothermal resources area" has the meaning given it by section 2(e) of such Act (30 U.S.C. 1001(e)) as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act;

- (3) the term "fund" means the Geothermal Resources Development Fund established by section 204(a); and

- (4) the term "Project" means the Geothermal Energy Coordination and Management Project established by section 101(a).

TITLE I—GEOTHERMAL ENERGY COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established the Geothermal Energy Coordination and Management Project.

(b) (1) The Project shall be composed of five members as follows:

(A) one appointed by the President;

(B) an Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation;

(C) an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior;

(D) an Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(E) the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

(2) The member appointed by the President under paragraph (1)(A) shall act as Chairman of the Project.

(c) The Project shall have overall responsibility for the provision of effective management and coordination with respect to a national geothermal energy research, development, and demonstration program, including—

(A) the determination and evaluation of the resource base;

(B) research and development with respect to exploration, extraction, and utilization technologies;

(C) the demonstration of appropriate technologies; and

(D) the loan guaranty program under title II.

(d) (1) The Project shall carry out its responsibilities under this section in cooperation with the following Federal agencies:

(A) the Department of the Interior, the responsibilities of which shall include evaluation and assessment of the resource base;

(B) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the responsibilities of which

shall include the provision of management capability, evaluation and assessment of the resource base, and the development of technologies pursuant to section 103(b);

(C) the Atomic Energy Commission, the responsibilities of which shall include the development of technologies; and

(D) the National Science Foundation, the responsibilities of which shall include basic and applied research and overall funding pursuant to section 102(b).

(2) Upon request of the Project, the head of any such agency shall detail or assign, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, any of the personnel of such agency to the Project to assist it in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act.

(e) The Project shall have exclusive authority with respect to the establishment or approval of programs or projects under this Act, except that the agency involved in any particular program or project shall be responsible for the operation and administration of such program or project.

(f) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(60) Chairman, Geothermal Energy Coordination and Management Project."

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL SCIENCE
FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

SEC. 102. (a) Section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The Director shall provide support for programs relating to geothermal energy research, development, and demonstration, as provided in section 102(b) of the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974."

(b)(1) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall support and fund geothermal energy research, development, and demonstration programs initiated and approved by the Project.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not be construed as a restriction upon the authority of the Director to support and fund basic research. Such provisions shall not be construed as authorizing the Director to support and fund any demonstration project not included in a program initiated and approved as described in paragraph (1) if such authority is not otherwise granted by any other provision of law.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ACT OF 1958

SEC. 103. (a) Section 203 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2473) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Administration shall carry out research, development, and related activities in geothermal energy technology, as provided in section 103(b) of the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974."

(b) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized and directed to undertake and carry out those programs assigned to it by the project.

(c) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized and directed to prepare and transmit to the Chairman of the Project within six months from the enactment of this legislation a proposal for the employment of space technologies and the services and facilities of NASA to aid in the development of geothermal energy resources.

RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND ASSESSMENT
PROGRAM

SEC. 104. (a) The Project shall initiate a resource exploration and assessment program

with the objective of making regional and national appraisal of all types of geothermal resources, including identification of promising target areas for industrial exploration and development. The specific goals shall include—

(1) the improvement of geophysical, geochemical, geological, and hydrological techniques necessary for locating and evaluating geothermal resources;

(2) the development of better methods for predicting the power potential and longevity of geothermal reservoirs;

(3) the determination and assessment of the nature and power potential of the deeper unexplored parts of high temperature geothermal convection systems; and

(4) the survey and assessment of regional and national geothermal resources of all types.

(b) The Project, acting through the Geological Survey and other appropriate agencies, shall—

(1) develop and carry out a general plan for the orderly inventorying of all forms of geothermal resources of the Federal lands and, where consistent with property rights and determined by the Project to be in the national interest, of non-Federal lands;

(2) conduct regional surveys, based upon such a general plan, using innovative geologic, geophysical, geochemical, and drilling techniques, which will lead to a national inventory of geothermal resources in the United States;

(3) publish and make available maps, reports, and other documents developed from such surveys to encourage and facilitate the commercial development of geothermal resources for beneficial use and consistent with the national interest;

(4) make such recommendations for legislation as may from time to time appear to be necessary to make Federal leasing policy for geothermal resources consistent with known inventories of various resource types, with the current state of technologies for geothermal energy development, and with current evaluations of the environmental impacts of such development; and

(5) participate with appropriate Federal agencies, State governments, and private organizations in research to develop, improve, and test technologies for the discovery and evaluation of all forms of geothermal resources, and conduct research into the principles controlling the location, occurrence, size, temperature, energy content, productivity, and economic lifetimes of geothermal reservoirs.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 105. (a) The Project shall initiate a research and development program for the purpose of resolving all major technical problems inhibiting the fullest possible commercial utilization of geothermal resources in the United States. The specific goals of such program shall include—

(1) the development of effective and efficient drilling methods to operate at high temperatures in formations of geothermal interest;

(2) the development of reliable predictive methods and control techniques for the production of geothermal fluids and reservoirs;

(3) the exploitation of new concepts for fracturing rock to permit recovery of contained heat reserves;

(4) the improvement of equipment and technology for the extraction of geothermal energy from reservoirs;

(5) the development of improved methods for converting geothermal energy and associated fluids and products (including methane) to useful forms;

(6) the development of improved methods for controlling emissions and wastes from geothermal utilization facilities, including new monitoring methods to any extent necessary.

(7) the development and evaluation of waste disposal control technologies and the evaluation of surface and subsurface environmental effects of geothermal development;

(8) the improvement of the technical capability to predict environmental impacts resulting from the development of geothermal energy resources, the preparation of environmental impact statements, and the assuring of compliance with applicable standards and criteria;

(9) the identification of social, legal, and economic problems associated with geothermal development (both locally and regionally) for the purpose of developing policy and providing a framework of policy alternatives for the commercial utilization of geothermal resources; and

(10) the provision for an adequate supply of scientists to perform required geothermal research and development activities.

(b) The Project shall implement a coordinated program of research and development in order to demonstrate the technical means for the extraction and utilization of the resource base, including any byproducts of such base, and in order to accomplish the goals established by subsection (a).

DEMONSTRATION

SEC. 106. (a) The Project shall initiate a program to design and construct geothermal demonstration plants. The specific goals of such program shall include—

(1) the development of economical geothermal energy production systems and components which meet environmental standards;

(2) the design and construction of plants to produce electrical power and, where appropriate, the large-scale production and utilization of any useful byproducts (including oil, hydrocarbon gas, and helium);

(3) the continuous operation of such plants for a period of time;

(4) the provision of experimental test beds for component testing and evaluation by laboratories operated by the Federal Government, industry, or institutions of higher education;

(5) the involvement of engineers, analysts, technicians, and managers from industry field and powerplant development, which shall lead to the early industrial exploitation of advanced geothermal resources; and

(6) the provision for an adequate supply of trained geothermal engineers and technicians.

(b)(1) In carrying out its responsibilities under this section, the Project may provide for the establishment of a separate demonstration project with respect to each geothermal resource base involved, which shall include, as appropriate, all of the exploration, siting, drilling, pilot plant construction and operation, demonstration plant construction and operation, and other facilities and activities which may be necessary for the generation of electric energy and the utilization of geothermal resource byproducts (including oil, hydrocarbon gas, and helium).

(2) Plants and other real property utilized or involved in any demonstration project under this section may be purchased, leased, constructed, or otherwise established or obtained by the Project, through the appropriate Federal agencies. Such agencies may obtain such plants and other real property under appropriate contracts or arrangements with other public or private persons or agencies.

(3) (A) During the conduct of any demonstration project under this section the agency designated by the Project to conduct such project shall take such steps as may be necessary to dispose of all of the electric energy and other geothermal resource byproducts of such project, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as such agency may determine to be feasible and in support of the objectives of this Act.

(B) To the maximum extent possible the disposition of byproducts under paragraph (1) shall be accomplished through the sale of such byproducts (including oil, hydrocarbon gas, and helium) for commercial utilization, on such terms and conditions and in accordance with such plans as such agency may prescribe or develop.

(4) At the conclusion of the program under this section or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, the agencies designated by the Project to conduct demonstration projects under this section shall, by sale, lease, or otherwise, dispose of all projects which they have undertaken pursuant to this section (including mineral rights therein) on such terms and conditions as such agencies determine to be reasonable, or, if the disposition of any such project or any part thereof on reasonable terms and conditions is not possible or feasible, the agency involved shall under appropriate contracts or other arrangements provide for the disposition of all of the electric energy and other geothermal resource byproducts (including oil, hydrocarbon gas, and helium) of such project or part thereof.

(5) The selection of a siting for each demonstration plant shall be made only from known geothermal resources areas.

TITLE II—LOAN GUARANTIES

ESTABLISHMENT OF LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) It is the policy of the Congress to encourage and assist in the commercial development of practicable means to produce useful energy from geothermal resources with environmentally acceptable processes. Accordingly, it is the policy of the Congress to facilitate such commercial development by authorizing the Chairman of the Project to designate an appropriate Federal agency to guarantee loans for such purposes.

(b) In order to encourage the commercial production of energy from geothermal resources, the head of the designated agency is authorized to guarantee, and to enter into commitments to guarantee, banks or other financial institutions against loss of principal or interest on loans made by such institutions to qualified borrowers for the purposes of—

- (1) the determination and evaluation of the resource base;
- (2) research and development with respect to extraction and utilization technologies;
- (3) acquiring rights in geothermal resources; and
- (4) development, construction, and operation of facilities for the demonstration or commercial production of energy from geothermal resources.

(c) Any guaranty under this title shall apply only to so much of the principal amount of any loans as does not exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project with respect to which the loan is made.

(d) Loan guaranties under this title shall be on such terms and conditions as the head of the designated agency determines, except that a guaranty shall be made under this title only if—

- (1) the loan involved is at a rate of interest which does not exceed the prevailing interest rates for conventional construction loans;
- (2) the terms of the loan require full repayment within thirty years after the date thereof;

(3) in the judgment of the head of the designated agency, the amount of the loan (when combined with amounts available to the qualified borrower from other sources) will be sufficient to carry out the project; or

(4) in the judgment of the head of the designated agency, there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan by the qualified borrower of the guaranteed indebtedness.

(e) The head of the designated agency shall not guarantee any loan for any project the

amount of which exceeds \$25,000,000, nor guarantee any combination of loans for any single qualified borrower in an amount exceeding \$50,000,000.

(f) As used in this title, the term "qualified borrower" means any public or private agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, political subdivision, or other legal entity which (as determined by the head of the designated agency) has presented satisfactory evidence of an interest in geothermal resources and is capable of performing research or completing the development and production of energy in an acceptable manner.

PAYMENT OF INTEREST

SEC. 202. (a) With respect to any loan guaranteed pursuant to this title, the head of the designated agency is authorized to enter into a contract to pay, and to pay, the lender for and on behalf of the borrower the interest charges which become due and payable on the unpaid balance of any such loan if the head of the designated agency finds—

- (1) that the borrower is unable to meet interest charges, and that it is in the public interest to permit the borrower to continue to pursue the purposes of his project, and that the probable net cost to the Government in paying such interest will be less than that which would result in the event of a default, and
- (2) the amount of such interest charges which the head of the designated agency is authorized to pay shall be no greater than an amount equal to the average prime interest rate for the preceding fiscal year as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury plus one-half of 1 per centum.

(b) In the event of any default by a qualified borrower on a guaranteed loan, the head of the designated agency is authorized to make payment in accordance with the guaranty, and the Attorney General shall take such action as may be appropriate to recover the amounts of such payments from such assets of the defaulting borrower as are associated with the project.

PERIOD OF GUARANTIES AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE

SEC. 203. No loan guaranties shall be made, or interest assistance contract entered into, pursuant to this title, after the expiration of the ten-calendar-year period following the date of enactment of this Act.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

SEC. 204. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a Geothermal Resources Development Fund, which shall be available to the head of the designated agency for carrying out the loan guaranty and interest assistance program authorized by this title, including the payment of administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

(b) There shall be paid into the fund the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 304(b) and such amounts as may be returned to the United States pursuant to section 202(b), and the amounts in the fund shall remain available until expended, except that after the expiration of the ten-year term established by section 203, such amounts in the fund which are not required to secure outstanding guaranty obligations shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) Business-type financial reports covering the operations of the fund shall be submitted to the Congress by the head of the designated agency annually upon the completion of an appropriate accounting period.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENT

SEC. 301. In the conduct of its activities, the Project and any participating public or private persons or agencies shall place particular emphasis upon the objective of as-

suming that the environment is effectively protected and that such activities do not threaten the safety of persons or property; and the program under title I shall include such special research and development as may be necessary for the achievement of that objective.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) The Chairman of the Project shall submit to the President and the Congress at least every six months a full and complete report of its activities, including such projections and estimates as may be necessary to evaluate the progress of the national geothermal energy research, development, and demonstration program and to provide the basis for as accurate a judgment as is possible concerning the extent to which the objectives of this Act will have been achieved by June 30, 1979.

(b) No later than one year after the termination of each demonstration project under section 106, the Chairman of the Project shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report on its activities related to each project, including his recommendations with respect to any further legislative, administrative, and other actions which should be taken in support of the objectives of this Act.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 303. Within sixty days after the effective date of the law creating a permanent Federal organization or agency having jurisdiction over the energy research and development functions of the United States (or within sixty days after the enactment of this Act if the effective date of such law occurs prior to the enactment of this Act), all of the research and development functions (and other functions) vested in the Project under this Act, along with related records, documents, personnel, obligations, and other items to the extent necessary or appropriate, shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Management and Budget, be transferred to and vested in such organization or agency.

Upon the establishment of a permanent Federal organization or agency having jurisdiction over the energy research and development of the United States, and when all research and development (and other) functions of the Project are transferred, the members of the Project shall provide advice and counsel to the head of such organization or agency in accordance with arrangements made at that time.

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 304. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation such sums, not exceeding \$300 million in the aggregate for the period July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1980, as may be necessary for such Foundation to support and fund geothermal energy research, development, and demonstration programs initiated and approved by the Project, and as may be necessary to carry out the other provisions of this Act.

(b) In addition to sums authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the fund not to exceed \$50,000,000 annually such sums, to carry out the provisions of the loan guaranty program by the Project under title II.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XLIII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the April 8 issue of

New York magazine is a shocking exposé of the huge handgun trade being carried on in this country and the many gun killings that ensue because we have no adequate gun control laws:

HOW GUNS GET TO TOWN: TRACING THE SOUTHERN CONNECTION
(By Steven D. Brill)

About a half-mile out of Greenville, South Carolina (population 61,000), a sign proclaims "Discounts on Guns, Ammo, Fireworks." The sign draws attention to a one-story stucco-and-brick store called Roberts Trading Post.

On February 15, 1972, Richard Thrift Jr., a fair-haired, 22-year-old native of South Carolina, did some shopping at Roberts Trading Post. At about nine o'clock that morning, he walked through the screen door and put six crisp hundred-dollar bills and four twenties on the glass display counter. He chatted with the owner's son, Blakely, then got busy signing a pile of federal forms. In the meantime, Blakely went to the back storeroom, took out five cartons containing 90 handguns and loaded them into Thrift's station wagon.

Richard Thrift came back six more times that day and bought a total of 241 handguns. Because South Carolina is one of 42 states that place no restrictions on the sale of handguns, nothing about any of these transactions, per se, was illegal. But Richard Thrift had friends, and this is what happened:

In the early morning of February 9, 1973, a man was shot and killed in the South Bronx in a dispute over a lovers' triangle.

On March 5, 1973, the police picked up a seventeen-year-old in Harlem because they thought he was selling heroin. When they frisked him they found a handgun in his right boot.

On March 27, 1973, a man was arrested outside a bar in Brooklyn's 76th Precinct after he allegedly threatened someone with a handgun by firing four or five shots in the air.

Eight days after that, someone used a handgun to put two bullets into a police officer near Bruckner Expressway.

The next day, another kid was picked up carrying a handgun in a schoolyard, this time in the South Bronx.

Each of the weapons involved in these and in ten similar police actions in New York last year was one of 241 handguns that Richard Thrift Jr. had bought from Roberts Trading Post, February 15, 1972.

The way these guns made their way from Greenville to the streets of Manhattan, the Bronx, and Brooklyn was not unusual or accidental. And the pattern is the same for Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, and other major cities of the North. In 1972, Richard Thrift Jr., an unemployed high school dropout, spent about \$40,000 at the Trading Post. He bought 3,600 handguns from Roberts that year and all of them eventually hit the streets of New York City. Thrift was a pawn in a sophisticated black-market network that took the guns from Roberts Trading Post, via Thrift, to two middlemen near Greenville, to two other middlemen in North Carolina, onto a truck bound for a factory in Brooklyn, and from the factory to about a dozen street sellers in the Bronx.

But as sizable as Thrift's contribution to the city's street arsenal may seem, it represents only a fraction of the tens of thousands of guns that are now flowing through extensive black market networks into New York and other big cities. Something like 100,000 handguns were sold on the black market last year in New York City, and the traffic will continue until the national policy on guns becomes something other than benign neglect.

Last year for the first time, the sources of guns being used to commit crimes in New

York City were traced by a special unit of the Police Intelligence Division at the direct request of then-Mayor John V. Lindsay. Lindsay had asked for the study as part of a campaign for national gun control. Strict local firearms laws had helped keep New York's murder rate lower than major cities that didn't have firearms restrictions. But more important in the campaign for national gun legislation would be proof that the guns used to commit crimes in New York City were coming from other jurisdictions where they were easier to get.

Working with the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (A.T.F.), the special police unit of the Intelligence Division took all the handguns seized from people arrested for murder, robbery, assault, and other crimes in the first six months of 1973, and traced them back to their original point of retail sales.

They found that 49—only 3 per cent—of the 1,802 traceable handguns had come from New York State.

Twenty per cent of the handguns were traced to thefts, a majority of which took place while large quantities of weapons were being stored or shipped by manufacturers.

More than 75 per cent of the handguns came from retail sales in a state other than New York, or, in thirteen cases, a foreign country. Most significant, 69 per cent of the handguns traced to other states came from just four states in the South: South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and Florida. Finally, 427 of the handguns, almost one-third of the out-of-state total, came from South Carolina.

The Intelligence Division's study did more than prove that guns used in New York were coming from somewhere else. It documented for the first time "the existence of an extensive black market . . . in illegal handguns in New York City."

The Gun Control Act of 1968 requires the purchaser of a gun to fill out a form for the retailer stating his name and swearing that he is not a minor, a felon, an addict, or a lunatic. He must also show proof that he is a resident of the state where the gun is being purchased. While the buyer's self-assessment of his mental state and criminal record does little to keep guns out of the hand of criminals or the mentally ill, the requirement that his name and residence be recorded proved enormously informative to the Intelligence Division and A.T.F. as they made their traces. When a name such as Richard Thrift began turning up five, ten, or twenty times on the 1,082 traces, they realized that organized gun runners were using agents to buy weapons the black marketeers wanted.

The process of identifying these operations by looking at the results of the traces was so simple that, according to A.T.F. Director Rex D. Davis, the police-A.T.F. survey resulted in some 40 cases like Richard Thrift's being developed. Police sources report that arrests in many cases are anticipated shortly under the provision of the 1968 federal law that prohibits interstate sale of handguns except between two licensed dealers. In addition, Davis initiated surveys in New Orleans, Detroit, and Atlanta that produced consistent results, and now plans similar surveys for major Western cities.

In New York, the size and nature of the gun-running operations revealed by the police study moved then-Police Commissioner Donald F. Cawley to establish a Gun Unit within the Organized Crime Control Bureau to work full time with A.T.F. in penetrating the black market.

As the man who commands the Intelligence Division, Deputy Chief Howard Metzendorf is the city's, and probably the nation's, ranking expert on the gun black market. Metzendorf believes that "The black market is so extensive and so hard to control that anyone out there who wants a gun can get one. . . . You can get a cheap one, the

Saturday Night Special, for 50 or 60 bucks, or you can get good ones. You can get rifles, shotguns, high-quality handguns, even a machine gun if you've got the money."

Based on talks with Metzendorf and Raymond Kiely, A.T.F. North Atlantic regional director, and using an Intelligence Division estimate that there are now about 1 million illegal handguns in the city, my own estimates is that a minimum of 100,000 handguns are sold annually on the black market in New York City. Though Metzendorf and Kiely do not endorse any estimate, each has said he has no reason to believe that the number 100,000 is too high. "The only sure thing," as one of Metzendorf's Harlem-based detectives put it, "is that all the guns you want are out there."

Metzendorf and his detectives point to three different sources of black-market guns. First, there are those that come from big-time operations like the one that involved Thrift.

Federal agents now believe that some 40,000 handguns came to New York City this way in the last five years from the Greenville area alone—more than enough to equip the entire New York City Police Department. Most of these were Saturday Night Specials purchased in South Carolina for about \$10 and sold here for \$80 to \$100.

A second source of black-market guns is theft. In the Intelligence Division report, 20 per cent of the handguns surveyed were found to have been stolen. The police believe that many black marketeers take advantage of insufficient security where guns are stored or shipped, and steal them in large numbers. This is how many higher quality handguns reach the black market. For example, the police recently arrested a narcotics dealer who sold eleven Colts to an undercover agent for \$250 each. It turned out that they were part of a shipment of 125 that had been stolen off a pier the year before. Thefts are also believed to be a prime source of the rifles and shotguns that are traded on the streets.

A third source of illegal guns are self-suppliers or individual, one-shot, entrepreneurs. The police believe that for every organized gun-running operation there are several casual transactions bringing smaller quantities of guns into the city. A favorite example is the New Yorker visiting his family in Virginia who is lured by a highway billboard there advertising "Guns For Sale, No Permit Needed." If he can use his family's address to prove he lives in Virginia—and often even if he can't—he'll be able to buy himself a handgun. In fact, it will be so easy that he may even decide to finance his trip by buying another and selling it to a friend when he gets back up North.

The more serious self-suppliers are a slight variation on this one-shot pattern. For example, a leader of a Chinese youth gang was recently caught dragging about a hundred handguns through Grand Central Terminal in two stuffed suitcases, which he was allegedly bringing back from the South.

It is not difficult to verify firsthand the cops' worst fears about guns being "out there." One afternoon last week I sat at a table in an abandoned firehouse with five members of a Lower East Side youth council and asked each of them if he could get me a gun if I gave him a hundred dollars. All five said they could do it easily and that I could even get change for the hundred if I didn't want an expensive "piece."

They also agreed that students at many of the city's junior and senior high schools are now frequently armed. "They sell 'em in the bathrooms," one reported. "I know this guy who sells .22's and .38's in Chelsea. . . . He sold one right on the spot to a kid who'd been hit with a baseball bat."

The gun black market is in fact so well known and well developed on the streets that two of the five kids who talked about

it casually listed the same four Southern states that the Intelligence Division's report had identified.

Chief Metzendorf didn't earn his command by being an idealistic booster of liberal causes. He's a tough career cop, but he readily endorses his report's conclusion that the only answer is a federal gun law patterned after the state's Sullivan law as it is administered in New York City by the Police Department. This would require that all firearms—both hand and long guns—be registered, that all firearms owners be licensed, that Saturday Night Specials (cheap handguns) be banned, and that all those who want a handgun prove a specific, legitimate need for the weapon before they can get a license to buy it. The police insist that banning Saturday Night Specials will not be enough, since more costly handguns and sawed-off shotguns—already major threats—would quickly fill the gap in the criminals' arsenal. Says Police Commissioner Michael Codd: "I would like to see handguns limited to those in the military, the police, and private security who need them for good and sufficient reason." Such a need requirement would certainly have prevented Richard Thrift's shopping sprees.

The Nixon administration has consistently opposed federal gun control on the basis that this is not an interstate concern, but instead should be considered, if at all, by each of the states on an individual basis.

The President's personal contribution to the dialogue was a statement at a press conference in 1972 following the shooting of Governor Wallace. Asked about gun control, Nixon said that a federal law banning the importation of Saturday Night Specials might be worth considering (but in fact, such a law was passed in 1968, and *domestically* made Saturday Night Specials are now the only ones being sold in America!).

According to his confidential assistant, James Duerk, Attorney General William Saxbe feels "there are too many gun laws on the books as it is, and they haven't worked. . . . What good would a national law do?" Asked about the interstate black market in handguns as an argument for national legislation, Duerk said that he "hadn't heard about it," but that "the attorney general feels in general that the way to fight crime is to begin at home."

Rex Davis, a career Treasury agent who has been A.T.F.'s director since 1972, has a different perspective: "If drug abuse is the nation's number one problem, firearms abuse is definitely number two. His superiors in the Nixon administration don't seem to share his concern. While there is now a special White House office of drug abuse, A.T.F. is still buried in the Treasury Department with Internal Revenue, Customs, and nine other bureaus. Still more indicative of where A.T.F. stands on the federal totem pole is Davis's admission that he has never once been invited to meet with either President Nixon or even Treasury Secretary George Shultz to discuss the bureau's work. While there are now about 1,500 federal narcotics agents assigned to New York City, there are 63 A.T.F. agents here, and about half of their time is spent enforcing tobacco and alcohol laws.

The administration's lack of interest in A.T.F. is further illustrated by White House attempts to use the bureau as a patronage dumping ground for two now-infamous Watergate figures. According to statements made last June by former Commissioner of Internal Revenue Randolph W. Thrower, while commissioner of I.R.S. in 1970, he was pressured by White House officials, including John Ehrlichman, to name either Gordon Liddy or John Caulfield as director of A.T.F. (A.T.F. was then a sub-unit of Thrower's I.R.S.) Thrower says he successfully resisted all attempts to place Liddy at A.T.F., something even the White House must now be thankful for since the would-be director

is reported by Jack Anderson to have subsequently dabbled in the gun black market himself by going over the D.C. border to Virginia to buy handguns for some members of the plumbing crew. However, Thrower did relent on Caulfield, and he was named assistant director of criminal enforcement, a position he held until his Watergate-related activities became known.

The government's relationship with the firearms industry fits the same pattern of benign neglect. Although A.T.F. officials are quick to volunteer how "cooperative" the gun makers are in giving A.T.F. all the information that is required of them, they also concede that there is not much they are required to give. The companies keep their own records of where the 5-million-plus guns they make for civilians each year are shipped and who buys them, and they supply this information to A.T.F. only when a specific inquiry is made about a specific gun. While the companies give A.T.F. data on how many guns they each make every year, A.T.F. respects the industry's wish that these figures be kept secret. Although A.T.F. and city police know that thousands of guns are stolen from the manufacturers each year and that these products invariably end up on the black market, the companies are not required to take any specific security measures to prevent such thefts. In fact, unlike manufacturers and transporters of explosives or drugs, gun companies are not even required to report thefts.

Apparently, the gun makers feel even less accountable to the public. The only difference in this regard between two Saturday Night Special producers, Clerke in California and E.G. in Florida, and the two leading and supposedly most "responsible" handgun makers, Colt and Smith & Wesson, is that the makers of cheap guns won't talk to reporters at all, while "responsible" companies have public-relations vice-presidents who talk to reporters.

Question: How many handguns a year do you make?

Mr. McMahon (Smith & Wesson): "I don't want to be quoted on anything, but I can tell you that we don't discuss our sales."

Mr. Cook (Colt): "I won't get into questions like that."

Question: Were your sales up or down last year?

McMahon: "I couldn't answer that. . . . Why do you want to know?"

Cook: "That would be confidential information."

Question: Police say there's a black market in guns coming from the South to the North. Do you ship a higher proportion of your products to the South?

McMahon: "I have no idea how many are shipped where. And I couldn't tell you if I did know. . . . Once they leave here we can't worry about them."

Cook: "I couldn't answer that."

Question: What about thefts? Are they a problem?

McMahon: "We don't lose any guns that way. Remember, this is all off the record. . . . Is your name listed on the masthead of the magazine?"

Cook: "We don't want to address ourselves to that at all, except to say if it's any problem it's a concern to us."

Though its relationship with the press and the people may not be well cultivated, the gun industry seems to have quite a bit of input with the people's representatives in Washington. Each of the companies employs its own lobbyist in the capital, and the industry funds a joint lobby called the National Shooting Sports Foundation.

There is also the National Rifle Association. The N.R.A. boasts more than a million members, including President Nixon and several dozen congressmen and senators, and it is well known for burying Congress in pro-gun

mail every time firearms legislation is being considered. What is not as well known is the source of all the association's funds and the reason for its tax-exempt status as a nonpolitical "educational" organization. The N.A.R. firmly asserts that none of its more than \$8-million annual income comes from the firearms industry. "Our constituency is the consumers of firearms, not the manufacturers," says N.R.A. spokesman Steve Hines. Asked about allegations that the industry helped fund the N.R.A. through ads taken in the association's magazine, *The American Rifleman*, Hines produced a glossy annual report that showed that the magazine had not made any money in 1972. Hines said the financial statement had been prepared by an "outside, independent auditor." But he refused to name the auditor because "that is confidential information."

Whatever the source of the N.R.A.'s money and motivation, everyone in Washington agrees it is a force to be reckoned with. Even A.T.F. officials confided that they must be careful about tightening supervision of the industry because of the gun lobby's power.

The N.R.A. is not at all afraid of using that power. Last year, when the National Council of the Y.W.C.A. called for federal legislation to license handgun owners, the association organized a letter-writing and publicity campaign urging all local United Way drives to throw the Y.W.C.A. out of the Community Chests because of the stand it had taken in favor of "gun confiscation." In fact, the tax-exempt N.R.A. suggested that the Y.W.C.A.'s tax-exempt status be reconsidered because of the stand it had taken on a "controversial issue."

While the Y.W.C.A. didn't back down, most legislators would run for cover under that kind of assault. Public-opinion polls have consistently reported that more than 70 per cent of Americans favor a national firearms laws that would treat guns like cars by registering them and licensing their users. Yet only a few congressmen and senators are willing to fight for it.

Under its previous administration, New York City was perhaps the strongest lobbyist in Washington for federal gun control. Former Mayor Lindsay regularly raised the issue with congressional leaders, and the Intelligence Division's study is one of the many instances when he made sure the New York City Police Department was the congressional gun control advocates' best information resource. In 1973, the mayor even interceded with a House subcommittee to help A.T.F. get its budget approved. With the change in administrations, the city's position on gun control is now in doubt. Sidney Baumgarten, an assistant to Mayor Beame who has been given staff responsibility for the issue, says that "Beame hasn't focused on it yet." More ominous than that, however, is the fact that Baumgarten is a long-time member of the National Rifle Association, and though he believes that handguns should be controlled, he agrees with the Nixon administration that "federal controls probably aren't the answer." Asked if the interstate black-market traffic might be a good argument for uniform national controls, the mayor's assistant took the basic N.R.A. position that the black market "only shows that no laws can really be effective and that we can never solve the problem with a law," a view that is sure to please those in Congress who would rather not face the issue.

In the meantime, guns continue to be sold around the country like bubble gum: a new handgun every thirteen seconds, and a new rifle or shotgun every eleven seconds, with maybe a dozen states or cities having any controls at all on who can buy them. Americans are dying by gunfire at the rate of 69 a day, and the murder rate in the United States is 10, 20, and 30 times that of every other industrial democracy.

But while the nation waits for Congress to

act, the federal government need not be paralyzed. A.T.F.'s recent successes in the cases it has had time to pursue demonstrate that a separate Bureau of Firearms Control, freed from its alcohol and tobacco duties, and given a high-priority allocation of manpower and funds, could make a dent in the interstate black market.

Even without this mandate from above, the bureau itself could help by tightening the regulations it now uses to supervise the handgun trade. For example, it could require that dealers send it immediate special notice of anyone who buys more than one or two handguns at a time. In this way, bulk buyers like Richard Thrift could be investigated when they buy the guns, instead of by chance later on when one of the weapons they bought is traced back to a crime. Also, A.T.F. could start demanding more detailed production and shipment records from manufacturers, and Congress could give it the power to make manufacturers, shippers, and dealers take sufficient security precautions and report thefts.

Another step short of national licensing and registration that most police endorse is the enforcement of stiffer penalties for violators of existing federal and state gun laws and for those who use guns to commit crimes. The maximum sentence a large-scale gun dealer can now receive under federal law is five years, and in New York someone caught with an illegal gun can get a year at the most.

Whatever their views on these aspects of the penal code, most police agree that the real answer is legislation that takes guns seriously enough to control who can buy them in the first place. Detective Gloria O'Meara of the Intelligence Division played a key role in preparing the handgun report. She summarized the problem this way: "When I started this thing I really had an open mind about gun control, especially national controls. But you look at the numbers and you understand what the problem is. We can only control this in New York or anywhere else if they pass a good law in Washington. Until then, anyone who wants a gun here will be able to get one, and people will keep getting killed."

FORMER SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, Senator Jordan was a man whose life was widely spread, both in its roots and branches—it has taken nourishment from many sources, grown in many directions, and has borne a great variety of fruit. It has been richly fertilized, and it has been abundantly fertile. He was the son of Dr. Henry Harrison Jordan, Methodist circuit rider in the late 19th and 20th centuries whose four sons made notable contributions to North Carolina.

In addition to Senator Everett Jordan, they were the late Dr. Henry Jordan, former State Highway Commission chairman; Dr. Frank Jordan, who followed in his father's footsteps as a minister; and Charles E. "Dr. Charlie" Jordan, who served with distinction as a long-time official at Duke University.

The Jordans, all of them, were, and are, individuals of sterling character and unusual enterprise. The characteristic

which marked them well was a pervading sense of humor, innate modesty and civility and devotion to public service. Their breed is rare, in ours or any age, and should not be forgotten. The Jordans will be remembered as one of North Carolina's great families.

The one of these four sons who went wrong and went into politics was Senator Jordan.

In characterizing his 15 years' service in the Senate, words like "kind," "gracious," "considerate," "sense of humor" are what you hear from his colleagues. But the words "kind and gentle" were always yoked with "effective." Some people are boxers and some are sluggers. Senator Jordan was a boxer. As a rule, the sluggers get the headlines but the boxers get results. Senator Jordan knew how to make things happen in the Senate.

He was particularly effective as chairman of the Senate Rules Committee. In a job that involves saying "No" most of the time, he endeared himself to his colleagues by not saying "Yes" but the way in which he said "No"—with complete understanding, patience, and always with kindness.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, he was instrumental in the building of the Scott Reservoir, the falls of the Neuse Reservoir, and the New Hope—now the Senator Everett Jordan—Dam. He did much to create jobs and businesses in North Carolina by the development of the Ports of Wilmington and Morehead City, and by the improvement of navigation on the Cape Fear.

A fitting epitaph would be: "He did what needed to be done, not what made you look good."

He knew how to make things happen in the Senate. One of his fellow Senators said:

The Senate is a catalyst which absorbs diverse views and disparate talents of its separate Members and gently enfold them into a body of tradition which binds and enriches and transcends its individual Members and inspires each to greater efforts in pursuit of the public interest. I have always appreciated Everett Jordan as an important element in that catalyst.

No mention of his career would be complete without mention of his remarkable wife, Katherine.

My wife tells me that Mrs. Jordan has been absolutely wonderful to all the wives in our North Carolina delegation in Washington. Emily says she could never have lived through that first year in Washington without Katherine. Both Senator and Mrs. Jordan radiated happiness and if happiness is the dividend on a well-invested life, then no two people in the world have more wisely invested their lives to give the most people the most happiness.

I would not try to characterize Senator Jordan's political philosophy as liberal or conservative. Rather, I believe he agrees with Emerson:

The lesson of life is to believe what the years and centuries have to say against the hours.

He was a conservative in the deepest values of life. But he was not a fiscal

conservative in the sense of "one who votes against spending in someone else's district." He was not an exponent of the "gankplank syndrome", that is the syndrome that says, "I've gotten where I want to go; now let's pull up the gangplank and leave everyone else out." He was a liberal in his compassion.

When we look back over his career we can say about him what Walter Lippmann said about Justice Holmes on his 75th birthday:

He has lost nothing that young men have, and he has gained what a fine palette can take from the world. If it is true that one generation after another has depended upon its young to equip it with gaiety and enthusiasm, it is no less true that each generation of the young depends upon those who have lived to illustrate what can be done with experience.

Senator Jordan's life illustrates what can be done with experience and we are all the richer for it.

I enclose two newspaper articles which give an excellent account of the reach of his career.

[From the Burlington (N.C.) Daily Times-News, Mar. 18, 1974]

OVERFLOW CROWD HONORS SENATOR JORDAN
(By Don Bolden)

SAXAPAHAW.—B. Everett Jordan left this little Alamance County community for the last time yesterday.

In the past, he had left many times—off to Washington to serve his state as a United States senator, or off to the capitol of the world as a representative of his nation. But he always returned to the banks of Haw River to be a part of his community and to play a leading role in Sellers Manufacturing Co.

But yesterday, he left in death, the flag in front of the Saxapahaw Post Office hanging at half-staff in final tribute to Saxapahaw's leading citizen.

But he did not go alone.

The great and the not-so-great filled the little white Saxapahaw Methodist Church to overflowing, with the church yard holding the sizable overflow and many people remained in their cars. There were senators and congressman, along with workers from the mill just across the river. And they had one thing in common on this windy March afternoon—they had lost a friend.

Sen. Jordan died Friday morning at the age of 77, losing a long battle to cancer.

His funeral service yesterday was a simple one.

Following the 23rd Psalm, Dr. Howard Wilkerson, president of Greensboro College and former chaplain at Duke University, delivered the eulogy.

Standing behind the flag-draped coffin, he said "a great tree has fallen in God's forest".

He said that when a person dedicates himself to God, it is good, but when many band together, the impact is greater.

Such an impact was felt, he said, from the family of Annie and Henry Jordan, who had six children.

"Never has there been a family which had such an impact in religion, higher education, government and agriculture. No family has ever served the state and nation with more impact than those children and their spouses."

Dr. Wilkerson noted several lessons to be learned from Everett Jordan's life.

"Everett Jordan was regarded as a friend all over. We think of the headlines and overlook the personal element. The lesson we can learn in that we too can be a friend.

"He trusted the Heavenly Father with an almost childlike faith, and don't knock that childlike faith," he added.

Another lesson, he said, comes from Everett Jordan's belief in young people, he said. He said Jordan had sought to influence the young through his support of the Boy Scouts and higher education.

"He listened to young people," Dr. Wilkerson said.

Four years ago, while he was a chaplain at Duke University, he said the young people there were ready "to write off the older generation". Concerned, Dr. Wilkerson sent some of those youngsters to Washington to see Sen. Jordan.

"He talked to them and listened to them. He turned them around in their thinking. He always listened, but he did not always agree".

The speaker noted an entry by one of the senator's colleagues in the Congressional Record—"Everett Jordan was always ready to listen to new ideas and to grow".

He concluded, "These lessons make us better citizens and friends. We can be glad we had such a teacher as Everett Jordan".

After the brief church service, in which the Rev. Murray L. DeHart, church pastor, participated, a funeral procession more than three miles long accompanied his body to Pine Hill Cemetery in Burlington.

There, again, simple rites were conducted, with his brother, Dr. Frank Jordan, participating. There was a scripture reading, followed by the Lord's Prayer. Four scouters from Troop 65, a troop the senator organized in Saxapahaw, folded the flag over the coffin. Members of the troop served as an honor guard.

Scoutmaster Ben Bulla of the troop then presented the flag to Mrs. Jordan, saying "On behalf of the President, this is a symbol of a grateful nation."

A floral tribute from President and Mrs. Nixon stood at one end of the grave. Nearby was a floral replica of the American flag, sent by employees of Sellers Manufacturing Co., the textile mill which Sen. Jordan reopened from bankruptcy in 1927 and saw it move to prosperity.

The senator was buried in a plot with his parents and brother, Dr. Henry Jordan.

Sen. Jesse Helms, who now holds the Senate seat once occupied by Sen. Jordan, was the official representative of the President.

Also present was Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. and Mrs. Ervin. Sen. Ervin was a boyhood friend of Sen. Jordan.

Former Gov. Luther Hodges and his wife also were present. It was Gov. Hodges who appointed Jordan a senator in 1958 at the death of Sen. W. Kerr Scott.

The list of dignitaries read like the "Who's Who" in North Carolina politics.

Gov. and Mrs. Hodges and Sen. and Mrs. Ervin were with the family at the funeral.

Among others attending were Supreme Court Justice and former Gov. Dan K. Moore, Lt. Gov. Jim Hunt, Rep. Richardson Preyer of the Sixth District, Rep. David Henderson of the Third District, State Treasurer Edwin Gill, Commissioner of Agriculture Jim Graham, Insurance Commissioner John Ingram, Labor Commissioner Billy Creel, Atty. Gen. Robert Morgan, SBI Director Charles Dunn, former Congressman Horace R. Kornegay of Washington, Consolidated University President William Friday, Federal Judge Eugene A. Gordon, and former Congressman Paul Kitchener.

Ten members of the former senator's Washington staff also attended, led by William Cochrane, Wes Hayden and Hugh Alexander.

Also attending were Nick Galifianakis, who defeated Sen. Jordan in the 1972 campaign, along with Sen. Ralph Scott, Rep. Jim Long, and numerous Alamance County officials.

Assisting in the arrangements at the rites were members of the Sheriff's Department, the State Highway Patrol, and the El Whitney Fire Department.

But just as prominent in the crowd out-

side the church, braving a stiff March breeze which came off Haw River, were the plain people, the people who live in the little white houses of Saxapahaw, the people who work in the mill across the river. They, too, were friends of the senator.

EX-SENATOR JORDAN DIES AT HOME IN SAXAPAHAW

SAXAPAHAW.—Former U.S. Sen. B. Everett Jordan died at his home here Friday morning at the age of 77, a victim of cancer. He had been seriously ill for several weeks.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m. Sunday in Saxapahaw Methodist Church. Burial will be in Pine Hill Cemetery.

Jordan served as the junior senator from North Carolina from 1958 to January, 1973.

He was appointed by Gov. Luther Hodges to complete the term of Sen. W. Kerr Scott who died in office.

As he sought successive terms in the Senate, he easily disposed of challengers in both the Democratic primaries and the general elections until the primary of 1972 when he was defeated.

He is survived by Mrs. Jordan, the former Katherine McLean of Gastonia; two sons, Ben E. Jordan Jr. of Burlington, and John M. Jordan of Saxapahaw; one daughter, Mrs. Roger Gant of Burlington; one sister, Mrs. Henry Sprinkle of Florida; one brother, Dr. Frank Jordan, a retired Methodist minister, also of Florida; and ten grandchildren.

Officiating at the services will be Dr. Howard Wilkerson, president of Greensboro College; The Rev. Murray DeHart of Saxapahaw Methodist, and the senator's brother.

The body will be at the Rich & Thompson Mortuary in Burlington from noon today. The family will receive there from 7 to 9 p.m.

Memorial contributions may be made to the N.C. Chapter of the American Cancer Society, or to a charity of the donor's choice.

Until his appointment to the Senate, Jordan had never held a major public office.

A gentle, soft-spoken man, he came to national prominence in 1963 when, as chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, he presided over the investigation of the Bobby Baker case.

He was well known and beloved by fellow members of the Congress.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith spoke for many of them when, in 1972, Jordan failed in an effort to gain re-election. She said:

"He was not only a fine senator, but above all, he was a wonderful human being, and the kindest man I have ever known."

William M. Cochrane, administrative assistant to Sen. Jordan through his entire senatorial career, described him as "a warm and generous spirited man of deep compassion for his fellowmen. Their problems were of genuine personal interest to him."

"This was the key to his greatness as a man and as a U.S. senator. He was an unusually effective senator, whose judgment and friendship were valued by his colleagues. He was equally at home with cabinet members and his Saxapahaw neighbors."

In North Carolina he was perhaps best known for his work in agriculture, and for the extensive water resources developments he sponsored over the state.

These included the New Hope Dam in Chatham County, part of a flood control and water recreation project on the upper reaches of the Cape Fear River Basin.

Last October, the Senate honored Jordan by changing the project name to B. Everett Jordan Dam and Lake. He was known to consider this one of his highest honors. It was his hope to attend dedication ceremonies for the dam this spring.

Jordan was less well-known as a philanthropist, but he gave generously to educational institutions all over the state. In recent weeks he donated sizable amounts to Greensboro college, Elon college, Duke University, Methodist college, and Brevard college.

He also contributed \$35,000 to the capital campaign of the Cherokee Council of the Boy Scouts of America, for use in building a dining hall at the Cherokee Scout Reservation in Caswell County.

Jordan was honored as North Carolina Distinguished Citizen of the Year at a testimonial dinner held Feb. 20 in Raleigh by the State Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. It was the foundation's second annual public service award.

More than 400 people paid a minimum of \$25 each to the foundation to attend the banquet. Jordan himself was too ill to be there, but through a special telephone hookup to his Saxapahaw home, he was able to hear many distinguished Tar Heels pay tribute to his lifelong dedication in service to fellowmen.

He was recognized as one of the first North Carolina members of Congress to espouse the cause of federal aid to education.

He helped to pass the Cancer Bill in 1971, the most far-reaching law on cancer research ever to come out of Congress.

He was a sponsor of the first sickle cell anemia bill in the Senate.

Last year, Sen. Jordan served as chairman of the Cancer Drive in North Carolina.

He served as a trustee of Duke University, Elon College and American University in Washington.

Jordan had a reputation as a hard worker. He once said work was his hobby, and that he had done "just about everything to make a nickel."

He was born Sept. 8, 1896, at Ramseur, the son of a Methodist minister. He worked his way from mill superintendent as a young man to become one of the wealthiest textile industrialists in the state. He owned mills at Cedar Falls and Wake Forest which grossed more than \$15 million a year.

He was graduated from Trinity College, now Duke University, in 1916, and served in the U.S. Army from 1918 to 1919, spending the last year with the Army of Occupation in Germany.

During his Senate career, Jordan served as chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, chairman of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, and as a member of the committees on agriculture, public works and printing.

Of the controversial Bobby Baker Case, Sen. Jordan said, "We did a good, conscientious job. We turned all of our evidence over to the grand jury which indicted him. I don't know what else any committee could have done."

The committee hearings were an inquiry into influence peddling charges against Robert G. Baker, one-time secretary to the Senate Democratic majority.

Sen. Jordan was considered a member of the conservative wing of the Democratic party, but he was also known as a dove on the issue of the Vietnam War.

In 1966 he was expressing deep regret that the United States had become involved in the conflict, and at one time said, "I am anxious for us to get out as quickly as possible on an honorable basis."

In 1970 he broke ranks with other Southern Democrats to vote in favor of the Cooper-Church Amendment to the defense appropriations bill. The amendment was passed, limiting the President's power to extend U.S. participation in the war.

When Gov. Hodges named Jordan to the Senate, it was widely speculated that the new Senator was serving only as a seat warmer for the governor. The Raleigh News and Observer said as much in a front page editorial. But when Hodges' term as governor expired, he became Secretary of Commerce to President Kennedy.

Sen. Jordan lost his bid to remain in the Senate in 1972 when Nick Galifianakis defeated him in the Democratic primary. Republican Jesse Helms went on to win the seat in the general election.

Sen. Jordan left the Senate "with no regrets."

Of his position toward the Democratic party, which did not fare well in the 1972 general elections, he said, "I live in a small village (Saxapahaw). We've had a lot of preachers come and go. I didn't like some of them, but I never thought once about leaving the church."

"That's the way I feel about the Democratic party."

WOMEN CHALLENGE THE CORPORATIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times financial pages carried a very interesting article that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. The headline of the story is, "Celanese Gets Proposals of Feminists."

Mr. Speaker, this article will probably become the first of a series of stories as more and more women challenge the policies and practices of our major corporations as they relate to discrimination against women.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

CELANESE GETS PROPOSALS OF FEMINISTS—ONE RESOLUTION SEEKS WOMAN AS DIRECTOR
(By Marilyn Bender)

The first shareholder proposals to be submitted by feminists at a major company's annual meeting were voted on yesterday by stockholders of the Celanese Corporation at the Essex House.

During the discussion the 56-year-old chairman, John W. Brooks, was chided by a male member of a church group supporting the resolutions for his "seeming antagonism" to the women stockholders.

The resolutions, calling for nomination of women to the board of directors, for a report to shareholders on employment practices and for cumulative voting, were defeated as expected. But under the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission, they received enough votes to be resubmitted next year.

The first two proposals received approval of 5.4 per cent and 4.6 per cent, of the shares voting, respectively. The cumulative voting resolution, which has long been a favorite of corporate meeting goers like the brothers Lewis and John Gilbert, and which feminists see as a chance to get their representatives elected to boards, received 14.7 per cent of the nearly 10 million votes cast.

PROPOSALS SUPPORTED

Representatives of the National Organization for Women and of the National Council of Churches spoke in support of the proposals, which were presented by Joan Hull, a merchandising manager in Celanese's fibers division. Last summer, Miss Hull instituted a class action in Federal court charging Celanese with sex discrimination. The litigation involves five other professional employees, one of whom, Donata Delullo, is an associate general counsel for the corporation.

Mr. Brook's attitude toward the women contrasted with his patience toward John Gilbert, whose proposal for preemptive rights for stockholders was approved by 5.8 per cent of the stockholders, and toward Morton Adler of Rye, N.Y., who complimented Mr. Brooks for "the way you've turned the company around."

In his speech to the shareholders, Mr. Brooks announced record first-quarter in-

come for the corporation, which has undergone restructuring of its troubled phases during the last five years.

LAWYER RECRUITED

When Carole De Saram, a vice president of NOW asked Mr. Brooks how many women served on the Corporate Equality Committee of the board of directors, which monitors the company's affirmative action programs, he answered: As you well know before you asked the question, there are no women on the board of directors.

"We are not going to change our procedures because we are doing the right thing," he declared. Later he said that "a lawyer is telling her what to ask."

Another NOW member, Betty Harragan, was critical of the past that Selanese had only 3.6 per cent of women in managerial and supervisory positions last year. She termed it "low quality performance" by the company. Mr. Brooks retorted, "I know you are here to stir up this problem and are not interested in our answers."

Timothy Smith, representing the division of church and society of the National Council of Churches, chided Mr. Brooks for "your seeming antagonisms to our women friends."

"I don't appreciate your attempt to scapegoat the women here," Mr. Smith said.

CONFIDENCE EXPRESSED

"You need a little bit of ferment to bring about change."

Two directors expressed confidence in the corporation's intentions to advance female and minority employees. "The heart of management of the company is in the right place on this issue," said Grayson Murphy, a partner in Shearman & Sterling. Vernon E. Jordan Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, Inc., and the only black on the board said: "I think there is a sense of genuine effort. Obviously nobody is satisfied with the results."

Celanese reported first-quarter income before extraordinary items of \$1.37 per common share, equal to \$120-million, on sales of \$440 million. Earnings were 38 per cent higher and sales were 15 per cent higher than in the first three months of 1973.

"Demand for our entire product line remained firm during the first three months of 1974," Mr. Brooks said. "There is every indication that our business will continue to be strong during the coming months." However, he said he did not expect the same rate of profit increases to continue into the second quarter.

UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE SOVIET UNION NAMED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, earlier I published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a partial list of the Ukrainian women political prisoners held captive in the Soviet Union. Certainly, this is by no means a complete list, since 67 percent of the political prisoners in Russia are Ukrainian.

The following names of prisoners and their brief biographies was compiled by the Association of Ukrainian Women in Great Britain, and covers those persons arrested and persecuted between 1972 and 1973.

I bring the plight of these people to the attention of our colleagues in order to give voice to the fact that these people are individuals deserving of basic human

rights. These rights are being denied them by the Communist slave masters in Moscow, in a direct attempt to silence dissent of that nation's largest minority group.

I include the related list following my remarks:

UKRAINIAN WOMEN POLITICAL PRISONERS ATHENA VOLYCKA

Athena Volycka, a scientist at Lviv University, she stood up in defence of all repressed Ukrainians and protested to the Supreme Court of the USSR, against the savage trial of V. Moroz, demanding an end to the illegal judgment and went to Ivano-Frankivsk for his trial. She was publicly reprimanded for this, and given an assistant at the laboratory, who was an agent of the K.G.B. to watch her movements. In the summer of 1972, Volyckas' home was searched, after which she was arrested. Her present fate is not known.

KHRYSTYNA TYMCHUK

Khrystyna Tymchuk, who worked at the Academy of Sciences was arrested in 1972 in Kiev. During interrogations, the K.G.B. insisted that she work for them, but when she refused they promised to help her in her career as a reward for her cooperation, but this too, had no effect. The fate of Khrystyna Tymchuk and her present whereabouts are now unknown.

MARIJKA VALYA

Marijka Valya, an assistant at the Institute of Sociology in Lviv, a specialist in baroque literature, was fired on the pretext of "nationalist, anti-Soviet feeling." She has since been deprived of her government pension.

DZYLENKO IRYNA VOLOBYMYRIVNA

Born 28th April 1931 in Kyiv, she received a degree from the Philological Faculty of Kyiv University in 1964. She worked as a tutor, and later in a publishing office of newspapers and magazines. She printed her first poems in 1958 and since then has systematically appeared on the pages of various periodicals. In 1964 her artistic essays "Bykovynski Ballads" were published, followed by several collections of poetry. A series of her lyric poems "In the Bells of the Heart" appeared in 1972-73. As a result of this the Soviet censors began to attack Iryna Dzylenko on the pages of the Soviet press, accusing her of "ambiguity in the context of her poetry", which strays from the Party line, in other words, the line forced by the overlords. Normally, such strong criticism and accusations precede the denunciation of an author's works and probable imprisonment. It is not known what the future holds for Iryna Dzylenko and her creative endeavours.

KYRYCZENKO SVITLYANA

Scientist, formerly working at the Institute of Philosophy in the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R. In 1972 in Kyiv she was fired from her job after continuous harassment. She is accused of "nationalistic and anti-Soviet views". Often people are arrested after such accusations, and this can easily be the case of Svitlyana Kyryczenko.

KOVALSKA MARIA

A sales clerk in the bookshop "Molod" in Lviv. In 1973 the KGB searched her apartment but found nothing. Nevertheless, she was released from her job and is continuously persecuted. Maria Kovalska is accused of too friendly an association with visiting tourists, for conversing with them, which is forbidden to Soviet citizens unless they are agents of the KGB, and also for expressing sympathy with Ukrainian cultural figures sentenced by the regime.

HUSAR IRYNA (BORN 1965)

She received a doctorate in philology from the University in Lviv in 1940, and is also an author of school textbooks for the teaching of

German. She was released from her job at the University of Lviv in the summer of 1973, where Ukrainian students were demanding lectures to teach subjects in the Ukrainian language. For some reason, the Ukrainian professors and lecturers were blamed for this, and since then Iryna Husar has been continuously persecuted. Now there is a question mark whether she will receive her pension.

HULYK STEFANIA

Former employee of the Society for the preservation of historic and cultural monuments in Lviv. In 1970 she sent a protest letter to the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian S.S.R., in defence of the unlawfully sentenced Valentyn Moroz, and also protested against the ruinification of Ukrainian cultural and historical monuments by the Bolsheviks. She is married and has a small child. She was arrested in January and later released, however, she is constantly being questioned by the KGB and may be re-arrested at any time.

DUZYMINSKA OLHA VASYLIVNA

Born in 1883 in Western Ukraine. She is an expert of literature and art. Olha was formally accused of having strong patriotic beliefs and contact with the Ukrainian revolutionary freedom fighters. For this, in 1949, she was arrested and sentenced in Lviv to 10 years imprisonment. In 1972 the KGB aimed malicious accusations at Olha who is now very old. They began to persecute her again. She was alleged to be circulating Ukrainian anti-Soviet literature and to be giving her opinions on patriotic Ukrainian poems, especially the works of Iryna Senyk who was sentenced to 11 years imprisonment.

IRYNA STESHENKO

Born 5th July, 1898, in Kyiv, a writer-actress who translated foreign works into Ukrainian, she was the granddaughter of a well-known writer. In 1920, she graduated from the Dramatic Institute, and worked as an actress at the Shevchenko Theatre, and then at the Berezel' Theatre. At the same time, she translated plays, poetry and prose from French, Italian, English, German and Russian. She took part in the "Fatherland War" for which she was awarded a medal. From 1973 Iryna Steshenko fell into disfavor, being accused of maintaining contact with Ukrainian scientists abroad, and allowing her lodgings to be used for meetings with Ukrainian cultural figures and foreign tourists, in which she also took part.

MARIA VOYTOVYCH

She lives in Lviv. On 12th May, 1972 she wrote a letter to the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR in defense of the illegally convicted historian Valentyn Moroz. As a result of which she is continuously persecuted and unable to obtain work.

NADIA VOLKOVYCH

Born 1947, and later became a member of the Komsomol. She worked in a children's nursery in Kyiv. She was a member of the Ukrainian folk-ensemble, "Homin", which was disbanded by the Russian authorities who accused it of being "nationalistic." Nadia Volkovych was interrogated in connection with this, and forced to be an informer for the KGB. When she refused to do this she was fired from her job and has been continuously persecuted.

OLGA HEL'

Her brother Ivan Hel', a distinguished writer has to serve a long prison sentence. She has heart trouble, and looks after her elderly mother, she previously received an invalid's pension, which has since been stopped; ill and persecuted she lives under strained circumstances. It was reported that in 1972, Olga Hel' was arrested but later released on account of her ill-health.

LUDEMYLA CHYZHUK

Was a student at the Kyiv University where she transferred from the Russian to the Ukrainian department. On 22nd May, 1971,

she recited poems by the poet Symonenko at the Shevchenko Monument. After this she was called up for interrogation, at which she was reproached, among other things, for changing her university course, and for reading Symonenko. She was accused of nursing a "hostile view of Soviet authority". Since then Ludmyla Chyzhuk has been expelled from the university and is still continuously persecuted.

HALYNA YAREMYCZ

A student at Lviv University, from which she was expelled in 1973, for protesting together with other students against the russification of Ukrainian schools, and for insisting on the freedom to commemorate the poet, Shevchenko. Several students of this group were arrested, but it is so far not known what has happened to Halyna Yaremycz.

LUDEMYLA SHEREMETYEVA (BORN IN 1945)

An extra-mural student of journalism at Kyiv University. After the arrests of O. Nazarenko and Karpenko, the KGB searched her home, looking for Samydvav material which it did not find. However, Sheremetyeva has continued to be persecuted since then, and in 1969 she was expelled from Kyiv University and her diploma was refused.

LYBOMYRA POPADYUK

A lecturer of German at the University of Lviv. At the beginning of 1972, the KGB searched her house and began persecuting her. Later she was fired from work, under the pretext that she was acquainted with cultural figures M. Osadchy, V. Chornovil, and others. In actual fact, she was fired because the students of Lviv University protested against russification and criticised the regime in the Ukraine; there have been recent reports of her arrest. Her son Zorian Popadyuk has been arrested and sentenced to 7 years imprisonment.

RAJISA MORDAN'

(Born 1939, nr. Kyiev)

The wife of the poet V. Mordan. She was a teacher at a nursery school in Kyiv, and taught the children a few Ukrainian songs, brought them to a concert commemorating Lesya Ukrainka, in which the ethnic choir 'Homin' also took part. For this Rajisa Mordan' was called up for 'questioning' at which she was brutally treated and dismissed from work. She was accused of "contact with the 'nationalistic' choir Homin, and for influencing the children". From then on Rajisa has undergone continuous persecution, and her husband has also suffered as a result of this.

MOROZ RAJISA

A wife of a well known historian Valentyn Moroz who was sentenced to 14 years of imprisonment. She is a teacher of German in the Ivano Frankivsk teacher's college and is continuously persecuted because her husband was sentenced for "anti-soviet" activities as he stood out in defence of the Ukrainian culture and language. In 1973 harassment towards her was increased because she had contact with Ukrainian intellectuals abroad. As a result of this, her 11 year old son, Valik, is also suffering.

KORNICZUK VALYA

Former student of Lviv University, she was expelled in the summer of 1973 for criticizing the terrorist activities of the Soviet regime. She was also a member of a student group which published an uncensored magazine "Postup" and disseminated pamphlets that criticised Moscow's policies of Russification in Ukraine.

KACZMAR-SAVKA MARIA

An artist who on 25th November, 1970 sent a letter of protest to the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian S.S.R. in defence of the unjustly sentenced Valentyn Moroz. The court ignored this as well as other similar protests, but as a consequence the KGB began to harass Maria Kaczmar-Savka. In 1972 the KGB stepped up its persecution towards her.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the anniversary of Greek independence, and it is appropriate to commemorate that occasion with a brief history of the fight for freedom by the people of Greece.

Mrs. Georgia V. Poppo of Chevy Chase, Md., has written an excellent account of this struggle. A teacher by profession, Mrs. Poppo has taught in the D.C. Public School System for 15 years. She is a member of the National Education Association and in 1970 received the Outstanding Teacher Service Award.

Mrs. Poppo received her B.A. degree from Mount St. Mary's College and has done graduate work at Marquette and George Washington University, where she received a master's degree in urban learning. She is currently completing work on her doctoral degree in sociology.

Active in community affairs, Mrs. Poppo sits on the George Washington University Women's Board Association and is a member of the National Federation of Homemakers. She is also a member of Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church and is active in various church community activities.

Mrs. Poppo's article follows:

INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

(By Georgia Voulgares Poppo)

Greek independence day was observed this March 25 in all parts of the world where Greeks live. Dinners, dances, teas, lectures are given in commemoration of this historical event the world over. In Washington and Maryland the celebration began with morning services at both of the Greek Orthodox churches. Guest speakers are invited to celebrate the anniversary of Greek independence.

"We are all Greeks," says Shelley. "Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece." Philhellenic sentiments the world over should arouse the interest in possessing the knowledge of the event of Greek independence, on March 25.

If it had not been for Greece, what inheritance would civilization today have been granted from the past? From Assyrians and Babylonians, from Egyptians, Carthaginians, and Romans, what has Europe received which she could compare with the heritage she has from Grecians? If Myron, Phedias, and Praxiteles had not clothed stone and bronze with the strength and beauty of the wrestler and the huntress; if the majesty and grace of Doric and Ionian architecture had never inspired the builders of the temples of Zeus and Apollo; if Aeschylus and Sophocles had never imagined their tremendous tragedies, nor Homer's voice reechoed "the surge and thunder of the Odyssey" nor Plato schemed the making of a republic based on a philosophy of higher thought than any but the Christian Gospel, what would remain of the architecture, poetry, and art of later ages? The fabric would be baseless, the art, and the philosophy would be almost without a reasoned beginning.

The Greeks were able, as freemen of an empire of leisure and liberty, to work in the light of great imagined ideals, rather than under the pressure of need and competition, that they have given to duller ages an altruistic heritage: And it was in the blessed hour of that sacred freedom that they argued out

their philosophy of life, so that in the words of an English poet whose lips have been touched by the coal from their altars says:

"Every thought of all their thinking
Swayed the world for good or ill,
Every pulse of all their life-blood
Beats across the ages still."

But the influence of Greece mankind has been brought to a clearer and better comprehension of its obligations. Her ideas of philosophy and law followed the conquering Romans, led to the civilization of the barbarians of Northern and Western Europe, and had no small part firmly establishing a pure religion. Artists and scientists, poets and orators, philosophers and statesmen have never ceased to turn to Greece for help and inspiration. The names of Lycurgus and Solon, Plato and Aristotle, Homer and Pindar, Phidias and Praxiteles, Demosthenes and Aeschines will live as long as men pay tribute and homage to the altars of learning and culture and civilization. This imperishable legacy she left to mankind.

It is my purpose here to make known to readers not only the valiant and superhuman sacrifices of my Hellenic forefathers for the liberation of Greece but also the noble and philanthropic and philhellenic sentiments of the American people in the interest of Greek freedom.

The fall of Constantinople began in 1453. Constantine Paleologus, the last emperor of Greece, was massacred during the siege, and whole of Hellas was captured. Churches were ransacked and destroyed, schools were closed, and Greece appeared to exist no more. The civilized world seemed to have forgotten that the descendants of the men of Marathon and Thermopylae still inhabited the Peloponnesus and lived upon the shores of the Aegean Sea. During the four centuries of captivity Greece had been a terra incognita to the rest of Europe.

Rarely had the foot of the traveler ventured to walk the soil which Socrates once trod, to tread their way among the grand columns of Olympian Zeus and along the nostalgic shores of the Ilissus or to wander amid the ruins which centuries ago, had heard the clink of Praxiteles' chisel. Beneath the cruel hand of time, and the rude hand of violence which enshrouded poor Hellas, poets ceased to sing, artists ceased to paint and carve, for it was the hour of dark slumber. Yet notwithstanding these destructive forces, the Greek people survived. Ultimately in the year of 1815 a friendly society was founded known as "Phillike Hetairia." It was a revolutionary organization with centers at Moscow, Bucharest, and Trieste, it collected arms and funds and made preparations for the coming insurrection. Alexander Ypsilanti was the leader of the society, whose aim was to free Greece.

In the year 1821, on the 25th day of March, Archbishop Germanos, of Patras, raised the standards of revolt at the monastery of Aghia Lavra, and before God and man the Greeks took an oath for "Liberty or Death." The nations of Christendom heard with surprise the revolt of a nation of less than 1,000,000 people against a Moslem nation of over 25,000,000.

The revolution was begun by the Greeks without definite plans and without any generally recognized leadership. The force with which Germanos marched from Kalavrytu was composed of peasants armed with scythes, clubs, and slings.

The first outstanding patriots who is considered as the first martyr to the cause of Greek freedom was Rigas Fereos, who while dying exclaimed: "I have sown the seed, and the time will come when my countrymen will reap its sweet fruits." Other prominent men were Admantios Koraeis, Mavromichalis Kolokotronis, and Mavrocordatou.

A more barbaric and inhuman ruler than "Ali" has never been recorded in

history; he was known as the Nero of Epirus. Only a little republic of Suli, situated amidst the mountains of Epirus, did not bow to the rule of the tyrant. Ali considered this a personal insult and could not tolerate this independent Greek state of the Sulios amidst his great satrapy. All made several attacks on the Sulioats, and finally, worn down by war and famine and strictly blockaded, they were led to the necessity of accepting terms of capitulation which Ali never meant to fulfill. A party of about 200 women and children, being cut off from the rest, fled to a steep precipice near the monastery of Zalongo. Rather than yield to ignominy and be defied by their captors, the women entered into a solemn compact dance what might be called the "death dance." They first hurled their children over the rocks and then the matrons, joining hand in hand and raising their minds to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by native song, whirled round and round till they approached the edge of the cliff, from which they one and all threw themselves headlong to the field of honor below.

Many heroic deeds such as the foregoing are recorded in the annals of history. However, the most remarkable example is the contribution of a pure, genuine, philanthropic, altruistic devotion of the American people to the Hellenes. On May 25, 1821, a spirited appeal of the Greek Assembly at Messenia, addressed to the people of the United States under the signature of that valiant Maniate chief, Petros Mavromichalis, created a tremendous impression throughout America. The appeal was sent to Adamantios Koraeis at Paris, who transmitted it to the famous American sympathizer with the Greek cause, Prof. Edward Everett, who in turn released it to the press of the United States. Later Mr. Everett published the call of Greece in the North American Review, together with a patriotic letter from the famous Koraeis.

The immense philhellenic sentiment on the part of the American people aroused similar attention to the Government of the United States, and in 1822 President James Monroe displayed his genuine interest in his famous declaration. Negotiations followed between the provisional government of Greece and the United States, among whom Mr. Andreas Louriotis, envoy of the provisional government of Greece in England, Alexander Mavrocordatou, Secretary of State of Greece, Hon. John Quincy Adams, at that time Secretary of State, are to be remembered.

The Presidential declaration on one hand, the great interest of the American press on the other, and generally the overwhelming public sentiment in favor of the Greek cause, gave rise to a general constitutional discussion as to the propriety, or not, of giving recognition to the Hellenic Government.

Introduction of the Hellenic question for consideration by the Congress of the United States is largely credited to that brilliant orator and eminent lover of Greece, Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, Webster's resolution was not taken up for debate until the end of January 1824, but in the meanwhile numerous appeals and petitions to the Congressmen at Washington from their constituents throughout the Nation besought action in behalf of the Greeks.

In support of Webster's resolution we find some of the greatest intellects of Congress, such as Poinsett, of South Carolina; Cook, of Illinois; H. W. Dwight and F. Baylies, of Massachusetts; P. Farrelly, of Pennsylvania, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

Unfortunately, the kind sentiments of Webster, Clay, and other Greek sympathizers in Congress could not prevail, for it was generally felt that passage of the resolution would involve either war or serious international difficulties. A motion was pre-

sented on January 26, 1824, by Congressman Rich, of Vermont, to the effect that no formal vote to be taken on the resolution, and that the same be referred indefinitely for consideration at some future date when conditions had changed.

The thrilling operations of Webster and Clay in support of the resolution resounded throughout the entire Nation and citizens committees were everywhere formed for the raising of funds and supplies for the destitute people of Greece.

The American sympathizers with Greece extended their benevolent assistance by adopting and educating various Greek orphans who had been salvaged and sent to the United States by various American missionaries.

Of those it is interesting to note here, Col. J. P. Miller, of Vermont, adopted a young boy later known as Col. Loukas Miller. This boy had been born in Livadia in 1824, and was the son of a Greek chieftain who died in battle and who was a good friend of Colonel Miller. The boy received a liberal education, served in the American Army, took part in the Mexican war, and later, in 1853, was elected Congressman from the State of Wisconsin.

American Philhellenes in Greece who deserve honorable mention for their services are Lt. Gen. George Jarvis, Col. J. P. Miller, Dr. Samuel Howe, Henry A. V. Post, John R. Stuyvesant, Erswick Evans, William G. Washington, relative of George Washington, and many others.

Through the various aids to a revolution which lasted 12 years, Greece received her independence in 1833. Prince Otho of Bavaria had been selected by the powers as King of Greece.

Years passed into centuries and again Greece was confronted with the same cause. Liberty was again her theme in the Second World War—liberty from her oppressors—from dictators and tyrants—namely, the Germans and the Italians.

Once again this little valiant nation fought for 6 long months in the beginning of World War II—and gave America the precious time for preparedness—bringing about the turning point of the war.

Thus did old Hellas rise from the grave of nations scorched by fire, riddled by shot and baptized by blood. Greece emerged victorious from the conflict and after years of inhuman torture the Shores of the Aegean again breathed the sainted air of freedom.

FOR THE CHILD'S SAKE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, Carl Sandburg, I believe it was, once remarked that the birth of a child is God's hope that the world go on. Certainly the birth of every child ought to be a positive experience full of joy and anticipation as an unfolding life full of creative possibilities and high accomplishments, is contemplated. But regrettably, many children are not brought into this world in that kind of an atmosphere, for they are born into disadvantaged circumstances where all too often, poverty, ignorance and disease, and economic, educational, and psychological deprivation, are their unfortunate lot.

For example, in 1972, there were almost 25 million Americans living at the poverty level, and about 40 percent of

them were children. In 1973, there were some 19,145,000 children under 6 years of age and nearly 30 percent of them had mothers in America's labor force; and of the 2,149,000 family situations in which the mother was the head of the family, almost 40 percent of the mothers were working mothers. It also is estimated that in March of 1973 there were 20.5 million children under the age of 18 whose fathers and mothers were both working. From these statistics it can quickly be deduced that there are many children in America who, in their very formative years, do not enjoy the stable family situations that is conducive to getting a good start in life.

This is where the day care programs enter in. According to the most recent data available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1971, licensed or approved day care centers in the United States had a capacity for 719,232 children, while licensed or approved family day care homes had a capacity of 192,469. Certainly the number has grown substantially since then, although more recent data is not available. In addition, we know that large numbers of children are being cared for in facilities that are not licensed or approved. Census data also show that in October 1973, 1,692,000 children, aged 3 and 4—or 24 percent of this age group—were attending schools that offered some type of formal instruction, although there is no way of knowing how much duplication there is in this school and day care statistic.

The Federal Government has not been insensitive to its responsibility to help these children, and through project Headstart and title IV, parts A and B of the Social Security Act, Federal funds are authorized to underwrite some of the expenses in establishing and maintaining day care services for America's children.

Operation Headstart, authorized under title II-B of the Economic Opportunity Act is a comprehensive preschool program designed to foster the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of economically disadvantaged preschool children and their families. The program provides activities and experiences for preschool children designed to help them better develop their image potential. It is estimated that in fiscal 1973 some 379,000 children were enrolled in the Headstart programs across the country and that the Federal Government's Headstart budget was some \$407.8 million.

Under title IV, part A, of the Social Security Act, the Federal Government is authorized to match State expenditures for day care services which may be provided by the State as a social service to families who are receiving aid to families with dependent children payment; and funds are also authorized under title IV, part A, for child care services for children affected by the referral of mothers to work-incentive programs. Under title IV-B, of the Social Security Act, grants are made to State public welfare agencies for child welfare services which may include, but are not limited to, day care

services. To qualify for a Federal grant, a State must have an approved child welfare service plan developed jointly by the State agency and HEW; and priority in determining need for day care is to be given to members of low income or other groups in the population, and to geographical areas that have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care. Each State is allotted \$70,000 and the remainder of the appropriation is allotted on a variable matching formula basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of mentioning all this is by way of background for the description I would like to share with my distinguished colleagues in the Congress of one child care program where I think a good job is being done, the taxpayer's money is being well spent, and some children from disadvantaged backgrounds are being given a very positive opportunity to turn potentially negative patterns of development into constructive channels. I am referring to the Center for Child Care, Inc., located at 2909 East 11th Street in Indianapolis. Its director is Mrs. Suellen Boner, and I visited with her and her staff and the children last Friday morning, April 5, 1974. It was a rewarding and heartwarming visit for me, and I came away with the conviction that in this instance, and undoubtedly in many, many others that could be cited, a very good job is being done at building into young minds and hearts, the kind of positive self image that will help bring Carl Sandburg's dream to fuller realization.

The center has been open for 1 year, and its object has been to provide high quality day care for the children of working parents on Indianapolis' near-east side, utilizing the Montessori method of education for preschool children. The staff of teachers completed 5 weeks of intensive training in the Montessori methodology which seemed appropriate to the urban life style of the community in which the center is located. This expansive, spontaneous, educational system is aimed at tapping a child's natural motivation by providing disciplined preparation, practice, imitation, and repetition involving a variety of interesting materials—a method proven effective time and again. When the contract was let to use and remodel facilities at the Centenary Christian Church of Indianapolis, in January 1973, the total cost for the remodeling was \$35,000, which was made available through the Marion County Coordinated Child Care Committee and the Community Services Program of the city of Indianapolis. The work made licensing by the State a possibility, and when it became a reality, this in turn made the center eligible to participate in the State's title IV-A, program, which meant that families with low income could be assisted in paying for the services. Nine children showed up for the first week's operation in March of 1973, and in March 1974, the enrollment had grown to its licensed capacity of 46. Twenty-one of the children are enrolled under the title IV-A, program; the other 25 pay the full \$25 regular fee or less on a sliding scale. Over half of the operating

funds come from fees paid by the parents, and one of the main concerns of the staff is that they do not have enough operating capital. They hope that some more money will become available either from public or private sources so that this program can be augmented. Their appeal to me was, "Do not let us die!"

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to let this program die, or others like it. It is trying to give disadvantaged children something to hang on to by building into their little minds and hearts a desire to learn and work and live constructively. It is much more than just a day care babysitting service. It tries to shore up disintegrating family structures.

It works with parents to help them see the good future that can be in store for their children. It tries to overcome the frustrations and emotional abuses that many of these children suffer. I saw one little girl there who was so bottled up with tension and frustration that she persistently tore all her hair out; I was told about another child in the group, a 3-year-old, who is regularly taken by his mother when she buys a "fix" in the neighborhood and goes home and puts a needle in her arm. This program is seeking to apply preventive medicine so that negative patterns can be prevented from developing. By early intervention, many problems that interlock in a child's emotional and psychological development can be worked on and solved before they become so serious as to lead to juvenile delinquency and destructive adult patterns of behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mrs. Boner, the staff that works with her and the board of directors of the center, deserve commendation for the good job that they are doing. It is fashionable in some quarters to criticize the amount of Federal money that is being wasted in community service programs throughout the country; and without blinking the fact that undoubtedly there is some waste in some places, we must realize that there are many many instances of a good job being done today in order to save tomorrow. The Center for Child Care in Indianapolis is one such instance. Let us never let it die—and others like it—for the child's sake—and for society's.

A TRIBUTE TO THE READING
BUCCANEERS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of their annual concert, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Reading Buccaneers for their many outstanding accomplishments.

Every year, from June to September, this world-renowned drum and bugle corps performs throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. The concert season is preceded by months of arduous practice. And, during the season itself, the members devote at least 18 hours per week to

their music. One of the most distinctive attributes of the group is its ability to adapt to changing modes of music and marching. All of this practice and versatility is manifested in the fine concerts offered by the Buccaneers. Since their beginning, the group has been considered to be one of the top five drum and bugle corps in the world.

The number of honors earned by the Buccaneers is ample evidence of their excellence. Among these are: The Veterans of Foreign Wars' national champion for 1960, 1961, and 1962; the Pennsylvania State champion from 1960 through 1966 and the Canadian international champion in 1967 and 1968.

The Buccaneers received deserved tribute to their excellence when they were selected for membership in the Drum Corps Association, one of only 12 class A groups thus honored. Within the association, they are credited with performing the most varied and difficult musical compositions. In 1965 and 1968 this group was named the Drum Corps Association world champion, the highest recognition which a drum and bugle corps can receive.

The Buccaneers are certainly effective good will ambassadors not only for the city of Reading, but also for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the entire United States as well. They have brought much honor and enjoyment to their home community and to many areas across the country. I am happy to have this opportunity to commend the Buccaneers for their dedication, congratulate them on their achievements and extend my very best wishes for their continued success.

1974 LOUISIANA YOUTH SEMINAR

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, this past summer, I was pleased to be present and speak before the Louisiana high school delegates participating in the 1973 Louisiana Youth Seminar. This statewide program, which promotes training in leadership, programing, and interpersonal communication techniques has, in the short period of 3 years, become one of the most successful programs of its type to be offered in the State.

I am extremely pleased to announce that this year's fourth annual Louisiana Youth Seminar will be held for the first time at the University of Southwestern Louisiana in Lafayette, La., which is located in my district. The move to USL brings with it the past record of an excellent educational institution which continually strives to bring to Louisiana students the finest in educational experiences.

The Louisiana Youth Seminar was founded 4 years ago in an attempt to offer Louisiana high school students a general forum for education in leadership skills. The weeklong seminars have been highly successful in developing these abilities in students by providing a

spirited, thought-provoking, and stimulating experience. The hundreds of past delegates who have attended the seminars expressed that the program represents a common ground for discussing pertinent events and activities which involve all student leaders.

I look forward to participating in the fourth annual Louisiana Youth Seminar and witnessing the remarkable accomplishments of the student participants. I highly commend this program to anyone interested in leadership training and personal development, along with the University of Southwestern Louisiana for its sponsorship of this worthy event.

PAUL O'DWYER SHAKES UP THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Paul O'Dwyer has been president of the New York City Council since January and already many of the anachronisms which prevented the city council from acting effectively have been removed. Major reforms in such areas as proxy voting restrictions and opening up council committee hearings are moving toward making the council a more democratic body.

The guiding force leading the city council into the 20th century is Paul O'Dwyer. Paul, a constituent of mine, has long been in the forefront of the fight for human rights both in the United States and abroad. From the American civil rights movement to the Israeli war of independence and on to the struggle for the rights of Catholics in Northern Ireland, Paul has made his mark. His creativity and energy are now making their mark on the structure of city government in New York.

It is a privilege for me to share the following article on Paul O'Dwyer with my colleagues:

COUNCIL PRESIDENCY GETTING NEW LOOK UNDER O'DWYER

(By Lucinda Franks)

It was his second day as City Council President and Paul O'Dwyer hadn't even hooked up the phones in his office. A distraught delegation of Rheingold Brewery workers was on the doorstep with something else in mind for him. They would all lose their jobs, they said, unless he came to their aid.

That day Mr. O'Dwyer began a nine-week campaign to save the livelihoods of the 1,500 workers at the Brooklyn brewery, which PepsiCo Inc. had said it could not afford to keep open. He alerted the mayor's office, acted as a catalyst for discussions between all sides in the negotiations, and did not stop until a buyer was finally found. After it was all over, Paul O'Dwyer still had not gotten proper telephones.

That same week in March, Mr. O'Dwyer was installed as grand marshal of the St. Patrick's Day Parade. Two weeks before the parade he mounted the podium at his installation ceremonies, drew up his grandfatherly frame, tossed back his plume of white hair, and did what a New York Irishman seldom does while celebrating the shamrock.

He recited no sweet remembrances of the

old country, no brave tales of days gone by. Instead he talked of the discrimination he suffered in New York as a young immigrant boy fresh from Ireland, and he paid tribute to the Price sisters, two young members of the Provisional wing of the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland who were convicted of bombing cars in London and sentenced to life plus twenty years in an English prison.

SNUBS BRITISH LINER

Two weeks later, when Mayor Beame celebrated his birthday aboard the British liner Queen Elizabeth 2, Paul O'Dwyer was absent. He had quietly announced the day before that in view of what he called the "arrogant tyranny of the British courts" and their "legal lynchings" of Irishmen, he would, as a gesture of protest, refuse to attend the party.

All three incidents were typical of Paul O'Dwyer. None were typical of a City Council President. Traditionally, it is a powerless and ceremonial job, primarily a stepping stone to higher office, whose functions are pretty much limited to opening and closing council meetings. A lot of people think that in Paul O'Dwyer, a modern-day Don Quixote has penetrated the sedate rather musty reaches of Abe Beame's City Hall.

Paul O'Dwyer's staff reveals much about him. Not unlike a slice from a world's fair, it is a bustling hive, roughly 50 per cent women and 50 per cent men. There are six Irish, four Jews, four Puerto Ricans, four blacks, one Chinese, one Scandinavian, two Italians, and one white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. Most of them are under thirty.

"I suppose I'm looked upon as somewhat of a foreign object here," said Mr. O'Dwyer the other day, knitting his bushy salt-and-pepper brows and crinkling his thin Dublin mouth into an amused expression. He spoke softly with a shy, barely detectable brogue. "But I'm not about to retire from the battle now. I want to expose the injustices, to bring all the little people together."

Mr. O'Dwyer and Mayor Beame, who campaigned together on the same Democratic ticket, share a distant although cordial and courteous relationship. No differences have yet arisen between them, but Mr. O'Dwyer is clearly establishing an independent stance, moving on his own initiative on such matters as the Rheingold brewery.

In Board of Estimate meetings, for instance, where he has the same number of votes as the Mayor, Mr. O'Dwyer has begun an independent campaign to force New York hospitals to use funds allocated by the city under the Federal "Ghetto Medicine Act" exclusively for ghetto medicine rather than for general operating costs.

Mr. O'Dwyer has long been a champion of minorities of all stripes—it is said that he can always be counted on to love a loser. As a New York lawyer he defended blacks and Puerto Ricans without fee back in the nineteen-forties when it was not yet fashionable to do so and he has consistently supported the Jewish struggle in Israel.

In 1972, he was one of the defense lawyers for the Rev. Phillip F. Berrigan and five others who were acquitted of charges of plotting to kidnap Henry A. Kissinger. He came off that case and right onto another controversial legal struggle involving civil rights—the case of the Fort Worth Five.

The five, Irish sympathizers, and residents of New York, were transported to testify before a Federal grand jury in Fort Worth, Tex., and jailed when they refused to answer questions about alleged smuggling of weapons from North Texas to the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland.

Mr. O'Dwyer, who said the five were victims of a "witchhunt," rallied congressmen to protest the jailing as unconstitutional, and took the case up to the Supreme Court. The men were finally released after a total of nine months in prison.

"Now that I'm here, I want to use my official capacity to continue this kind of work," said Mr. O'Dwyer, a mess of papers lying in no discernible arrangement over his giant-size desk. "The Establishment gives in very hard. You have to show the people how they have gotten a dirty deal so they push until something is done for them."

People say they always know where Paul O'Dwyer stands. At times, however, the strength of his stands have led him precariously close to the other side of the law. He has conceded, for example, to acting as a stakeholder for arms smuggled to the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the underground group that fought the British in Palestine before Israel became a state.

"Thank God the statute of limitations has run out on that one," says an aide.

Mr. O'Dwyer has been linked by rumors in Ireland with gun-running to the I.R.A. operating in the North—rumors which he denies.

Public records in Dublin show that the Irish Institute, which Mr. O'Dwyer founded here in the nineteen-fifties, contributed \$12,000 to an Irish government fund which was supposedly to be used only for relief of distress in Northern Ireland, but which an Irish parliamentary report in 1972 indicated went, in part, to buy guns for the I.R.A. It was this report that eventually led to the Dublin Arms Trial in which two former Irish cabinet ministers were tried for—and acquitted of—gun-running to the North.

According to the parliamentary report, a check from the Irish Institute was put into an Irish bank account under three fictitious names rather than into an account for relief of Northern Irish distress.

Mr. O'Dwyer denies that the check was put to ill-use. "I was aware of the contribution and I feel morally certain that it did not go for any other purpose than for what it was intended—relief and shelter for the refugees in the North," he said.

RETREATS TO FARMHOUSE

Mr. O'Dwyer is now chairman of the board of trustees of the Irish Institute, which he says exists primarily to promote the arts in Ireland and in the Irish community here. Mr. O'Dwyer was born in 1907 in a farm in County Mayo and even today after almost half a century on these shores, his heart is pure Irish. On weekends he retreats to an Irish-style stone farmhouse in Montgomery, N.Y. complete with ponies from Connamara, after working sometimes 16 hours a day during the week. ("We always close up City Hall," says an aide). In his office is an Irish harp, a County Mayo shield, and a cross made by prisoners in Long Kesh internment camp in Northern Ireland.

His Irish connections—as well as his multifarious links with labor and minority groups—have helped Paul O'Dwyer slowly extend his domain beyond his City Council quarters during his first few months in office.

The union at the Rheingold brewery that approached him was heavily Irish and during the recent transit negotiations, the Transit Worker's Union, whose leadership is Irish, had planned to ask for Mr. O'Dwyer's help had there been a last-minute deadlock before the strike deadline.

The former labor lawyer also regularly gets telephone calls from the ironworkers, the longshoremen, and others who want help in various dealings. There is speculation that Mr. O'Dwyer has higher goals in mind and is building bridges for a bid for mayor in 1977.

Paul O'Dwyer has endured more defeats than victories; having made numerous bids for office, he has won only one other election, that for councilman at large from Manhattan in 1963. His friends like to think it is because he has paid more attention to the little fellow in need than to the rules of the political game.

For instance, although he has always been a friend to Irish-Americans—his law firm, O'Dwyer and Bernstein, has always been full of red-haired young lads in need of legal aid—most of them have never been very pleased with him. In fact, they have consistently refused to vote for him, have called him a Communist for his championing of minorities, and they have even booed him in Gaelic Park.

POSITION IS ASSAILED

His election as City Council President was the first time the city's 12 per cent Irish vote has gone over almost entirely to his side. His aides attribute this to his well-publicized defense of the Fort Worth Five, and his gesture of support for Northern Ireland. They speculate also that the Watergate scandal has pushed everyone—including the conservative Irish-American—slightly to the left.

"Suddenly people were realizing that the Irish could be black also, that they could be treated badly as in the case of the Fort Worth Five," and Mr. O'Dwyer's first assistant, Linda Fischer. "They found a voice in Paul O'Dwyer."

Since the troubles in Northern Ireland began, Mr. O'Dwyer has been an active Irish Republican supporter. He started a group called American Committee for Ulster Justice, which includes such Irish-American names as Jimmy Breslin, Helen Hayes, and Carroll O'Connor, to publicize the plight of the Catholics in the North. He also led a nationwide boycott of British goods in 1972 to protest Bloody Sunday, when 13 Catholics were killed by British troops during a civil-rights demonstration in Londonderry.

Nevertheless, Mr. O'Dwyer's protest activities have been criticized as "tokenism" by at least one Irish group—the National Association for Irish Freedom, which supports the civil-rights struggle for both Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland.

"He's like a Jekyll and Hyde. He's liberal as far as American civil rights go, but a conservative Irishman," said the group's chairman, Thomas Naughton. "He talks out of both sides of his mouth."

Mr. Naughton cites Mr. O'Dwyer's actions after the American Committee For Ulster Justice and eight other Irish organizations had put out a statement in early 1973 condemning Irish Prime Minister Jack Lynch for cracking down on the I.R.A. in Dublin.

The statement urged that all Irishmen should boycott Irish government agencies in the United States, such as Irish Airlines and the Irish Tourist Board.

Two months after the statement, executives of the Irish Airlines and the Irish Tourist Board pinned shamrocks on Mr. O'Dwyer at a St. Patrick's Day party in an Upper East Side bar. And a few months after that Mr. O'Dwyer had newspaper photographs taken with them at different occasions.

Mr. O'Dwyer answers these criticisms with a sigh. "I am an elected public official now," he said. "I walk a tightrope in some respects. I can't afford to lose my effectiveness by going too far, and besides I have a whole city to think about—not just the Irish."

NEEDY NEW YORK

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are probably familiar with the many New York lobbyists who are currently on the Hill trying to get Congress to approve mass transit operating subsidies. This money would be for a pay

increase for the New York subway car cleaners. I believe my colleagues will find this article which appeared in the April 4 Wall Street Journal most informative:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 4, 1974]

NEEDY NEW YORK

New York City, which soon will be paying subway car cleaners \$11,472 a year or \$1,600 more than Ohio paid school teachers on average last year, quite naturally has a transit crisis on its hands.

It can't really afford to pay the car cleaners and other transit workers the princely sums called for under a new wage contract just signed. And yet New York City politicians have promised the town's citizens that they will fight tooth and nail to keep from raising the 35-cent transit fare to a 50-cent level that might provide greater solvency.

The fighting, very predictably, is being done in Washington, where New York lobbyists are trying to get mass transit operating subsidies approved by Congress. The lobbyists don't want the subsidies allotted on the basis of New York's share of total national population, which is only 4%. They want them allotted on the basis of New York's share of total transit ridership, which is 35%.

In other words, tax money paid by those Ohio school teachers would go to help pay the salaries of the New York subway car cleaners and to save New Yorkers from paying higher transit fares. The Ohio school teachers and all the other folks in the nation's hinterland might well wonder if that is fair.

Which should suggest a reason why operating subsidies are a bad idea. They may seem fine for the people getting the free ride but they seem less so for those who have to pay the fare.

VERRAZANO DAY, APRIL 17, 1974

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has come once more for us to pause and pay homage to Giovanni da Verrazano. Once again we find ourselves reflecting upon the significant deeds of this gallant and intrepid Florentine navigator. This we do because the name Verrazano commands both gratitude and respect from a Nation whose people are forever indebted to the youthful Italian, who, sailing under the French flag, discovered New York Harbor and Narragansett Bay. His charting of most of our eastern shores from the Carolinas to Newfoundland was essential to the subsequent visits of ships from a score of countries.

Today marks the birth of this eminent voyager who dared to explore the wild and unknown waterways of the new world. Today we happily join with the thousands of Americans of Italian birth or lineage to pay just tribute to a man whose valor and courage commanded our love and veneration.

For those of us who live in Brooklyn the name Verrazano has a particularly deep meaning not only for Italo-Americans, but for all of us who are reminded of this great man whenever we cross the Verrazano Bridge which spans the Narrows between Staten Island and Brooklyn.

All Americans will recall with sadness and deep regret the tragic demise of Giovanni da Verrazano. Unfortunate it was indeed that our Latin American friends were deprived of the same type of exploration and navigational recording which Verrazano afforded us. Had not this illustrious navigator met his death at the hands of cannibals, the Southern Hemisphere might have benefited from charts and maps comparable to those made for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of us will never forget Verrazano's contributions to the development of our country. May we never lose sight of an opportunity to praise his name and glorify his achievements. We commend our several fine Italo-American organizations for their dedicated efforts to achieve this goal.

SALUTE TO ELI L. ROUSSO

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our newspapers are filled with stories of high Government officials who have belied the public trust and who have tried to destroy the values upon which this Nation was founded, it is too easy to believe that good men and good leaders are no longer working for the public good.

We know, however, that there still are many fine men who are enriching the lives of those around them—and one of them is Mr. Eli L. Rouso of Brooklyn.

Mr. Rouso, president of the Sephardic Home for the Aged and a founder and office holder in many other philanthropic organizations, has played a vital role in the success of many important community activities.

I, therefore, would like to include in the Record the two-part profile and interview with Eli Rouso that appeared in the Sephardic Home News on its silver anniversary, for I believe that Eli Rouso is the type of man that the author Cervantes was describing when he said: "Great persons are able to do great kindnesses."

The profile follows:

PROFILE AND INTERVIEW WITH ELI ROUSSO

Almost three and a half years have passed since it became known that Eli L. Rouso was to be the next President of our Home. At that point in time, we all knew that he had been Chairman of our Annual Dinner-Dances for the previous four years; we knew that he was the President of a large corporation and that he was involved in many educational, social, religious and general philanthropic enterprises, such as the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, U.J.A., Federation, Israel Bonds and B'nal B'rith.

We also knew that he is the *Bohor* (oldest son) in a family whose name is synonymous with involvement in a great variety of philanthropic enterprises. His credentials on leadership, business success and social responsibility were all that one could possibly hope for, and when on June 14, 1970, over one thousand Sephardim and their friends saw Eli installed as the seventh President of our Home, we had every expectation that his

administration would be characterized by forward planning in every area of importance to our Home.

We were also certain that, above and beyond all the problems he would face as President, he would address himself with the greatest energy to the many questions that were still to be resolved before the construction of our Barkey Wing could begin. Eli devoted the better part of his first administration to finding the answers for the many preliminary but very troublesome questions, such as deciding what kind of a building we should build and how we were to finance its construction. That these two categories of vexing matters were finally cleared away by May 11, 1972, and construction started is a tribute to the man and his intense resolve that nothing, but nothing, shall delay the completion of the Barkey Wing even by one hour if it could possibly be prevented.

These then are the credentials of the man and the challenges he faced when he assumed office as President on June 14, 1970. How he came to be the Eli we now know can be best understood by tracing his background which Eli supplied in a recent interview with Rabbi Marans.

On December 5, 1913, one of the settlers to land on these shores was a tall and slim young man at the eager age of 15, looking for work and success but, in particular, seeking to escape the war clouds which were gathering overhead and were soon to engulf all of Europe and which history has come to name as World War I.

Louis Rouso was the name of our new immigrant and he was born in Monastir, Turkey, (now Betol, Yugoslavia) where the future was so foreboding as to cause him to leave behind his parents and family and travel alone to a new world of peace and hope. One year later Louis, the first born, was to learn that his father whom he loved dearly had passed away; so he worked hard, saved as much as he could, and by 1919 he was able to bring his entire family—mother, three brothers and a sister—to join him in this country.

In 1920 Louis married Dora Cohen who was born in Jerusalem, and who was orphaned at a very early age. Dora and Louis toiled hard and long in their now found happiness together, and Dora was glad to seek and find employment so that all of their daily needs would be properly met.

Eli was born November 3, 1920, on Ludlow Street, a typical tenement-lined, pushcart-congested street on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, about which much has been written. His birth was therefore in the very heart of the original "melting pot" where, beginning with the turn of the century, most of the never-ending wave of immigrants had settled when they reached these shores after having fled some threatening situation in the "old country" such as poverty or war or both.

Five years later his brother Irving was born and he too followed in the footsteps of the family tradition—actively participating in the life of the Sephardic community. Irving has his own first-class credentials testifying to his sense of religious, social and philanthropic involvement. He is the Founding President of the Sephardic Temple at Cedarhurst and is a long time benefactor of our Home. His wife Lillie is past President of the Sisterhood of the Temple and is also a member of our Ladies Auxiliary and a warm friend of our own Home. Eli also has a charming sister, Diana, who has served as chairlady for several important fund-raising functions for our Ladies Auxiliary (LASHA); David Pins, her husband, has been a dedicated supporter of our Home for many years and he can always be counted on to do everything possible in the interest of our Home.

This then is the family which nurtured his childhood dreams and aspirations and from which Eli received his sense of moral values, his understanding of his family

traditions, and his respect for his Sephardic heritage.

Eli spent a good deal of his early childhood in the Lower East Side of New York where he attended public school and the only Sephardic Talmud Torah, then located on Eldridge Street. When Eli was about 12, the Rouso family moved to Sheffield Avenue in "New Lots" Brooklyn, which was then the "suburb" of the Lower East Side and was developing into a substantial Sephardic community. There he continued his schooling and graduated in 1934.

Here too he went to the Talmud Torah on Malta Street and later he transferred to the Talmud Torah opened by the Monastirli congregation. He was the first boy to be Bar Mitzvahed at the Williams Avenue Synagogue where the Ahavat Shalom Monastir congregation worshiped. As everybody recalls with some nostalgia, and even envy, Bar Mitzvah ceremonies in those days were more modest and oriented more toward the spiritual significance for the boy and his family than the Bar Mitzvah extravaganzas that we are more likely to attend these days.

The cultural and spiritual climate which nourished the adolescent Eli was one rich in the traditions and customs of the Sephardic people whose heritage could be traced to the pre-Spanish Inquisition days, and from whom came forth unparalleled achievements in every avenue of intellectual progress. One needs to mention only the names Maimonides and HaLevy as an example of the greatness of their scholars.

The social life of the times was such as to bring the Sephardic people together in all sorts of functions such as weddings, Bar Mitzvahs, and parties in general. This togetherness resulted in the predominant marriages being between Sephardic boys and Sephardic girls. And so it was with Eli Rouso and Julia Saporta whom Eli knew for many years, even before he really met her. Julia was a friend of his cousin, Pauline Cohen, and every so often Pauline and Julia would visit the Rouso household. So the romance simmered along until Eli learned that Julia was spending her vacation at Tamarack Lodge. Accompanied by his friend, Ben (Flash) Elias, who advised him that "Julia was the girl for him," Eli went to Tamarack Lodge where he had the first opportunity to spend a few days with Julia. The romance blossomed to the point where Eli and Julia were dating steadily, and so on November 15, 1941, they were married.

PART II

"As unto the bow the cord is,
So unto the man is woman,
Though she bends him, she obeys him,
Though she draws him, yet she follows,
Useless each without the other"

So sang the poet Longfellow and so were the attributes that drew Julia and Eli together in the state of matrimony.

Julia Saporta came from a family that was well-known and greatly respected by the Sephardic community. Rachel and Abraham Saporta had earned the love and respect of all who knew them. They were kind and responsive neighbors and their lives were guided by their devotion to the traditions and religion of their forefathers. There were six children in the Saporta family. Sam, the (*Bohor*) first born, has been a friend of our Home for some time. Hymie needs no introduction to our readers for he has been Chairman of our Journal campaigns for many years, and is the First Vice President of our Home. Jack, Jean and Barbara are the other members of the Saporta family.

This then is the family from whom Julia learned the basic human values that make for a good life partner and for a continuously viable marriage. Julia has many qualities that endear her to her many friends. She is sincere and courteous, and is a good listener. She has an easy smile and is fun to be with

in the company of her friends. She can blend successfully her natural role of a mature wife, mother and grandmother with the spirit of a youthful teenager having an evening of fun. She has an obvious devotion to her own family—her husband, her children and grandchildren. Since the death of her mother, she is looked upon as the "Mother" of the Saporta family.

And so over the years the lives of Julia and Eli did unfold in a harmony that withstood the turbulent years of war and the years of peace that followed—a matter of no small consequence in a culture where the ravages of time do great violence to togetherness and the bonds of matrimony become ever more brittle with the passage of the years.

Pearl Harbor was the great bugle call that blew across the nation with an irresistible blast, causing the pouring out of millions of our men and women. It took them out of their tranquil daily lives, where nights followed days, and catapulted them into a state of never-ceasing motion, blurring day and night as well as the moral values of right and wrong.

World War II was the great disrupter of countless lives—some only to a slight degree some irrevocably and forever more; and for others, somewhere in between. Fortunately for Julia and Eli, the war was only a troublesome interlude in their lives, leaving no lasting scars on their bodies or in their memories.

Eli saw service as an enlisted sailor on the U.S.S. Hamul which was assigned to patrol around Iceland, a tour of duty which Eli remembers with a rather sharp recall—that it was C-O-L-D. After this thoroughly chilling experience, and as though feeling sorry for him, the Navy assigned him to warm Bermuda and from there to Washington, D.C., where he and Julia remained long enough for Doris to be born.

One day he received his orders which crisply said, "Proceed to . . ."—and proceed he did, for he left Washington for the Pacific and, after many intervening detours, starts and stops, he was finally able to join his own ship, the U.S.S. Hamul, in the Philippines. From there the Hamul steamed toward Okinawa whose historic invasion was being readied and which shortly thereafter was to be the scene of much bloody fighting and dying.

The war was soon to be ended, and Eli could begin to count the days, as did millions of service men and women the world over, when he would be released and the long journey to the "States" begun. And that day finally did come for Eli, but a funny thing happened on his way to the "States." His ship was struck by a typhoon, a matter which Eli recalls with great pain—"I'll never, never want to live it again." He finally did reach San Francisco and was ultimately discharged from the Navy on November 27, 1945.

Eli returned to the problems of peace which only too often were as formidable as the tasks of war. Finding an apartment presented a very special difficulty as the thousands of returning service men and women were soon to realize. Julia and Eli had to settle for a basement apartment to begin with and, after varying intervals, moved to East Flatbush, then to Woodmere, and finally in 1962 to their present home in Hewlett Harbor.

Finding a job was also a matter that occupied the energies of those returning from war. Eli and his brother Irving, also a sailor returning from the war, combined their resources and talents and on January 2, 1946, formed the Russ Togs Corporation. They were joined by their father a few years later and their business has since prospered exceeding well.

Julia and Eli have been blessed with three talented and devoted children. Doris Taxin, the oldest of the three, has two adorable

children, Erica and Eli, at the ages when they are just too lovable—six and five. Louis is a serious-minded young man of twenty-one who has heard that man's future lies many fathoms deep below the oceans of the globe, and he is addressing himself to the subject of Oceanography at the University of Washington in the city of Seattle. Susan is something else again—an easy smile, a fluid and agile stride, she was captain of the Cheerleaders Squad and a member of the Woodmere Academy basketball team.

This is a family on the move, whether at work, at school, at play, or at philanthropy. Eli is on the go with a tight schedule day after day—at work or play—he has a passion for taking long walks, but stopping every so often to hit a little white ball; or attending a meeting for some worthy cause—and these are many indeed: He is a Founder and on the Board of Overseers of Albert Einstein College of Medicine; a Founder of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and, on October 29th, together with his father, is scheduled to dedicate the Dora & Louis and Julia & Eli Rousso School for Pre-Academic Studies on Mount Scopus, Israel. He was General Chairman and is currently Vice-Chairman of the New York Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and active in U.J.A., Federation and Israel Bonds.

Eli first became involved in matters Sephardic when he was President of the United Sephardim of Brooklyn. When the congregation movement to the Woodmere section of Long Island had depleted the Brooklyn membership, the Sephardic Temple at Cedarhurst was started and it is a Temple of rare beauty. Eli is currently Vice President and Chairman of the Admissions Committee.

With his father heavily committed to the progress of our Home, it was inevitable that he should encourage his sons to give a helping hand in this labor of love. And so he did, and in 1962 Eli became Chairman of the Finance Committee. He later became a Vice President and Chairman of the Dinner-Dance Committee, positions he held until 1970 when he ascended to the presidency.

It is clear that Eli has had an extensive experience in the general area of philanthropy and he no doubt has had his sympathies scattered over the entire spectrum of social responsibility. Nevertheless, one has the insight that what turns Eli on most is: the thought that the Home and its services not only extend the life span of our residents, but it clothes their lives with as much happiness as it is possible to achieve; the completion of the long delayed Barkey Wing; his intense desire to bring young Sephardic men and women into positions of leadership in our Home because, as he says, both the young and the old will be the better off for it; the filial satisfaction that, by their own example, his parents have given him a fuller life by teaching him to share his blessings with others.

For Eli, giving as he does with a full heart, the rewards for his good deeds can be as simple as they are full of satisfaction.

GEORGE WASHINGTON HONOR MEDAL

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to announce that the Courier and Monroe Adventure published in Temperance, Mich., by Richard F. Daggett has once again been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

This coveted citation was made by the 1973 National Awards Jury composed of State supreme court justices and officers of national patriotic, service, and veterans organizations. It will be my honor to present the award to Mr. Daggett on May 17 at the Bedford, Mich., Volunteers Recognition Dinner.

The selection of the Monroe Courier for the George Washington Honor Medal is no surprise to those who know Dick Daggett personally. He has a well-deserved reputation as a defender of freedom and the American way of life. At a time when the naysayers are warning that our Nation is incurably sick, Mr. Daggett has been reminding us of our Nation's greatness and the strength of her free institutions. His newspaper reminds citizens about keeping America beautiful, law and order, strong family ties and spiritual values. Mr. Daggett is also being cited for his writing about great historic leaders, the value of hard work, and the importance of sound leadership for youth.

It is especially noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that the Monroe Courier is being awarded the George Washington Honor Medal for the third consecutive year by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. As an indication of the high esteem accorded the Courier, a special week has been set aside for the third consecutive year as "Courier Week" in Bedford, Mich.

This is truly a great honor for the Monroe Courier and a much-deserved recognition of Mr. Daggett's patriotism and skills as a journalist. The community is much indebted to Mr. Daggett and the Courier for continued civic contributions and an unflagging dedication to the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and the bill of rights.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY TO PROTECT COASTAL RESOURCES

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island, the Ocean State, is bordered by 384 miles of seacoast, unsurpassed in scenic beauty and a natural resource of great value to the State's economy. Our sports fishermen and our domestic fishing industry have for many years suffered the depredations of our fish resources through the reckless fishing practices of foreign fleets. The urgent need for legislation to protect our fish resources is apparent, and I have introduced and supported such legislation since 1966. The members of the house of representatives of the Rhode Island General Assembly, acutely aware of the severity of the situation and the importance of protective measures, introduced and passed on the 8th day of March, 1974, this house resolution memorializing Congress to act favorably on legislation establishing a 200-mile coastal limit for resource management.

The resolution follows:

[State of Rhode Island, etc.]

HOUSE RESOLUTION

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ACT FAVORABLY ON LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING A TWO HUNDRED MILE COASTAL LIMIT FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Resolved, That the house of representatives of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializes congress to act favorably on legislation establishing a two hundred mile coastal limit for resource management; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Rhode Island delegation in congress.

ALBION: AN ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to announce today that Albion, Mich., has been named an All-American city by the National League of Cities. This award is one of only nine given this year throughout the country, and it signifies a great deal to the people of Michigan. We are reminded that Albion, a city of 12,000 people, has led in the fight against citizen apathy, and has extensively promoted and improved the quality of citizen involvement in community programs.

The All-American City Award is the most prestigious commendation which can be received by any community. Bestowal of this award does not rest on the effectiveness of city government, but instead on the efforts of citizens to better their environment, their homes, their city, Michigan, and those of us in the Third District especially, recognize Albion's achievements in these areas.

Each year, the National League of Cities honors only a few cities in the United States, and this year's competition included over 400 applicants, with 18 cities qualifying as finalists. Representatives of each of these 18 communities then journeyed to Dallas, Tex., to give presentations of slides, displays and testimony before an awards jury.

Albion, a city facing a multitude of problems, impressed the awards jury and became a winner partly because of local determination to counter the odds stacking up against the community. Problems stemmed from a lack of city financial support for human relations, environmental, or youth involvement programs, but never lacking in Albion was the spirit and energy of its citizens in implementing change. Albion's application for the All-American City Award outlines only three of more than a dozen programs which have been instrumental in lessening the burden of local problems.

These programs include the "Melting Pot," a plan of social interaction bringing black, white and chicano couples together. Subsequently, a community-wide effort, among the blacks and chicanos that constitute 25 percent of the city

population, was instituted to facilitate racial interaction. At least 1,500 persons have attended "Melting Pot" social events and discussions.

Improving the environment has also become a massive citizen project. Since 1965, the Albion Beautification Committee has dedicated itself to river clean-up plans, and acquired CBS coverage during Earth Day 1970. Corresponding research from Albion College has resulted in tentative approval for dredging over 300,000 cubic yards of silt from the mill ponds that have become "eyesores" in Albion.

"Youth for Ecology" is another program wherein the collection and recycling of refuse has resulted in the creation of a local recycle center; over 300 tons of paper and glass have been recycled since mid-1972.

"Earn, learn, and play" involves 350 Albion youngsters in 6 weeks of summer activities combining work, education, and recreation.

Albion's presentation to the awards jury also mentioned the \$100,000 Johnson Day Care Center built by local donations, the 100-unit, integrated housing subdivision supported by local churches, the citizen-operated historical museum, an entirely volunteer ambulance service, and other programs that Albion's citizens have nurtured to fruition, and of which they have a right to be proud. Defeating the spectre of apathy in Albion has produced a reduction in crime, and school and racial tensions, and has increased employment.

The problems Albion must face are similar to the problems of many other cities across the Nation, and they are ones that will persist for years to come. Yet a spirit of optimism and responsive action pervades the atmosphere of Albion, and it is significant to this award that the people of Albion display the All-American effort to surmount all obstacles with typical courage, zeal, and above all, optimism.

I salute the citizens of Albion today because we in Michigan are so proud, and I also congratulate the other All-American recipients of this prestigious award. Let us hope that all cities may be able to gain some inspiration from these dynamic examples of communities united in a common effort.

THE ROSS MANSION IN FREDERICK

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 22, 1974, the Daughters of the American Revolution, Frederick chapter, will sponsor the dedication of a bronze plaque in front of the Ross Mansion on Court Square in Frederick, Md. The plaque will outline some of the events which have occurred in the colorful history of the Ross mansion. This house is one of the most historic in Frederick, a town filled with history, and I com-

mend the sponsors of this dedication for their efforts in marking the story of the Ross mansion.

The Marquis de Lafayette stayed in the Ross mansion on December 29-31, 1824 as the guest of Col. John McPherson. His son, George Washington Lafayette, accompanied him on this sojourn. While Francis Scott Key was staying in the Ross mansion, he was inspired to write a poem dedicated to his cousin. There were many other events in the history of the house that has been recorded, and it is fitting that this tribute is being paid to a building of such distinction.

TV TALENT HELP RAISE \$1.3 MILLION FOR MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY FIGHT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with headlines carrying little but tragedy and scandal, it is indeed noteworthy to acknowledge human accomplishment rather than corruption.

Paul Shannon, a children's television personality at Pittsburgh's WTAE channel 4, and other television performers have made an immeasurable contribution to the fund raising activities of the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America through their promotion of ways in which children can conduct their own backyard carnivals and contribute the proceeds to Muscular Dystrophy Association.

As a letter I received from Bob Ross of the association suggests:

Through the project, participants learn how to organize and set up a complex event, how to cope with responsibility, and how to meet the challenge of operating a business enterprise of their own. But perhaps the greatest benefit they derive from carnivals is the "education in compassion" which it gives them—their increased awareness of the plight of the less fortunate.

Mr. LONG and his colleagues have been so successful in their efforts that more than \$1.3 million was raised for the fight against muscular dystrophy in 1973.

I would like to add my deepest thanks and congratulations to Paul Shannon and the many other talented men and women who made this all possible and include in the RECORD at this time the letter from Mr. Ross of the Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America, Inc.

The letter follows:

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY ASSOCIATIONS OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 18, 1974.

Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
Federal Building,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: I believe you'll be interested to know that a signal contribution to the welfare of citizens in your area and elsewhere throughout the country—especially children and adults afflicted by neuromuscular disease—has been made by WTAE-TV, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania through the efforts of Paul Shannon.

In very large measure, it's thanks to indi-

viduals like Paul and stations like WTAE-TV throughout the United States that Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America has been able to make such gratifying progress toward increasing public awareness of the life-and-death problems represented by muscular dystrophy and related disorders—and toward enlisting constructive support from concerned citizens in your district and elsewhere.

WTAE-TV and Paul Shannon have furthered the educational thrust of this Association in many ways, but I'd like to pay special tribute to their aid in promoting our Carnivals Against Dystrophy project. The enlightenment and inspiration they've provided their youthful viewers through this project have led directly to a significant enhancement of our ability to serve patients in your constituency and throughout the nation.

Inspired by TV personalities at stations all over the country, young people held more than 40,000 backyard Carnivals in 1973. Their efforts led to the realization of more than \$1.3-million to help support MDAA's programs of research and patient and community services.

As you may know, the Carnivals project functions primarily through promotion by popular children's TV personalities like Paul Shannon. These broadcasters invite their young viewers to write for a free kit, which contains all elements essential to the production of a fun-filled Carnival—which youngsters organize and run in their own backyards. Through the project, participants learn how to organize and set up a complex event, how to cope with responsibility, and how to meet the challenge of operating a business enterprise of their own. But perhaps the greatest benefit they derive from Carnivals is the "education in compassion" which it gives them—their increased awareness of the plight of the less fortunate.

In furthering this project in your area, Paul Shannon and WTAE-TV have done even more than help provide desperately-needed assistance to the victims of neuromuscular disease whom this Association seeks to serve. They've helped enrich the very spirit which has inspired this nation's greatest achievements.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ROSS, Executive Director.

ARTHUR ENDRES RECEIVES BENE-MERENTI MEDAL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, Art Endres of the Catholic University of America received the Benemerenti Medal from the Apostolic Delegate, Jean Jadot, who is Pope Paul's personal representative in the United States.

This decoration was instituted by Pope Gregory XVI in the early 1800's to recognize military valor and civil distinction. In more recent times it has been awarded to educators who have substantially contributed to the advancement of Catholic education or who have rendered long years of devoted service to Catholic institutions.

Art Endres received this award for over 25 years of loyal and dedicated service to the Catholic University of America. Art joined the university in 1948 as an instructor in physical education. He was promoted to the rank of assistant

professor of physical education in 1958. In addition, since his arrival at the university he has been the director of its successful intramural sports program.

In presenting the award on behalf of Pope Paul VI, Archbishop Jadot emphasized the importance of the educational profession and indicated the great need for hard work and diligent research in order to obtain a better insight into truth and reality.

I wish to commend Art Endres for his years of faithful service to the pontifical university and to congratulate him for being the recipient of this significant award.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE PHILLIPS CURVE

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's debate on the Obeys amendment to the fiscal year 1974 supplemental appropriations bill I discussed an economic theory referred to as the Phillips curve. I noted that many claim that public employment programs cannot be provided as, under the Phillips curve, when there is a decline in unemployment there is a proportional rise in inflation and prices. I further observed, however, that we are presently not only experiencing a persistent high rate of unemployment but, simultaneously a rise in the rate of inflation—a situation which would seem to defy the thesis underlying the Phillips curve. Surely if the relationship between unemployment and inflation ever existed—and I do not believe it ever did—it certainly does not exist now.

The financial section of yesterday's New York Times contained a rather perceptive article on this whole issue and it seriously questions the basis of the Phillips curve. Inasmuch as much attention has been given to the theory—particularly in posing arguments against a full employment economy and the expansion of public service programs—I insert this article herewith in the RECORD and commend it to our colleagues' attention:

AN ECONOMIC QUANDARY: DISCORDANCE OF PRICE AND JOB GOALS FRUSTRATES NATION'S POLICY MAKERS

(By Soma Golden)

In the promised land of economics it would not be the lion and the lamb that exist side by side but full employment and stable prices. The search for a way to twin these two policy goals seems to have become more frustrating than ever. A wicked combination of changes—some economic, some political—has boxed Washington policy makers further and further into a corner from which there seems to be no easy exit. Any direction the President's advisers turn, the options are more limited now than a decade ago, the risks somewhat greater.

On the upside of a business cycle the economy kicks off sparks of inflation sooner than it did in the past. And on the downside (as in the current period) the economy seems to shed less inflation than it used to.

To make matters worse, the United States has suddenly become vulnerable to the whims and whiplashes of world supply and demand—a fact driven home all too painfully last year. In the wake of the second devaluation of the dollar, the world's industrialized nations experienced simultaneous boom for the first time in recent history. Prices both here and abroad soared.

The implications of these trends are ominous for the men on the spot in Washington. They will probably get very little improvement in the price indexes from the current business slowdown. And, if the economy picks up as expected later this year, the indexes could take off once more.

Ironically, the inflation threat today represents a partial victory of economic policy—not a total defeat. Ever since the despair of the Great Depression this country, like many others, has been more afraid of unemployment than inflation.

Indeed, the record on the job front has improved since then. Walter W. Heller, who was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers until President Kennedy, points out that, for a "long, long period" before World War II, unemployment in the United States averaged 10 to 14 per cent of the labor force. Since the war the rate has moved down to the vicinity of 4 to 5 per cent. More recently, the figure was hovered above 5 per cent.

What mars this achievement, however, is the parallel rise in prices. During the decade from 1954 to 1963, consumer prices scarcely budged, moving up an average of 1.4 per cent a year. Unemployment averaged 5.4 per cent in that decade.

Since then unemployment has come down a bit, to an average of 4.6 per cent of the labor force. But prices have jumped sharply, averaging a yearly rise of 4.4 per cent in the 10 years since 1964.

Economists have long believed that at low levels of unemployment—when the country's labor resources are stretched and demand is booming—inflation tends to worsen. The professionals have described this trade-off with a theoretical device known as the "Phillips curve"—named in honor of A. W. Phillips, a British economist who first charted the hypothetical relationship for his country in 1958.

The curve, which is based on historical evidence, shows what happened to prices when unemployment reaches low levels. The trade-off is clear from the curve's inevitable shape: When the jobless rate falls, inflation tends to worsen.

Despite uncertainty about the precise shape of the Phillips curve for the United States, Democratic economists who came to Washington in the early days of the Kennedy Administration thought they could guide the country along the imaginary curve to a comfortable trade-off position—without too much unemployment or inflation.

But the Keynesian economists of the nineteen-sixties never made it to the promised land. Their effort to nudge the American economy out of recession into an inflation-free expansion ended in a crushing disappointment. President Johnson spent billions on a secret build-up of the Vietnam war and refused to offset the outlay with new taxes, economic advice to the contrary.

As a result, the economy speeded past the target level of low unemployment and on into inflation land, from which it has not returned. Now the route back seems to have become more difficult.

The traditional way to restore price stability is a slowdown or, if it lasts long enough and hits hard enough, a full-fledged recession. But research under way by a Columbia University economist, Phillip Cagen, indicates that the old cure does not work so well anymore.

United States inflation, he says, has become increasingly sticky on the downside of the business cycle. The 1969-70 recession,

which the Nixon Administration found so frustrating because the inflation rate barely subsided, was part of a trend that began in 1949, according to Professor Cagen, who is on leave this year for work at the National Bureau of Economic Research.

A STUDY OF PRICES

The economist, who studied wholesale prices to see what happened to them during recession and the eight months after the recessions bottomed out, says the implications of his study are "very pessimistic." He does not expect the current slowdown to produce much of a payoff in prices.

Professor Cagen, who served earlier in the Nixon Administration as a senior staff economist on the Council of Economic Advisers, is not sure precisely how to explain his findings. But he rules out the notion that big business is at fault—a form of villainy often alleged by John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard University economist.

Without naming names, Professor Cagen says that the effort to place the blame for inflation on administered prices in highly concentrated industries has led people "180 degrees of the track." On the contrary, the Columbia professor has found that in general highly concentrated industries—where a small number of companies control a large part of sales—play a follower rather than a leader role in showing up the price needs.

UPSIDE PROBLEMS

While Professor Cagen's findings about the sticky nature of prices during a recession will come as sad news to most economists, the economics profession has already come to accept the fact that there are added problems on the upside of a business cycle.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 21

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent commentary on ABC News, Mr. Howard K. Smith called for the creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. Mr. Smith stated that the corporation would provide competition in an industry now dominated by a few monopolistic giants and would also provide a "yardstick" by which to obtain the Nation's first independent measure of production and development costs. The editorial, reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor on February 8, is another indication of the widespread support for the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues at this time.

The text follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 8, 1974]

A TVA FOR OIL?

(Commentary by Howard K. Smith on ABC News)

Shortages and soaring prices of oil are bound to cause hardships. It is essential to morale that hardships are fairly distributed. Americans are not sure they are. Mainly there is the suspicion the oil companies are not bearing a share, but are making hay out of the crisis. The truckers are the first to blow over that. They won't be the last.

The companies say their profits average over the years about 6 percent, not too much. But suspicion persists that there are hidden

gains in write-offs at various stages in production—exploring, drilling, refining, transporting, wholesaling, retailing . . . every stage controlled by the oil companies.

We don't know because, also, the oil companies have a monopoly on all facts, a situation complained about by energy chief Simon and Sen. Henry Jackson.

What can be done? We could put an army of federal accountants into the companies to scour books at every state—cumbersome, costly, irritating.

But now, Senator Stevenson of Illinois has a better way. Do what was done when people thought power firms were raking in too much: set up a TVA for oil, a federally-run oil company, producing oil at known costs and reasonable prices. With it the companies would have to compete and therefore keep their prices reasonable too.

It did wonders for electric power prices. It might do the same for oil.

AEC STUDY OFFERS RECOMMENDATIONS OF SOLAR HEATING AND COOLING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, utilizing the sun to heat and cool the buildings in which we live and work offers significant hope for achieving long-run energy independence. For example, it has been estimated that if one-half of all buildings were equipped with solar heating and cooling systems in the year 2000, approximately one billion barrels of oil would be saved each year.

The significant obstacles to achieving this goal are not primarily a matter of technology. There are over 20 solar heated homes in the United States today. The principal obstacles are economic. These problems can, however, be substantially eliminated through a significant, short-term Federal commitment to the commercial development of solar heating and cooling technology.

The staff of the Atomic Energy Commission has examined this matter in great detail and has recommended a program of Federal involvement. I offer this staff study to my colleagues for their interest. The study follows:

STAFF STUDY

C. CURRENT STATUS OF TECHNOLOGY

1. Domestic water heating

The technology of solar domestic water heaters is well developed. They have the characteristic of having a fairly constant demand throughout the year, regardless of the climate where installed, the type of building construction used, and the degree of insulation in the building. In addition, they can be easily retrofitted to many existing buildings by being tied into the existing hot water heater, which in turn can act as a booster heater to the solar heater when required. The collector area required, around 200 ft.² for a private residence of average size, would be relatively easy to fit onto a roof. It is estimated that about twenty per cent of the heat load required for a building is used to heat water. If solar energy systems are to provide domestic hot water, the solar collectors must be operated at a temperature of approximately 130°F. Existing designs are capable of efficient operation at this temperature. Normally, a single collector can

serve for both heating of domestic hot water and space heating.

The existence of a commercial solar water heater industry and market in several foreign countries can be taken as evidence of the relatively advanced degree of commercial development that solar water heaters already hold. A market analysis in Japan, Israel, India and Australia should verify this and shed light on the direction that a new U.S. market should take.

2. Space Heating

The technology for solar space heating exists now. There have been more than twenty experimental solar heated structures designed, built and operated in the U.S. These efforts were custom designed and built by entrepreneurs. Architects are becoming interested in construction of solar heated homes and commercial buildings.

With mass-produced solar collectors using present technology, solar space heating should be competitive with fossil fuel heating in many regions of the nation. However, subsystems, and building solar systems data required by architects and heating system designers are not available. There is not sufficient experience in building solar systems design, component manufacturing, and operational experience to convince the building industry and the public that solar heating is economic and reliable.

It is not normally cost effective to install a solar system large enough to store all the energy required for heat during extended cloudy periods in the winter. Instead, a backup system, using either fossil fuels or electricity, must be provided. The optimum size of the solar system depends upon the climatic conditions, the cost of the solar collectors, and the cost of the backup fuel. In retrofit, the choice of backup fuel is determined by use of the existing heating unit. In new construction, the backup fuel can be chosen on the basis either of cost effectiveness or of alleviation of local peak load problems.

In the retrofit of a building with an existing central forced air heating system, advantage can be taken of the existing blowers and air ducts. Heat from the solar energy storage tank is transferred to the air by heat exchangers placed in the existing air ducts. Controls must be provided both to control the pumps in the solar energy system and to turn on the backup unit when the heat in the solar storage tank is depleted. Retrofit of buildings which lack a central heating system does not appear economical because the addition of the air ducts or other distribution system could require drastic alterations to the building.

3. Space Cooling

The technology for solar space cooling is in the early stages of development. An aggressive program of research and development could develop air conditioners powered by the heat from solar collectors. It is currently debatable whether or not an air conditioner can be developed which could efficiently use water at a temperature of less than 180°F. To achieve this high an operating temperature would require a program to perfect high temperature collectors. Because of the insulation and glazing requirements, these collectors will be more expensive than collectors which provide only space heat and domestic hot water using collectors of 130°F. In addition, more sophisticated control systems are required for cooling than for the other functions.

There are two classes of cooling and humidity control problems; one pertains to hot dry climates and the other to hot humid climates. Systems for hot dry climates are easier to develop and earlier implementation is possible. Combined solar heating and cooling systems for hot dry areas look economically promising now, but component

and system development and demonstration data are not sufficient to permit use by the building industry and the public. Climate data showing where such systems are feasible are also not available or not compiled in a useful way.

The adaptation of air conditioning systems in hot humid areas (e.g., evaporative, desiccant, night radiation, absorption, compressor, and heat pumps) to solar energy use is technically feasible but with more effort required. However, it does appear that absorption-type water chillers can be operated at about 200° F which is readily achievable from a high performance solar collector. Large units which would be appropriate for use in buildings are commercially available. Smaller units suitable for residences are under development and commercial availability can be forecast during the next several years.

Retrofit of most buildings with solar cooling would require alterations to the existing central air system, especially modification of the ducting to include the new cooling unit. In buildings which presently do not have any provision for cooling, the cooling could be included as part of the retrofit solar energy system.

D. LOCAL INVOLVEMENT

1. Government

The rights of individuals installing solar energy systems must be protected against adjacent construction which could shield them from the sun. Rights to sun angles must be guaranteed by legislation because an investor cannot risk the possibility of construction adjacent to his building site obstructing the sun. Model legislation should be prepared for introduction into State legislatures and local zoning ordinances. Generally speaking, pre-existing conditions will be honored. Local building codes must be modified to include solar energy installations. Model code amendments should be prepared and distributed to States, municipalities and other appropriate groups.

Detailed design studies must be made to prove that new solar systems designs meet safety and health requirements. Planning commissions, coding authorities, and local trade unions must be convinced to modify appropriate regulations and practices which may interfere with solar powered building construction.

2. Private

(a) Architects/Engineers

While the widespread use of solar heating and cooling in new private construction is a desirable national goal, such use is hampered by the lack of several important elements:

- (1) Architects experienced in the incorporation of solar systems into building design.
- (2) Records of proven solar system performance under a variety of conditions.
- (3) Plumbing, heating, and air conditioning contractors experienced in the installation of solar systems.
- (4) A pool of experienced maintenance and repair technicians.
- (5) Mass production of reliable low-cost solar collectors.
- (6) Nation-wide network of vendors for solar components.

An important ingredient in the establishment of a technical personnel base is a national effort to educate Architect-Engineers in the use of solar energy systems. The wide dissemination of design information is critical to the accelerated implementation of solar energy.

(b) Builders

Regional technical information and technical personnel training centers should be

established to expedite the transfer of information and the creation of the technical personnel necessary for implementation. Rather than establish a new network of technical centers which may be unable to cope with the technical aspects of the program, existing centers of technical excellence, such as educational institutions, should be used to the greatest extent possible. These centers should be widely distributed throughout the country.

Subsidized courses should be offered at the solar centers for builders, developers, contractors, equipment fabricators, and suppliers. A traveling troupe of instructors should tour the centers to give the initial round of short courses and train local staff to instruct subsequent courses. The solar centers should also arrange to make solar energy presentations to interested citizen groups in their area. These centers should serve their greatest purpose during the early phases of the program.

(c) Manufacturers

Various manufacturers should be placed under contract for the design and manufacture of prototype collector modules. The prototypes would require testing under a variety of controlled and field conditions.

This task aims at encouraging mass production manufacturers to be innovative with the most cost sensitive components. It is important that the competitive advantages of one manufacturing process over another be protected in order to provide maximum incentive. In producing the prototypes, each manufacturer should prepare a cost estimate for producing units in mass production quantities. The prototypes would all be tested initially under identical conditions in an artificial solar environment. Promising collectors would be field tested under different climatic conditions as components of complete solar energy systems. They also would be subjected to accelerated exposures to ultraviolet, thermal cycling, etc., to determine durability.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when we set out to write legislation with starry-eyed idealism and ignore the practicalities of the real world, we get some weird results. One of them is H.R. 11500, the bill that set out to assure effective land reclamation after coal surface mining—or so its sponsors say—and has become a bill so riddled with absolutes that it would virtually wipe out this important part of our energy supply.

For example, the bill requires land to be reclaimed in a manner to eliminate erosion. The only way to do that is to pave it. Any slope of earth, no matter how well vegetated, erodes in a rainstorm—and any member who doubts this is invited to slosh out to the foot of Capitol Hill during the next thunderstorm and drink a few ounces of the runoff from the lawn.

Erosion can be effectively controlled, and this bill should require it. But to specify that erosion must be eliminated is to require an impossible absolute that would prohibit surface coal mining. Absolutely.

This is as silly as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak. If we do not get some reality into this bill, the thing that will really be eroded is our power supply.

AIDING THE VIETNAM VETS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, a great deal of publicity has been given to the problems which are facing today's veterans. For too long, their problems have been ignored. I welcome the attention which they are presently getting. It is with this in mind that I am taking the liberty of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Columnist William Raspberry which recently appeared in the Washington Post.

I feel sure that my colleagues will find Mr. Raspberry's comments on the present state of veterans benefits of great interest.

AIDING THE VIETNAM VETS

(By William Raspberry)

The American people came to hate the war in Vietnam, all right. But it does not follow that they also hate the men who fought in that war.

That fact is slowly seeping through the public consciousness. And the pitiful little Vietnam Veterans Day parade staged here last week—as little and as late as it was—offered some indication that it is also seeping into the consciousness of President Nixon.

In medical care, in education, in job opportunities—in all the "extras" that we customarily heap upon war veterans—the Vietnam veterans are being short changed. The reason, I suppose, is not that they were individually less heroic than any other category of war veterans but that they are not heroes generically, because they didn't save us from anything.

The only Vietnam veterans to be treated as heroes were the returning POWs, and after the initial fanfare, even these men have been pretty much forgotten as far as the administration is concerned.

As inadequate as the country's response to Vietnam vets generally has been, it has been even more inadequate for minority veterans, a point made last week by a task force of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (a conglomeration of some 135 civil rights, labor, social and religious organizations).

"Because of inadequate and poorly managed programs, Vietnam veterans—and particularly minority veterans—have been effectively denied their earned benefits and have suffered grievous problems in trying to resume their civilian lives," said June Willenz, chairman of the Leadership Conference's Task Force on Veterans and Military Affairs.

She pointed out that while blacks composed only about 12.6 per cent of the armed forces personnel, they accounted for roughly 20 per cent of the combat fatalities.

"Minority veterans who bore the brunt of a discriminatory discharge policy while in military service are now being discriminated against upon their return to civilian life," she said.

That last was in reference to a point made by the National Urban League earlier last month during House hearings on amnesty: that black GIs have received a disproportionate

ately large share of less-than-honorable discharges from the military.

Ronald H. Brown, director of the League's Washington bureau told the hearing:

"The military, like the vast majority of our other institutions, has somehow learned to dispense justice in discriminatory measures. Minority members were drafted in greater numbers, assigned in greater numbers to front-line duty or to unskilled, dead-end jobs, and generally abused by the unfair system of military justice. Finally, those who were called upon to bear the brunt of duty were ejected in greater numbers with less-than-honorable discharges."

The less-than-honorable discharge represents far more than a blot on a veteran's record. According to those who have studied the problem, such discharges are often used as a basis for denying employment.

Even many discharges that appear to be honorable, are "coded with personal characteristics which may serve to discriminate against millions of men who are not even aware of the presence of such codes," Brown testified.

While the discharge codes can work against any veteran, they work "a special hardship on minority veterans, who already face many hurdles in the American society," Brown said.

He said that there is evidence that many major employers are able to decipher the codes, even though most veterans have no idea what they mean. (The Defense Department announced last week that it would no longer code discharges.)

Unfortunately, the Urban League, the NAACP and other member groups of the Leadership Conference have had little success in getting the government to act on the special complaints of minority GIs—which isn't surprising in view of how little attention has been paid the plight of white GIs.

There is very little reason to be hopeful about the prospects of reinstating special programs for minority veterans, but it wouldn't be surprising to see a major administration move to upgrade benefits for Vietnam veterans generally.

The President, so desperate for some gesture to improve his ratings that he has dredged up even the old standby of school busing, may find it politically attractive to climb aboard the veterans' bandwagon.

THE TAXPAYER NEEDS HELP TO FIGHT INFLATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the American consumer is finding it harder and harder to make ends meet. Every day I hear from Illinois residents who are experiencing financial hardships because of prices at the grocery store and the gas station, and in paying all types of inflated bills.

Just last month, wholesale prices rose 1.3 percent. Even the surprising 2.1 percent drop in food prices could not offset this surge. Fuel—which has in the past been the second leading cause of inflation—rose 4.8 percent in March alone. The price of metals increased 4.4 percent; chemical prices by 5.7 percent; lumber prices by 3.3 percent; pulp and paper 3.2 percent; and machinery and nonmetallic minerals 1.6 percent.

These increases follow a year in which the American consumer has already been confronted with decreasing buying power and much high costs. The real take-home pay of the average worker last month was 4 percent below a year earlier, even though the hourly earnings were up 6.6 percent. And, overall, wholesale prices have skyrocketed above 19 percent in the past 12 months.

While some of the latest increases may be attributed to the lifting of price controls, it is also clear that controls in general have simply not worked. Authority to impose wage and price controls is expected to expire on April 30. As that deadline draws near, most Americans are convinced controls have been a dismal failure.

Living costs are at least twice as high as they were when controls were imposed in 1971.

Fuel prices have increased at least a third, and food prices by more than a fifth.

Wholesale prices in March alone climbed at a seasonally adjusted rate of 15.6 percent a year.

Now, as taxpayers are paying their income taxes, they feel the pinch of inflation even more. Clearly, the \$750 personal exemption is not sufficient. We in Congress must be more responsive in providing a tax exemption that will at least cover the taxpayers' minimum living costs. For this reason, I am today introducing a bill to increase the standard deduction from \$750 to \$1,200. While this is obviously only a small step, I think it does represent a reasonable change in a current, outdated law, given our spiraling inflation.

I believe it is necessary to alleviate the great burden imposed upon the American taxpayer by the ever-rising cost of living. I urge immediate and favorable action on this legislation.

FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING OF MARYLAND

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this is the 30th consecutive year that Father Joseph F. Thorning has offered the prayer in the House of Representatives for the observance of Pan American Day.

Wisconsin is proud to claim Father Thorning as a native son. He took the initiative in inaugurating a celebration on Capitol Hill of the cause of inter-American understanding, cooperation, and friendship back in 1944. This annual observance is now a firmly rooted tradition, and has broadened the understanding and respect of Members of the House for our neighbors of the Americas.

Father Thorning is known as the "Padre of the Americas," a title awarded him by the distinguished gentleman from Montana who is now the majority leader in the other body, Senator MIKE MANS-

FIELD. Educated at St. Louis University and Catholic University in Washington, he devotes his time to being both a scholar and journalist on Latin America.

Today, more than ever, inter-American programs need leadership such as that provided by Father Thorning. The Members of this body, and all Americans, owe him a great debt of gratitude.

QUICK, HENRY, THE AMENDMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recently, Women's Wear Daily asked a cross-section of famous Americans whether my proposed constitutional amendment making all American citizens eligible to hold the office of President should be adopted, and whether they would support Secretary of State Kissinger as a Presidential candidate.

I did not intend my amendment as an endorsement of Dr. Kissinger despite his ability and worthiness to hold that great office, but the attached article from the April 5 edition of that publication does make interesting reading:

QUICK, HENRY, THE AMENDMENT!

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger can be a lot of things to a lot of people, but he cannot be president of the United States. As things stand now, he's not even eligible to run.

That's because Article II, Section 1, of the Constitution says, "No person except a natural born citizen . . . shall be eligible to the office of President." That rules out someone like Kissinger, who has lived here most of his life and who is a naturalized citizen, but who was born in Germany.

Recently, Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D., N.Y.) proposed a constitutional amendment that would repeal Article II, Section 1, and strike out the "natural-born" requirement. When Kissinger heard of it, he is reported to have said, "The State Department must be behind it. That's the only way they can get rid of me."

He was kidding, of course, but the proposed amendment is being given serious consideration by Congress. We contacted a cross-section of Americans and asked two questions: Would they favor such an amendment, and would they support Kissinger as a presidential candidate?

Here's what they said.

Gloria Steinem: "Yes, absolutely, it should be amended. Nationalism is becoming more and more archaic and as the globe gets smaller and smaller, we need to be able to choose from the greatest talent pool possible. Would I support Kissinger? Compared to whom? I think he's much better on foreign policy than on domestic policy, and compared to Nixon or Ford, yes, I would rather see him there."

Julian Bond, Georgia state legislator: "Yes, I would like to see the prohibition against foreign-born people being allowed to run for president amended. However, I am not in favor of amending the Constitution every time someone thinks they have discovered a problem. I feel Kissinger has made an excellent secretary of state and has been a gifted negotiator, but just because you are good at one thing doesn't mean you will be good in another. Nixon has a good background in foreign affairs and look at the do-

mestic scene in our country. Just because you have expertise in foreign affairs doesn't necessarily mean you have virtue either. Nixon has no compassion, no heart. As for Kissinger, I really don't know if he has any domestic knowledge about anything except Jill St. John."

Lt. Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia: "I would oppose any such amendment, and under no circumstances would I like to see Kissinger as president. His priorities are based on what's good for the world—not the U.S. I'm thinking of the grain and armament deals. We've ended up with a lot of shortages, just because we have not thought of our own priorities. I don't believe in one-world type person."

Barbara Howar: "I think the Constitution should be amended to say that no California Disneyland flunky can be the president's right-hand man. Other than that, my list of priorities does not extend to a foreigner's right to be president. Anybody would Henry want to be president who's already got more power than the President ever had. Besides, I don't think he gives a damn about the domestic situation. I think one should have to endure an American childhood before one can endure American power."

Sheila Mosler, assistant commissioner of commerce, New York state: "No, it should be a natural-born citizen. But I don't think it's that pressing an issue—so much so that we need to change that qualification. We have other, more urgent legislative needs that need to be dealt with right now instead of that. However, if I didn't feel that way about the amendment, I'd like to see Kissinger run. But my first choice is always Rockefeller, because with him, Kissinger, too."

Sen. Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.): "In my favor. I'm generally sympathetic to the approach. As far as Kissinger is concerned, the GOP is going to have to make that decision."

Norman Rockwell: "I think the best man should be president, and I have no objections to someone who is not a 'natural-born' citizen running for this office. As for me, I'm not sure I want to go down in print as an advocate of his potential candidacy. I'm no political expert."

Reg Murphy, editor of the Atlanta Constitution: "Yes, I think the Constitution should be amended. If it were, however, I would not particularly like to see Dr. Henry Kissinger as president. He is a remarkable public figure; he has one of the best minds and patience for broad leadership. It takes a long number of years to learn leadership skills that will be a unifying force in the country."

Barbara Walters: "I think the article should be amended. There is no reason why it shouldn't be. However, it's a little early in the game to talk about presidential candidates."

Sen. Charles Percy (R., Ill.): "I'm for the amendment. The constitutional prohibition against any foreign-born citizen applies not only to talented and valuable individuals such as Secretary of State Kissinger, but also to children of American citizens who happen to be out of the country at the time of the child's birth. This exclusion seems unwarranted and unnecessarily deprives America of potential leaders."

Dan Rather: "Yes, I think the Constitution should be amended, but I think a certain residency requirement should be added. I've only seen Kissinger in one area, so I couldn't say whether or not he'd make a good president on all counts, but if he were nominated, I think he would be a very worthy candidate."

William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester Union Leader: "The fact that one is native-born doesn't always guarantee one will be a responsible citizen, but there's an inescapable gut reaction that someone who's native-born will be more devoted to the nation's best

interests than someone who isn't. As to Mr. Kissinger, he has been, really, a failure. His wheat deal with Russia was a colossal disaster we're all paying for in higher food prices. And all we got out of his China negotiations were a couple of pandas. Kissinger is so fascinated by Metternich that sometimes he forgets he's in the 20th Century."

Bess Myerson: "I think anyone who is an American, whether by birth or by choice, should have the opportunity to share all the rights, responsibilities, and rewards of that privilege—to go anywhere and do anything as an equal, as far as his or her individual challenge and vision takes them. It isn't where anyone comes from that counts most—it's where he or she can help to lead us where we must go. Depending on the circumstances, I might support Kissinger, but more importantly, my support wouldn't be restricted just because he wasn't a natural-born citizen."

Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman (D., N.Y.): "I have taken no position on this subject and feel very strongly that a constitutional amendment is something which must be studied very carefully before it can be voted on. Secondly, I didn't know Kissinger was running."

Helen Thomas: "Every American citizen should have the chance to be president, no matter where they were born, but I wouldn't take a position on who should run."

Rep. Alan Steelman (R., Texas): "I do support the amendment. I can understand why some Americans would have doubts about electing someone who was not born in this country. I think the political marketplace is a testing ground. If someone has proven loyalty and dedication to the principles for which we stand through outstanding public service, as Kissinger has, then he should be able to run for office. The people should have the ultimate decision. If the man is not what he should be, it will be brought out and he won't be elected."

Arthur Schlesinger: "No, I am not in favor of amending the article. I would be in favor only if it were guaranteed that John Kenneth Galbraith would become president. As for Kissinger, even if it were amended, the answer is still no."

Vice President Gerald Ford: "This matter requires study by the Congress."

SCHOOLS FOR CRIME

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a recently published book by Gertrude Samuels, a crusading reporter for the New York Times Magazine, spotlights a disgraceful situation.

"Run, Shelley, Run!" is a hard-hitting, compelling documentary novel about the incarceration of children by the State—housed in detention centers that are in fact schools for crime, in prisons rampart with homosexuality. It is about young people designated as PINS, persons in need of supervision, more than often children who are victims of parental neglect. The book grew out of Ms. Samuels' many years covering juvenile justice in courts throughout the country. More than 100,000 children of juvenile court age are imprisoned each

year, and more than a half million are placed in detention centers.

The story, based on actual fact, is Shelley's, a street-wise little girl, classified as a PINS at age 12, she is signed over to the juvenile detention center because of her own mother's negligence. This is Shelley's "crime." "What is best for you," never worked for Shelley or countless others like her—incarcerated with little or no due process, confined under cruel and coercive conditions, abused under what is known as "law." For Shelley, running away loomed as the only hope.

"Run, Shelley, Run!" is an indictment of a system that is to be damned, along with its rubber stamp, files, hypocritical directors, and "idealistic" staffers. Shelley ran for the third time, knowing that if she were caught again, it would be the "hard rock hotel" of solitary confinement, high walls, barred windows, and the dark.

This is Shelley's story but it is the pattern: children who run, who are caught, and who run again; incarceration, no rehabilitation, mindless approaches to their treatment, and often suicide the only final escape. While gathering material for her article, "When Children Collide with the Law,"—the New York Times Magazine, December 5, 1971—Gertrude Samuels came to know and befriend girls imprisoned in institutions whose damaged lives were the basis for this story. Her conclusion in this approach to juvenile treatment reveals "a fundamental mindlessness."

"But what was worse," she says, "was the cruel indifference of the community which threw first offenders and child runaways in with kids who had committed crimes. In short, the prisons were in reality schools for crime."

CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. WYDLER MAKES PUBLIC FINANCIAL DATA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, there have been some groups and individuals who have suggested that Government officials in general, and Members of Congress in particular, make public more facts regarding their personal finances. These requests have taken different forms.

Although there is an invasion of privacy in such a request, particularly for the members of one's family, a reluctance or refusal to do so can be used to suggest some kind of impropriety.

We have official rules in the House of Representatives, of course, regarding disclosures of sources of outside income, which have been in effect for many years. As a Member of the House, I have fully complied with these requirements and filed the necessary documentation. Recently, this matter was reviewed by an ad hoc bipartisan committee of the New York delegation and it made certain rec-

ommendations as to what information should be filed and the manner in which such filing should take place.

I intend to comply fully with this recommendation by publishing the following facts—these facts will, of course, cover my wife as well as myself and be complete as to the two of us insofar as all of the following items are concerned. The sources of all of my noncongressional income are from the law firm in which I am a general partner, Wydler, Balin, Pares, Soloway, Seaton and Marglin, 1510 Jericho Turnpike, New Hyde Park, N.Y. In addition to that, I have a small income from dividends, as hereafter set forth. Finally, there may be some income from interest on savings accounts in my wife's and children's names, but this would be of a very small amount. I have no indebtednesses which are unsecured, except monthly running charge accounts in my wife's name and the usual running household bills and expenses. The only other source for reimbursement of expenditures, other than the U.S. Government, is from my aforementioned law firm.

The identity of all stocks, bonds and other securities owned outright or beneficially by me and my wife are as follows: Athlone Industries, Inc.; Bank of New York Co.; Botswana Rst. Ltd.; Colt Industries; Combined Communications Corp.; Foote, Cone, Belding; Industro Transistor, Inc.; Israel Savings Bonds; LITCO, Inc.; Lykes Youngstown; Management Assistance Corp.; Madison Square Garden; Marine Midland Banks; Munro Games, Inc.; Noble Lumber; Pacific Telephone & Telegraph; Pan Ocean Oil; P & F Industries, Inc.; Penn Central Railroad; Ranchers Packing Corp.; Retail Credit Corp.; Roan Selection Trust; Security National Bank; Servotronics, Inc.; Tami, Inc.; Telecommunications Industries, Inc.; U.S. savings bonds. Dividends on my holdings in these stocks totaled \$1,632.35 for 1972.

I am a director in the P & F Industries, Inc.; and a partner in the aforementioned law firm.

I have paid income taxes for the year 1972 in the following amounts: Federal income taxes \$20,917.00; State income taxes \$8,146.95.

Although I do not now have the exact figures available for 1973, they will be substantially similar to the above figures paid by my wife and myself on our joint income.

I am publishing this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or before April 15, as was recommended.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this information will prove helpful to the general public.

CONGRESS IS PROVIDING MUCH NEEDED AID FOR THE AMERICAN WORKER

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the misguided leadership of the Nixon

CXX—701—Part 8

administration, the American people have been subjected to economic policies which have resulted in increased unemployment in key industries.

The 93d Congress recognizes that the Nixon administration was inviting economic disaster, and it has taken up the burden of providing economic leadership which our hard-pressed workers so urgently need.

As you know, this distinguished body yesterday passed the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1974. This includes \$1.97 billion for manpower programs, \$305 million is designated for public service employment, \$208 million for summer youth employment and \$1.4 billion for on-going programs. This will go a long way toward easing the critical unemployment situation.

By passing the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the House of Representatives has shown that it is committed to eliminating our economic plight.

This amendment adds \$150 million above and beyond the funds already slated for manpower programs. We passed this amendment by a vote of 236-168.

The Nixon administration claims that unemployment has stabilized at 5.5 percent. While this figure appears to be encouraging, it is misleading. National unemployment may be at 5.5 percent, but regional unemployment, in areas like Massachusetts, California and Michigan is as high as 14 percent. We must not allow this situation to continue.

HEALTH MANPOWER SHORTAGE

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the decade of the 1970's will be characterized by sweeping changes in health care delivery. Money and trained health manpower have become scarce resources in today's medically underserved society. Human talent is the key to enhancing the quality of life and meeting society's medical needs.

By 1980, the health delivery industry may be the Nation's largest consumer of manpower. As health care becomes available to all citizens in this affluent society, more demands and pressures will be exerted on the health care system. To meet this growing need, the quantity and quality of health manpower must be increased through education and training. Since manpower is a major key to meeting our Nation's health goals, a new thrust is clear—a national mandate to relieve the chronic shortage of health manpower. The Carnegie Commission emphatically stated:

The most serious shortages of professional personnel in any major occupational group in the United States are in the health services.

The estimate of the allied health manpower shortage for 1975 is 322,000. For

1980 it is 432,000. These numbers do not take into consideration new estimates for health personnel to provide services under a Comprehensive National Health Insurance program. Factors to consider are:

First. The extent to which increasing technology and specialization will be efficient and desirable.

Second. The extent to which duties and responsibilities can successfully be delegated to lower-level personnel—improved utilization.

Third. The extent to which the scarcity of health manpower in underserved areas—urban and rural—can be solved.

The problem is not one of sheer numbers because the extent to which a given number of people meet the needs will be determined by the kind of education and training received in a clinical setting. An important segment of allied health education is clinical practice in a health facility. A major constraint has been the need for more clinical sites.

Until each health discipline is recognized for what and how it can contribute, health care services will never become a workable system. Priority must be given to training and clinical programs at all levels for allied health professions and occupations. To date there is little evidence of health "teams," in action. The capabilities, responsibilities, and an understanding of utilization, must be taught and integrated into the health care system.

Expansion of health care services, with new formats and new areas will demand new and expanding roles for the health profession, and the utilization of facilities such as primary care centers—satellite clinics, neighborhood health centers, secondary school health centers, doctor's offices and health stations located in sparsely populated rural areas—nursing homes, extended care facilities, rehabilitation centers and inner-city health projects, among others. These innovations cannot reach their full potential without the availability of qualified health manpower—in quantity and quality to staff these new programs.

One approach to meeting the health manpower shortage is the establishment of a volunteer, national health action program, in which young people receive special training in various areas of the health field. This youth service plan would allow a realistic view and exposure to the health and social problems of America, while offering them involvement and opportunity to serve their community and country.

Today, I am introducing legislation to create a National Health Action Corps. The intent is to give the youth of America an educational and rewarding experience in the real world before pursuing advanced education.

This bill would provide for a national health action program for young high school graduates in a full-time volunteer program. Upon completion of high school, the student would volunteer, then receive counseling on the various health disciplines available for training. The enrollee would select the health area of his choice, and then commit himself to an agreed-upon payback time—probably a

1- or 2-year commitment—depending upon the time and training required. In many instances the enrollee could train in a health facility in his local area. Such a youth service program not only would provide a transition period—alternative to college—from a high school teenager to a productive career-oriented adult, but it has the potential of assuring an adequate future supply of allied health manpower and health professionals in meeting Federal health care delivery repossibilities.

**A CIVIL RIGHTS ACT FOR THE
HANDICAPPED—SECTION 504 OF
PUBLIC LAW 93-112**

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on September 26 of last year, President Nixon signed into law the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, a measure he had already vetoed twice, despite obviously overwhelming congressional support. That act, now Public Law 93-112, has continued to be an orphan of neglect—apparently deliberately ignored in an attempt by the administration to accomplish through administrative procrastination what the President's vetoes could not.

Implementation deadlines established in Public Law 93-112 have been ignored. Particularly upsetting is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's delay in implementation of section 504 of the act.

Section 504 reads as follows:

No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States . . . shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance.

Preliminary plans for implementation of section 504 were to be published by December 24, 1973, according to James S. Dwight, Jr., Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in testimony before the House Select Subcommittee on Education on November 30, 1973. That date was not met, and subsequent target dates for progressive implementation of the section have apparently not been met either.

Mr. Speaker, section 504 deserves significant notice. It guarantees, without qualification, equal rights for the handicapped in federally funded or assisted programs. Its similarity to title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, in this respect, gives reason to describe section 504 as a Civil Rights Act for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the House Select Education Committee on H.R. 70, the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, of the Department of Justice, Mr. J. Stanley Pottinger, said that the Department of Justice was giv-

ing careful consideration to the implications of that statute, including whether it might serve as a vehicle for additional action by the Department to assure equal rights for the handicapped.

I wrote to the Department of Justice to determine the progress of that in-house study, and I have today received a reply. The text of that letter follows:

I am responding to your inquiry concerning my testimony before the House Select Subcommittee on Education on March 18, 1974. I testified at that time that the Department of Justice was giving consideration to the implications of Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) to determine whether it might serve as grounds for action by the Department in the area of educational rights of the handicapped.

This Department has not yet completed its analysis of the implications of Section 504. However, you should be aware of the following developments.

On February 26, 1974 the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare designated the Office for Civil Rights of H.E.W. as the agency within H.E.W. responsible for the enforcement of Section 504. As H.E.W.'s statement at the March 18, 1974 Subcommittee hearing indicates, the Office for Civil Rights is presently conducting an analysis of the tasks required to effectively implement Section 504. The Department of Justice will maintain close liaison with H.E.W. during this process.

On March 20, 1974 in *North Carolina Association for Retarded Children v. State of North Carolina* (C.A. No. 3050, E.D. N.C.), a case in which the United States is a plaintiff-intervenor, the private plaintiffs amended their complaint to include an allegation of a violation of Section 504 through the alleged exclusion of mentally retarded students from a free public education. As plaintiff-intervenors in this case, we intend to develop and present to the Court all relevant evidence concerning a violation of Section 504.

I hope you find this information helpful. If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

J. STANLEY POTTINGER,

Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights
Division.

It is heartening to know that this section of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is being taken earnestly. I am particularly pleased that Mr. Pottinger is aware of the provision and is actively moving toward a real implementation of it. I hope that Section 504 can indeed become the Civil Rights Act for the Handicapped and make available to the handicapped the same government-provided programs and privileges that the nonhandicapped enjoy.

**UPRISING IN WARSAW GHETTO
ON APRIL 19, 1943**

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are some moments in days gone by which have etched themselves deeply upon the pages of history. The valiant efforts and the heroic sacrifices made by

the Jewish ghetto dwellers in Warsaw on this day during one of the most crucial periods of World War II cannot be forgotten. It is well for all of us to remember April 19, 1943, that the Jewish Combat Organization—ZOB—commanded by Mordecai Anzclwicz launched armed resistance against the Nazi troops in the ghetto of Warsaw.

At no time in history has greater courage been shown than by these brave outnumbered and outarmed ZOB forces. Their gallant efforts against such overwhelming military might drew the admiration of the whole world. The resulting victory by the Nazi, with the aftermath of their ruthless punishment, the devastating of over 800 acres of the ghetto and the slaying of over 56,000 Jews, caused the world to bow its head in shame and sorrow. Thus, this courageous uprising and the horrors which followed did much to impress the world as to the savage and barbaric makeup of the Nazi hordes as well as the tragic plight of Jews in all the subjugated countries.

As we recall this sorrowful event today we find ourselves reflecting in painful memory on the millions of Jews as well as others who fought to throw off the shackles of Hitler's bestial minions.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as we reflect upon this date 31 years later, we remember well the victims of the infamous concentration camps and we remember well the mass slavery to which millions of Jews have been subjected by the Nazi slave-masters. All this we recall with deep sorrow. Even so that sorrow we recall is considerably dimmed by the sorrow which we feel today over the plight of the millions of helpless victims of current Soviet enslavement.

As we join our Jewish friends and neighbors all over the Nation in their observance of this historic date, may we rededicate ourselves to the completion of the unfinished tasks of freeing all slaves whether Jew or gentile from the bondage placed upon them by more powerful and greedy nations.

Ours is the heritage to see that the Warsaw ghetto defenders did not die in vain. Ours is the task to continue our utmost to remove any and all forms of human enslavement wherever it is found gnawing away at the precious freedom of mankind.

A VOTE FOR "CHIP"

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the drastic need of new legislation to insure Americans the best possible health care at a minimal cost. As we know, there are two principal health plans. This article, "A Vote for CHIP," may be beneficial to my colleagues:

A VOTE FOR CHIP

It seems all but certain that Congress this year or next will produce one of the most significant bills of our time, designed to insure all Americans access to health care at nominal cost.

The Congress has reached this point, after decades of struggle and acrimony over what the American Medical Association once called "socialized medicine," because of widespread support for the notion that an affluent society should provide its weakest members with a minimum standard of health care. But Congress still must choose between, or reconcile, two principal health plans, one backed primarily by President Nixon and the other primarily by Senator Kennedy.

The key to success will be in arriving at a plan that not only protects the interests of the economically and medically disadvantaged but also of those people who have a professional and economic stake in the delivery of health care. The idea of punishing the AMA and its members for past sins was never very worthy and is certainly not a justification for further moves towards nationalizing the health profession. Because the Kennedy plan still has vestiges of that approach, we find the carefully thought-out Nixon proposal more appealing.

Obviously, even Senator Kennedy himself was impressed by the administration plan, which was put forward in early February. Last week, the Senator co-sponsored a bill that represented a sharp departure from his previous all-encompassing \$61 billion national health program. His new bill would cost \$8.5 billion in new federal money, more than the \$6.4 billion projected for the Nixon plan, but is similar in benefits, deductibles and the like. Significantly, Wilbur Mills, who had co-sponsored the administration measure, also co-sponsored the Kennedy bill, persuading almost everyone that the health plan show is definitely on the road.

But there is a crucial difference between the Kennedy and Nixon plans. Mr. Nixon's Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan, or CHIP, will attempt to stimulate competition in health insurance and health care delivery methods by awarding a significant role to private insurers and delivery plans. All employers will be required to offer and largely finance employe coverage, but individuals will be free to waive coverage if they wish. The Kennedy plan, on the other hand, makes coverage compulsory for all Americans and puts management of basic insurance largely in the hands of the Social Security Administration.

This makes it clear that Senator Kennedy, despite his generous compromise, has not lost sight of his eventual goal of nationalized health care. But that goal is neither practical nor desirable. Perhaps it is true that by permitting broad latitude for professional self-regulation in medical care, the U.S. has been overly tolerant in the past of anti-competitive practices. But a government-operated monopoly would only further stultify the industry and lead to further, and probably drastic, increases in the real costs of medical care. That is not to mention the almost certain demoralization among doctors, most of whom have a genuine desire to fulfill their obligations to society.

The notion that the federal government can hand the American people medical care at no cost is utter nonsense. In both the Kennedy and Nixon plans, the major additional cost will be borne by employers, who in turn will pass it along in the form of higher prices, except for that substantial number who already meet minimum standards. Other costs will have to come out of the federal budget. If revenues aren't found to pay them, they will be paid through inflation.

However it is done, every citizen must somehow pay. The only magical force that can relieve the burden is greater economic efficiency. The Nixon plan will try to achieve that through competition. It may not work perfectly but it will work better than government monopoly and also permit a great deal more personal freedom. For that reason it is a far better CHIP to play.

RICHMOND, CALIF., CITIZENS AND LEADERS SUPPORT MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for years Richmond, Calif., along with many other cities throughout the United States, has benefited from the model cities program.

The Richmond model cities program has assisted and has been involved with implementation of housing and business development. This project has been very successful in helping create new business and employment where it is badly needed. Other projects sponsored by the Richmond model cities program deal with home improvement projects, drug abuse, career development, business development and housing loans, and public agency management integration. The resources available to the Richmond community are numerous and would not have been possible without the viable support of model cities.

Now, since the Nixon administration has placed such a low priority on domestic programs and human needs, many social programs have been terminated. We are now aware that the model cities program may come to an abrupt end and such successful ventures discontinued.

I believe that termination of model cities program would have the practical effect of depriving a substantial proportion of our citizens, who desperately need services provided them by this program.

I strongly urge my colleagues to make every effort to continue full funding of model cities programs until omnibus community development legislation is enacted and appropriations made available.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD correspondence I have received concerning the successful Richmond model cities program:

RICHMOND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Richmond, Calif., April 1, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DELLUMS: The Richmond Unified School District has been involved with the implementation of the career development project of the Richmond Model Cities program during the past years. This project has been very successful as evidenced by the acquisition of professional status and regular employment of Career Opportunities Program graduates.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed

Community Development Block Grant Programs may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full-funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

Sincerely,

Dr. R. W. LOVETTE,
Deputy Superintendent.

NATIONAL LEADERS,

Oakland, Calif., April 2, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR RON: The Prudential Insurance Company and myself have been involved with the implementation of the Business Development and Housing Loans projects of the Richmond Model Cities Program during the past years. These projects have been very successful in helping create new business and employment where employment is badly needed.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed Community Development Block Grant Programs may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full-funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. CREER.

CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIF.,

April 3, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

The Richmond Police Department has been involved with the implementation of the Public Agency Management Integration Project of the Richmond Model Cities Program during the past years. This project has been very successful and is currently being institutionalized.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed Community Development Block Grant Programs may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full-funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

ROY E. ESTES,
Acting Chief of Police.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY MEDICAL SERVICES,

April 4, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The Richmond Discovery Center has been involved with the implementation of the Drug Abuse project of the Richmond Model Cities Program during the past years. This project has been very successful as a drug prevention, drug intervention, drug education, drug information and drug referral center. The resources that are available to the community are numerous and would not have been possible without the viable productive support of Model Cities.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed Community Development Block Grant Pro-

grams may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full-funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

Sincerely yours,

JIM SUMMERS,
Director, Richmond Discovery Center.

BANK OF AMERICA, RICHMOND BRANCH,
April 1, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS: The Bank of America has been involved with the implementation of the home improvement projects of the Richmond Model Cities Program during the past years. These projects have been very successful as to the improvement of the housing in the city of Richmond.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed Community Development Block Grant Programs may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full-funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

Sincerely,

J. PRENDERGAST,
Assistant Timeplan Head.

RICHMOND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY,
Richmond, Calif., April 2, 1974.

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS: During the past years the Richmond Model Cities Program has assisted and has been involved with the implementation of housing and business development in the Downtown and North Richmond Urban Renewal Projects, the Neighborhood Facility Program in the Nevin Center Renewal Project and in the planning of the Port and Hilltop Renewal Projects.

We are now aware that Model Cities may be terminated and such successful ventures discontinued as legislation for the proposed Community Development Block Grant Programs may not be passed by Congress for a year or more.

In support of Model Cities, I request that you make every effort to continue full funding of Model Cities Programs until Community Development legislation is enacted and appropriations are available to local governments.

Sincerely,

JAMES K. KIMOTO,
Acting Administrator.

THE LAND USE PLANNING ACT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1970, I introduced a major bill that I entitled the "Comprehensive Land Use Act of 1970." On April 23, 1974, 4 years to the day after the introduction of that bill the Subcommittee on the Environment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives will begin 2 additional

days of hearings on the Land Use Planning Act of 1974. For me there is irony in this, for the Honorable MORRIS UDALL and the other Members of the House who have dedicated their time and energies to this issue, I am sure that there is frustration.

The bill I introduced 4 years ago included many of the provisions of the legislation before us, and quite a few more provisions that I believe should be before us. However, it is not the omissions of H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning Act of 1974, that are the reason for the newest round of hearings. The reason is that a small minority has poisoned the atmosphere around this bill and distorted its purpose. Mr. Speaker, the bill that was to be before us was a carefully drawn compromise that gave great consideration to the criticisms raised about the possible impact of the legislation. This bill continued to gather support from numerous divergent groups, and it began to look like a motherhood issue. Supporters of the Land Use Planning Act of 1974 included the President and several offices in the executive branch, the National Governors' Conference, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the AFL-CIO, the Wall Street Journal, and innumerable other institutions and groups. Then a determined, emotional, and malicious campaign was begun to defeat this legislation. We have all been recipients of communications from misinformed citizens who have been frightened into thinking that "planning" meant "control" and "land use planning" meant "confiscation of land." It is a sad state of affairs when any segment of the American people can believe that the Congress would undermine the Constitution and threaten their very security. The conduct of this administration has given substance to these fears by its almost dictatorial actions, but this should not prevent us from considering a modest, even timid, Land Use Planning Act.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of our colleagues intend to substitute a useless piece of legislation for H.R. 10294, a bill which represents 4 years of consideration and is a step forward, in the hopes of appeasing the malicious and the misinformed. It is their right to do so, but this body should flatly reject any such substitutions. As is clear by now, I am one of those who is not satisfied with H.R. 10294. I intend to include at the end of these remarks the statement of findings, declaration of policy and purpose of my Comprehensive Land Use Act of 1970. The findings, policy, and purpose described in 1970 still apply in 1974, and the need is even more critical. In 4 years the House has still failed to act on this legislation. Mr. JACKSON in the other body and Mr. UDALL in this one have given leadership to the Congress in this field. We have failed to follow. I recognize the need for a leader to compromise at the appropriate times, and Mr. UDALL is to be commended for his continued guidance of this legislation. H.R. 10294 does none of the things its

enemies ascribe to it, and only some of the things that I believe are necessary and proper functions for the Federal Government. If the provisions that I would like to see included in H.R. 10294 were implied by the existing language, then I would be satisfied. However, they are not, and at some point in the future I hope to see this situation remedied.

In this respect one of the arguments of the critics of this legislation is valid. Proponents of good, strong, and effective land use planning will not be satisfied with this bill. They will continue to press their points. This effort will be made quite openly, and the sponsors of the current bill are acting in good faith when they say the bill does only what they say it does. It is simply obvious that more Federal assistance and involvement than that envisaged under H.R. 10294 will be needed. It is also obvious that a majority of this body does not now agree with this assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge quick consideration of H.R. 10294 by the House. The hearings that will be held later this month should satisfy the most persistent critic. Let us get on with the Nation's business and pass this measure. It is, as I have stated, a mild measure, a compromise solution. Yet it is a positive and necessary step in an area of critical national concern, the future of the land.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to include the statement of findings, declaration of policy, and purpose of my Comprehensive Land Use Act of 1970 which clearly outlines, in detail, my views on this subject:

H.R. 17190, IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

A bill to establish means for developing comprehensive national, regional, and State land use planning policies and to provide financial assistance to States for the purpose of supporting and implementing such policies, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Land Use Act of 1970".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that there is a national interest in a more efficient and comprehensive system of national, regional, and statewide land-use planning and decisionmaking and that the rapid and continued growth of the Nation's population, expanding urban development, proliferating transportation systems, large scale industrial and economic growth, conflicts in emerging patterns of land use, the fragmentation of governmental entities exercising land-use planning powers, and the increased size, scale, and impact of private actions, have created a situation in which land-use management decisions of national, regional, and statewide concern are being made on the basis of expediency, tradition, short-term economic considerations, and other factors which are often unrelated to the real concerns of all the States and to sound national land-use policy.

(b) The Congress further finds that all across the Nation a failure to conduct competent, ecologically sound land-use planning has required public and private enterprise to delay, litigate, and cancel proposed public utility and industrial and commercial developments because of unresolved land use

questions, thereby causing an unnecessary waste of human and economic resources and a threat to public services and often resulting in decisions to locate utilities and industrial and commercial activities in the area of least public and political resistance, but without regard to relevant ecological and environmental land use considerations.

(c) The Congress further finds that many Federal agencies are deeply involved in national, regional, and State land-use planning and management activities which because of the lack of consistent policy often result in needless, undesirable, and costly conflicts between agencies of Federal, State, and local government; that existing Federal land-use planning programs have a significant effect upon the location of population, economic growth, and on the character of industrial, urban, and rural development; that the purposes of such programs are frequently in conflict, thereby subsidizing undesirable and costly patterns of land-use development; and that a concerted effort is necessary to interrelate and coordinate existing and future Federal, regional, State, and private decision-making within a system of planned development and established priorities that is in accordance with a national land-use planning policy.

(d) The Congress further finds that while the primary responsibility and constitutional authority for land use planning and management of non-Federal land rests with State and local government under our system of government, it is increasingly evident that the manner in which this responsibility is exercised within each locality and State has a tremendous influence upon the utility, the value, and the future of the public domain lands, the national parks, forests, seashores, lakeshores, recreation and wilderness areas and other Federal lands in addition to non-Federal land in all our States; that the interest of the public in regional, State, and local decisions affecting these areas extends to the citizens of all States; and that the failure to plan and, in some cases, poor land-use planning at the regional, State, and local level pose serious problems of broad national, regional, and public concern and often result in irreparable damage to commonly owned assets of great national importance such as estuaries, ocean beaches, and other areas in public ownership.

(e) The Congress further finds that the land-use decisions of the Federal Government often have a tremendous impact upon the ecology, the environment, and the patterns of development in local communities; that the substance and the nature of a national land-use planning policy ought to be formulated upon an expression of the needs and interests of regional, State, and local government as well as those of the Federal Government, private groups, and individuals; and the Federal land-use decisions require greater participation by State and local government to insure that they are in accord with the highest and best standards of land-use management and the desires and aspirations of regional, State, and local government.

(f) In order to promote the general welfare and to provide full and wise application of the resources of the Federal Government in strengthening the environmental, recreational, economic and social well-being of the people of the United States, the Congress declares that it is a continuing responsibility of the Federal Government, consistent with the responsibility of State and local government for land-use planning and management, to undertake the development of a national policy, to be known as the national land-use planning policy, which shall

incorporate ecological, environmental, esthetic, economic, social and other appropriate factors. Such policy shall serve as a guide in making specific decisions at the national, regional, and State level which affect the pattern of environmental, recreational, and industrial growth and development on the Federal lands, and shall provide a framework for development of regional, State, and local land-use policy.

(g) The Congress further declares that the national land-use planning policy should—

(1) favor patterns of land-use planning, management and development which are in accord with sound ecological principles and which offer a range of alternative locations for specific activities and encourage the wise and balanced use of the Nation's land and water resources;

(2) provide for future economic health of the United States;

(3) favorably influence patterns of population distribution in a manner such that a wide range of scenic, environmental, and cultural amenities are available to all the American people;

(4) contribute to carrying out the Federal responsibility for revitalizing existing rural communities and encourage, where appropriate, new communities which offer diverse opportunities and a diversity of living styles;

(5) assist State government to assume responsibility for major land-use planning and management decisions which are of regional, interstate, and national concern;

(6) facilitate increased coordination in the administration of Federal programs so as to encourage rational and desirable policies affecting the environment, as well as recreational and industrial land-use planning; and

(7) systematize methods for the continuing collection and exchange of land-use, environmental, and ecological information in order to assist all levels of government in the implementation and further development of the national land-use planning policy.

(h) The Congress further declares that intelligent land-use planning and management provides the single most important institutional device for preserving and enhancing the environment, for ecologically sound development, and for improving conditions capable of supporting the highest quality of life for all Americans.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this title—

(a) to establish a national policy to encourage and assist the several States to exercise more effectively their constitutional responsibilities for the planning, management, and administration of the Nation's land and related resources through the development and implementation of comprehensive national, regional, and State land-use policies and management programs designed to achieve an ecologically and environmentally sound use of the Nation's land resources;

(b) to establish a grant-in-aid program to assist State and local government to hire and train the personnel, and gain the competence necessary to develop, implement, and administer State land-use plans which meet Federal and regional policies and guidelines and which will be responsive and effective in dealing with the growing pressures of conflicting demands on a finite land resource base;

(c) to establish reasonable and flexible Federal and regional policies criteria and requirements to give individual States guidance in the development of comprehensive land-use planning policies and to condition the distribution of certain Federal funds on the establishment of adequate land-use policies; and

(d) to exercise the Federal Government's responsibility to maintain, develop, and refine a coherent national land use policy with respect to the planning, management, and administration of all federally owned lands.

THE WORKINGWOMAN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Gus Tyler, vice president and education director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL-CIO, wrote a column reporting on the organizing meeting of 3,000 women trade unionists into the Coalition of Labor Union Women, CLUW.

As Mr. Tyler says, women "work because they have to." I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues: [From the Long Island Press, Apr. 4, 1974]

WOMEN'S NEW CLOUT IN LABOR FORCE

(By Gus Tyler)

The 3,000 working women who gathered in Chicago to add a proletarian dimension to Women's Lib convened under an auspicious rubric: CLUW (Coalition of Labor Union Women). For CLUW is a clue to sexogenic changes shaping a future America.

Within the foreseeable future, women will make up at least half the labor force. In 1920, they were only 20 per cent; now they are 40 per cent.

A majority of women workers are in the white collar and service sectors—the fastest growing turf in our economy. As such employment expands, the number (and percentage) of females in the labor force grows.

Women at work are no longer young singles (average age of 28) as they were in the 1920s; they are now married women (average age 38).

They do not work for pin-money. They work because they have to. If women left the labor market, the percentage of husband-wife families living in poverty would more than double.

Working women come mainly from middle America. If a husband's income is between \$7,000 and \$9,999, then his wife is likely to go to work; Almost half the wives in such families do. (A smaller rate prevails in families where husbands earn less than \$5,000 or more than \$10,000.)

According to the U.S. Labor Department Women's Bureau figures, of the nation's 32 million working women, 12.2 million are mothers: 7.9 million with kids between ages 6 and 17—2 million with children under 6 and another 2.3 million with children under 3. Close to 6 million children under age 6 have working mothers. Inevitably, these mothers will demand—and get—day care through public action for their children.

Women's roles in the home, with equal inevitability, undergo a revolution. Rearing the young becomes increasingly a public charge. The actual size of the family shrinks with the help of pills and sterilization. (One out of every six couples in America has gone through voluntary sterilization.)

Working-class women who were liberated from traditional chores by dishwashers, diaper services, and precooked foods, are now increasingly liberated from long years of tending big families.

All these facts—cool, calculable, consequential facts—have been doing more to re-

make the American woman than all the reason and rhetoric of the military literatae who give Women's Lib its dramatic focus.

Whether the new Mrs. Middle America is a better wife and mother or a worse one will be an open question. But there is no question at all that she will be a different and more influential presence.

Economic determinism is not dead. As women learn to win bread in the work place, they also will learn to win arguments at home and to win elections in the nation.

POLITICS BY TAXATION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, because of all the talk regarding the issue of public financing of campaigns, I thought the following article which appeared in the April 10 Wall Street Journal, would be of interest to my colleagues: [From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 10, 1974]

POLITICS BY TAXATION
(By Vermont Royster)

"To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors," wrote Thomas Jefferson, "is sinful and tyrannical." Jefferson was speaking of religious opinions for in 1786—a decade after the Declaration of Independence—religious views and political opinions were often closely entwined. The remnants of religious orthodoxies still lingered in the politics of the former colonies; Catholicism in Maryland, for example, and Protestantism in Virginia. Among many people there was still strong sentiments for the support of religion out of the public treasury.

Here Jefferson, as always, was on the side of freedom of thought. But it was not enough, he said, that a man should be free to hold what opinions he wished, free to express them, free to support them with his money or other treasure. He must also be free of being forced to support by his taxes those opinions in which he did not believe.

Hence he insisted upon this principle in the Virginia bill for the establishment of religious freedom. It was a principle later incorporated into the federal Constitution, and today it is a principle so fully accepted that we can hardly imagine it was once a matter of controversy.

Accepted, that is, with regard to religious opinion. But now, strangely enough, the same controversy is arising again with regard to secular political opinions. There is a growing sentiment in Congress and elsewhere for the taxation of all citizens for the support of particular political parties and political candidates.

There are at least three bills in Congress for mandatory public financing of political campaigns. Senator Kennedy is a leading supporter of the idea. A number of influential organizations, such as Common Cause and the League of Women Voters, are lobbying for it. The philosophy of this kind of taxation is defended by many academics of the liberal tradition.

That this once discarded idea should be reborn is not difficult to understand. Many thoughtful people have been long disturbed by our campaign practices, most particularly by the mounting costs of political campaign-

ing and the resultant dependence of candidates on those who will pay their bills. This unhappiness has been intensified by the Watergate scandals. Among almost every group—liberals, conservatives, Republicans, Democrats—there is a groping for what can be done to improve the system.

In that groping a good many interesting ideas have been put forward: the limiting of campaign periods, particularly in Presidential elections; requirements for full disclosure of the source of all campaign contributions; restrictions on the amount of any one contribution to any one candidate; the use of a voluntary income tax check-off for political support; allowing the deductibility from income tax for contributions up to some modest sum; new laws against what has come to be known as "dirty tricks"; and so on.

There are, indeed, few who would argue that the present system cannot be improved. The nub of the matter, though, is how to improve the political process without injuring the fundamental principle of political liberty—the right of a citizen to support the political ideas he believes in and, conversely, not to have to support political ideas he abhors.

It's a problem inherent in many of the proposals. For example, those who write for the public prints are not restricted in raising their voices to support their political ideas or political candidates. If, then, a newspaper day after day praises one candidate and condemns another, are those of a different persuasion to be restricted in the amount they can contribute for advertising, pamphlets or broadcasts by way of reply? Is it equitable for one voice to be restrained and another not?

The public financing of political parties, or candidates, raises some especially troubling questions. On the practical level, no matter what formula you use for allocating these funds, some political candidates will be favored by this public largess, some penalized.

It would be ridiculous to ladle it out to every Tom, Dick and Harry who says he's a presidential candidate. There must be some eligibility rule. But any eligibility rule favors existing parties, discriminates against new parties or independents no matter how much public support they may have at the time.

Under the current doctrine Governor Wallace would not be eligible. His Independent Party did not get 5% of the popular vote in 1972. Barred from the public funds being distributed to others, and with his own supporters limited by the same restrictions as applied to the other parties, he and his supporters would be at a hopeless financial disadvantage. Yet will anyone argue that Governor Wallace has not been in the past, and may not be again, a "serious" candidate entitled to a public hearing in the political forum?

What if you change the rules? What if you use some other formula so that Governor Wallace, running as an independent, is allowed to share in this public largess paid for by all the taxpayers? Then you have created a situation where those to whom Governor Wallace and all he stands for are abhorrent are forced to pay for his campaign.

The dilemma is no less as between the two major parties. Any formula must be based on what the parties polled in the last election, and as we have many times seen the public political sentiment can change drastically between elections so that no formula can meet present circumstances. Had we, indeed, had such a system in times past there would likely be no Republican Party at all and we would be debating what share to give to the Whigs.

There is much we can do to improve our

present campaigning system. But if political liberty means anything at all it surely means both the right of a citizen to support what political opinions he pleases and not to be coerced into supporting those he detests. If we forget that in our rush to correct every seeming abuse, we risk the worst abuse of all the tyranny of the public purse over that political liberty.

ENERGY DOWN ON THE FARM: CRISIS OR PROBLEM?

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was recently supplied with a copy of an address delivered March 5 by Mr. B. J. Yarrington, executive vice president of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, before the annual Farm Forum of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Yarrington's speech, entitled "Energy Down on the Farm: Crisis or Problem?" is sufficiently important to warrant its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ENERGY DOWN ON THE FARM: CRISIS OR PROBLEM?

(By B. J. Yarrington)

I'd like you to know how much I appreciate the privilege of speaking to this large assembly of VIP's. So often lately, when an oil man is called on to speak in public, he feels like the peasant appointed to taste the king's food: If it weren't for the honor of the thing, he'd just as soon not.

But today is different. It's a pleasure to have this chance to discuss the nation's energy problem with people in the farming business. It's especially good to see so many young folks here. You should have more than just a casual interest in the issue—because I foresee you'll be middle-aged before you witness the energy abundance your fathers took for granted.

For this reason I was particularly interested to hear the President tell us at his recent press conference that we don't have a crisis—although we do have a problem. I agree thoroughly with his conclusion, but I disagree—equally thoroughly—with the reasoning that led him to it. We do not have an energy crisis today—not, as Mr. Nixon believes, because it has come and gone, but because it has yet to arrive.

Crises are turning points, after which the basic situation improves. What we've been through this winter, and what we face for a long time to come, is a series of trials in which near-term shortages create temporary pressures. When the pinch is eased, we feel a little welcome relief. But we'd be wrong to think that our troubles are behind us, now that we've broken the back of the winter season.

We'd also be wrong to think that our conservation efforts, important as they are, were responsible by themselves. Turning down thermostats and driving slower were a great help—and we'll need to keep up with these and other measures in the future. But let's not delude ourselves. We were saved by a mild winter. We went through a trial—but the crisis, by definition, is still ahead of us.

We have, then, an energy problem—one that has been a long time coming, although only recently has it been easily visible to the average person. To the people who work

the land and to those who supply them, it has surfaced at an especially crucial time.

The value of farm marketings is reliably estimated to grow to more than \$90 billion by 1980, averaging a 6-per-cent-a-year increase—and this past year, the \$17 billion worth of agricultural products sold abroad put the U.S. balance of trade in the black for the first time in five years.

Considering such a bright outlook as this, it's no wonder that people in agriculture are deeply concerned about the recent developments in U.S. energy supply and demand.

You're interested, of course, isn't new. Ever since machines began to replace human sweat and animal power, the farmer has realized his growing dependence on an adequate supply of energy. Today, because of the new land in use and the increased requirements for fuel and fertilizer, the need is greater than ever.

For example, it has been calculated that the amount of energy used in American agriculture in 1970 was equal to the energy contained in some 14 billion gallons of gasoline. On that amount of gas—given 13.5 miles to the gallon, which isn't at all bad for today's cars—you could drive around the world more than 7½ million times.

It's also significant that agriculture is uniquely dependent on petroleum energy. We have yet to find a way to run a tractor on nuclear power or coal, and the great bulk of the chemical energy that goes into the soil in the form of fertilizer originates with one or another form of petroleum.

So to say that farmers have a vested interest in adequate energy is really to say that they have an essential stake in what happens to our supply of oil and gas.

I won't dwell for long on the basics of petroleum supply and demand, even though I probably should, since the data are so regularly misinterpreted by the media and misunderstood by others. Let's just boil it all down to one hard fact: Domestic petroleum supplies in recent years have not kept up with the tremendous demand generated in every facet of our economy.

In industry, the shortage of natural gas—brought on by its desirability as a fuel and by its low, government-controlled price—has resulted in a switch to oil fuels. In utilities, where burning coal has been outlawed in many areas, the use of distillate fuel oil has increased by more than 20 times in six years. Largely because we have had no comprehensive national policy covering all forms of energy, most of the problems have been pushed off onto the oil segment of our energy supply. And even within oil, the pressures have mounted—as, for example, in transportation, where big cars with air conditioning, power operations, and required emission controls have added greatly to gasoline consumption.

We are today using our domestic oil and gas at a faster rate than we are adding to new reserves—and still we depend increasingly on imports. We become vulnerable to the political whims of small sheikdoms in the Middle East, because this area and Africa together control more than 80 per cent of the crude reserves in the non-Communist world. We become the victims of arbitrary price increases that fall only a little short of extortion. We're now paying 33 cents a gallon for crude oil from Venezuela, while Canada—which supplies much of the crude from which your gasoline and diesel fuel here in the northern Midwest are made—has posted a price increase to 26 cents a gallon.

For this reason—and because Canada, too, must look to her own self-sufficiency in energy—agriculture and farm-related business in this region should be even more than ordinarily concerned with policies and programs to boost our supplies of domestic oil.

These would include the 10 billion barrels known to be under the Alaskan North Slope. Even though it will be directed to western markets, it will replace oil that can be shifted to refineries serving Midwestern farms and cities.

Whatever the source of oil, however—foreign or domestic—the inevitable fact is that it will cost more. The oil industry can no more absorb these higher costs for raw materials than the American farmer could meet today's operating expenses with dollar-a-bushel wheat.

How some political opportunists can continue to ignore such an obvious and basic fact is beyond my understanding. Yet Congress passes an energy bill containing a provision to roll back oil prices, and continues to debate the merits of various ways to limit profits. Surely the 20-year history of federal controls on the field price of natural gas—and the resulting shortage—should tell us something. Such restrictions are the most effective way I know to prolong the shortage by making it more and more difficult to find new supplies.

I am often discouraged, therefore, to see how few of the policies so far announced by the Administration or proposed in Congress go to the real heart of the difficulty, which is the need to increase our total domestic supply of energy. For the most part, the flurry of activity in Washington since the creation of the Federal Energy Office has been directed less toward solving the problem than to spreading the discomfort.

The patient has galloping consumption, and the medical advice from Washington is to take two aspirin and call me in the morning.

Let me cite a few examples. At a time when our total petroleum fuel supplies are tight, refineries are prohibited by government regulation from operating at a level of more than 76 per cent of capacity. That compares roughly with taking good land out of production when people are hungry.

To draw another parallel, suppose you were required to turn over a portion of your land to a less efficient neighbor. Refiners find themselves in about that position, because any one who has enough crude to run at more than 76 per cent of capacity has to sell the excess to a competitor who has less.

When areas of the northeastern U.S. are threatened with brownouts, the reaction is not to draw more electric power from elsewhere in the country, but to go through the cumbersome process of ordering more distillate fuel production from refineries and attempting to shift it from the Midwest and Southwest. If somebody's short of food, it would seem easier to give him bread than send him a bushel of wheat.

I don't intend to carp about the organization and actions of the Federal Energy Office, because that's not where the real problem lies. Mr. Simon and his staff face a terribly complex problem—and it is made a lot worse by the fact that they must act under Congressional orders and pressures, most of which seem designed to seek revenge for the unhappy state of fuel supply and prices. Congress has simply not permitted the FEO to address what should be its central purpose: to act as the coordinating agency responsible for the nation's total energy program.

The FEO could and should be the nucleus for a balanced effort to develop all energy sources—oil, gas, coal, shale, electricity . . . everything. This has not so far been its function. Instead, Mr. Simon has had to put on a fireman's hat, grab an allocation hose, and try to douse the petroleum shortages. He's had no chance to get to work on some badly needed, long-range solutions.

Mr. Simon himself is an outstanding man and an able administrator, who is willing to

take necessary action. Our company is giving him our full support, not only where the law requires, but voluntarily in whatever way we can. Administering the allocation program is so difficult and frustrating that perhaps the only thing worse would be actual rationing—and we hope that with hard work and a little bit of luck, we may be able to avoid that.

One thing about allocations that everybody seems to agree on: First priority goes to agriculture. Why? Simple: No fuel equals no harvest equals no food. So while farmers make up a privileged class in this respect, few of us would quarrel with the principle. Agriculture will get 100 per cent of its requirements for fuel.

Industry, too, has been placed well up on the priority list. So, it's the motorist—and the Sunday driver in particular—who will shoulder most of the burden.

If having a farmer's allocation status is a privilege, then we have to recognize that it also involves a responsibility. Fuel delivered for agricultural purposes will have to be used for agricultural purposes, or the whole point of the system is lost. The potential for abuse of the allocation program is considerable; letting a visitor fill his car's tank from farm storage is just one example.

Eventually, this practice will be reflected in further shortages suffered by, say, service station dealers in nearby towns, or the proprietors and workers in small manufacturing businesses.

In my own company we've set up a fairly elaborate system of paperwork to see that agricultural customers get all the fuels they need—but no more. Most other companies, I suspect, make very similar arrangements. The basic principle involves certification by a customer of the amount of fuel he needs, and an undertaking on the part of the oil company agent to deliver only that amount.

In our case, this means maintaining individual records on most of our 375,000 rural customers—how much fuel was used in 1972, both for farm and non-farm uses. A farmer is entitled to buy at least as much as he bought for farm use in 1972. It's possible for him to get more—if, for instance, he puts more acreage into production. In that case, however, the additional need must be certified, not only to the supplying company but to the Federal Energy Office.

We also maintain a complicated set of reports to make sure that our agents are delivering product in compliance with the government's regulations. I can remember the time not so long ago when we used to be an independent company—but there's no doubt about who's running the show today. Government tells us what kind of product to make, how much of each kind, where and to whom to sell it, and what to charge for it.

Whatever fuel is left over after all of agriculture's priority needs are met can be sold to non-farm users. In our case, these customers were entitled to 80 per cent of their 1972 volumes during February—but things have tightened up somewhat, and the allocation for March is 75 per cent.

So much for the way allocations are working. Clumsy and confusing they may be at times—but so long as shortages exist, they're necessary. And they beat coupon rationing any day.

With practically a guaranteed supply of farm fuel for his machinery, a northern Midwest farmer has only two energy problems to face: fertilizer and LP-Gas, particularly propane.

As for fertilizer, I've seen some very dire predictions recently, including one that made use of the word "famine." This is a scare tactic.

At the same time, there's no doubt that

the situation with regard to ammonia-based fertilizers is serious and will remain that way for some time. The U.S. Department of Agriculture figures a shortfall of about 5 per cent in the 1973-74 period, while some fertilizer people put the figure closer to 15 per cent. While it's practically impossible to put a firm figure on the likely shortfall in this particular region, our estimate would be closer to the USDA's 5 per cent.

Since ammonia fertilizers come in large measure from natural gas processing, the gas shortage has had its effect on supply. Also, much of the gas that might have been available for making fertilizer in the Midwest is being sold intra-state in the Southwest, where the price is not federally controlled.

I don't want to overstate the problem with regard to fertilizers, but it is serious enough to mean that farmers will have to be selective in their applications, using a limited supply where it will do the most good.

In the case of LP-Gas, we're anticipating an increase in demand in '73-'74 of about 3 per cent over 1972-'73. Supplies will undoubtedly be tight—but because at least half the agricultural LP-Gas is actually used to heat farm homes, and because the winter has been mild, the outlook is far brighter than it looked a few months ago.

The propane shortage is partly a problem of economics and partly one of distribution. While some price rollback on propane may have been justified in view of up-bidding by brokers, the fact remains that continued inadequate prices for the product would discourage recovering it from natural gas and refinery feedstocks. Not only that, but it would delay the building of pipelines, plants, tanks, and trucks to get the gas to market.

With these two exceptions, propane and fertilizer, we see no serious shortage problems for agriculture in the near-term future. Your immediate outlook is reasonably good, thanks in large part to the mechanism of product allocations. Yet I would re-emphasize one very significant point: The best allocation program in the world does not add a drop of gasoline, or diesel fuel, or any other product to the total supply. And it is in boosting total supply that we will find an acceptable solution to the real energy problem of the nation.

I'm sure it would be easy for you to conclude from what I have said today that my purpose is simply to advocate some public policies and government actions that will do my company and industry a good turn. Now I'm not in the least ashamed of advocating things that are good for the oil business—but the fact is that the national economy, and specifically the farm segment of that economy, will prosper only if it can depend on adequate energy. And that, in turn, depends on the oil industry's ability to produce a larger, more secure domestic energy base.

If I advocate quick completion of the Alaska pipeline—and I do—it's because the country needs North Slope oil as soon as we can get it.

If I advocate more frequent lease sales on the Outer Continental Shelf—and I do—it's because this is the area where most of our potential reserves of oil and gas are waiting to be discovered.

And if I advocate free-market pricing on petroleum, along with fewer restrictions on the size of profits—and I do—keep in mind that the object of adequate prices and profits is the ability to increase supplies of crude oil and other basic energy resources.

As farmers and farm-businessmen, you should have no difficulty understanding the essential need for passing through the higher costs of doing business and for making an adequate profit. It's as basic to growing food as it is to producing energy.

Also as farmers and farm-businessmen, you recognize that in today's circumstances, solving a problem of these proportions requires comprehensive, practical policies on the part of government. You've had enough of your own experiences with well-meaning but misguided policies, adopted under the pressure of expedient politics, to know that only the mature decision—only the long-range vision—will suffice. With all due respect to the extreme complexity of the difficulties facing Congress and the Administration, I cannot see that we are getting much maturity or depth of understanding in the policies that so far have emanated from Washington.

Most emphatically I believe that it is a matter of vital interest to you—and to agriculture generally—that you support those actions which will be most effective in ensuring adequate fuel and energy for the future, not succumb to political blandishment.

So I am—for the long term—an optimist, based on my abiding faith in the working of our competitive-enterprise system. A great company that has voluntarily entered the competitive arena, and yet does not see the battle through to success, must eventually suffer all the consequences of defeat. A realization of this truth enables a company to accept and meet far-reaching obligations and responsibilities, such as those that now rest with the individual companies making up the oil industry.

The malaise of today is not a natural outgrowth of our system. The essence of competitive enterprise is progress. Our current troubles stem from other factors—temporary supply shortages, and coincident government intervention designed to suspend competitive market forces.

We must—and we will—continue to oppose such extrinsic factors with all the vigor usually reserved for competitors, but with one single thought in mind: continuing to find and supply adequate energy, quality products, and superior services to consumers.

Thank you.

PROTECTING A PRECIOUS RIGHT

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in a special order on April 2 and again in the Extensions of Remarks section April 3, I have addressed remarks to the subject of invasion of privacy—particularly the opening of the income tax returns of farmers to the Department of Agriculture.

USDA was allowed access to these returns through two Executive orders issued by the President. I along with others of my colleagues, was fearful that this would set a precedent and in the future HEW could examine the returns of teachers and doctors, Commerce could look at the returns of businessmen, and HUD could obtain access to the tax returns of all homeowners.

Today I wish to complete sharing with my colleagues a series of articles which have appeared in the news media relating to these Executive orders which were only recently rescinded by the President:

[From the Watertown Daily Times,
Mar. 15, 1974]

FARMERS' TAXES STAY CONFIDENTIAL (By Alan Emory)

WASHINGTON—Vice President Gerald R. Ford has recommended that President Nixon revoke his controversial executive orders opening up farmers' individual income tax returns, and the President reportedly has informally agreed.

A new order, drafted by the Office of Management and Budget at Ford's request, has been given to the White House. It specifically scraps the two Nixon orders or farmers' returns.

GAINS SUPPORT

The Vice President won support from Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz Monday night, although Butz had previously refused to urge Nixon to withdraw the orders.

Still unsettled is a Justice Department opinion that the 1973 order serve as "a prototype" for all other federal agencies. This has spurred legislation tightening the safeguards around tax returns and will be one of the first items to come up before the new Domestic Council Committee on the Right of Privacy headed by Ford.

Ford told Butz that inspection of farmers' tax returns was not worth the threat to privacy in exchange for the data that might be obtained and added, informed sources say, that he thought the 1973 Nixon order was a bad idea.

MEMO TO NIXON

The Vice President's recommendation to Nixon to shelve the orders came in a memorandum from the Domestic Council setting out Ford's position and the endorsement from Butz.

Nixon has provided informal assurances he will sign the revocation.

Ford, who has named Grand Rapids, Mich., attorney Philip W. Buchen executive director of the privacy panel, says he does not intend to allow the group to be used as a "smokescreen" for Watergate.

"My own privacy had just been investigated more thoroughly than anybody's since Eve ate the apple," he told the National Governors' Conference here March 6.

He told an interviewer this week, "Having had my privacy invaded by two committees (of Congress) pretty extensively, I think I know a little bit more about how you can react." He specifically cited "laying out your income tax returns . . . putting it all out on the record."

UNDERSTANDS ANGER

Ford said he could understand people's resentment at having something they always considered private made public.

Ford's move on the Nixon order came just as Sen. Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., D., Tex., a member of the Senate Finance Committee, revealed he would introduce legislation Tuesday designed to restrict sharply the access of government agencies to individual tax returns.

Bentsen, who said he expected hearings to be held with Internal Revenue Commissioner Donald C. Alexander an "important witness," denounced the Nixon order for opening tax returns to "fishing expeditions."

Ford says he wants his panel to "establish common-sense safeguards for the fundamental right of privacy."

"What we are going to do as long as I am chairman is to try to put a stop to unwarranted future invasions of individual privacy by the federal government or its agents, period," he said.

"Preservation of the right to privacy . . . has certainly been complicated by the im-

mense growth of federal power and its concentration here in Washington," the Vice President said.

President Nixon told a Feb. 25 news conference he was turning the matter of his income tax orders and inspection policy over to the Ford privacy committee for review.

It appeared today, however, that the issue of the orders themselves might be settled even before the committee held its first hearing next week. The unit is directed to complete its study of individual privacy problems within four months.

Executive Director Buchen confirmed, in an interview, that the administration's overall policy on tax returns would be one of the first issues to be considered.

IRS Commissioner Alexander has refused to comply with the Nixon order to give the Agriculture Department individual tax returns and has said he would provide only the names and addresses of the farmers.

In a letter written Monday Sen. James L. Buckley, C-R., N.Y., called on Nixon to rescind the tax return orders "immediately" as an implicit invasion of privacy.

The House Ways and Means Committee is expected to take up tax return privacy legislation this year. Bentsen's move was the first on the Senate side.

The Texan said the Nixon order contained "great potential for abuse" and it would be impossible to maintain the integrity of voluntary self-assessment in filing tax returns if access were greatly broadened to a host of government agencies.

"The responsibility is ours here in the Congress," Bentsen said. "If all departments are going into fishing expeditions on tax returns this will lead to the politicizing of the Internal Revenue Service and prove a serious mistake."

Bentsen indicated reservations about leaving the final decision to the privacy panel headed by Ford.

In an interview this week, Ford said he was taking his privacy assignment seriously.

When asked about using the committee as a "smokescreen" for Watergate and the cover-up, Ford replied, "The mere fact that I am chairman helps" refute that argument. "I understand the problem."

The original Nixon orders were never made public in a general release or announcement, but were just published in the Federal Register. They opened up farmers' tax returns going back to 1967 in most important aspects.

Agriculture Department officials told Congress they had not requested such broad orders, but the policy had been formulated by the Justice and Treasury Departments. Don Pearlberg, chief of farm economics for the department, called the orders "inoperative," but rebuffed a Congressional request to ask the more recent one to be tightened.

One of Ford's top aides said the Vice President, after the Feb. 25 press conference and subsequent news stories, told Butz "the game wasn't worth the candle" and the executive order was a "lousy idea," in the aide's words.

After winning Butz' support, he then took his case to the White House. It appeared today he had won.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1974]

NIXON ASKED TO LIFT ORDER ON TAXES

(By Alan Emory)

Vice President Gerald R. Ford, in his first move as head of a new government committee on privacy, has recommended that President Nixon revoke his controversial executive order opening up farmers' individual income tax returns, and the President reportedly has informally agreed.

A new order, drafted by the Office of Management and Budget at Ford's request, has been given to the White House. It specifically scraps the Nixon order, as modified, on farmers' returns and represents a potential major shift in administration policy.

The Vice President won support last week from Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz, although Butz had previously refused to urge Mr. Nixon to withdraw the order.

Still unsettled is a Justice Department opinion that the 1973 order serve as "a prototype" for all other federal agencies. This has spurred legislation tightening the safeguards around tax returns and will be one of the first items to come up before the new Domestic Council Committee on the Right of Privacy headed by Ford.

Ford told Butz that inspection of farmers' tax returns was not worth the threat to privacy for the data that might be obtained and added, informed sources say, that he thought the order was a bad idea.

The Vice President's recommendation to Mr. Nixon to shelve the order came in a memorandum from the Domestic Council setting out Ford's position and the endorsement from Butz.

Mr. Nixon has provided informal assurances he will sign the revocation.

Ford, who has named Grand Rapids, Mich., attorney Philip W. Buchen executive director of the privacy panel, says he does not intend to allow the group to be used as a "smokescreen" for Watergate.

"My own privacy had just been investigated more thoroughly than anybody's since Eve ate the apple," he told the National Governors' Conference here March 6.

He told an interviewer recently, "Having had my privacy invaded by two committees (of Congress) pretty extensively, I think I know a little bit more about how you can react." He specifically cited "laying out your income tax returns . . . putting it all out on the record."

Ford said he could understand people's resentment at seeing something they always considered private made public.

Ford says he wants his committee to "establish commonsense safeguards for the fundamental right of privacy."

"What we are going to do as long as I am chairman is to try to put a stop to unwarranted future invasions of individual privacy by the federal government or its agents, period," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1974]

HOW PUBLIC IS THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY?

The right to privacy has gone public. Your editorials and news analysis on the privacy issue are appreciated. A little-noticed provision of the federal student aid program for college students should be publicized too, since it appears as another invasion of the privacy of tax returns.

Under the Basic Education Opportunity Grant program, students applying for modest grants (averaging \$250 this year) and their parents, sign a form authorizing the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to secure copies of the family tax returns from the District Director of Internal Revenue. This regulation affects millions of students from low- and middle-income families.

The requirement lends additional credence to the fear expressed by Rep. Bill Alexander (D-Ark.) (Post, March 11) about administration attempts to make "personal income information of whole classes of people available to various departments." Surely we can find other less threatening methods to verify the accuracy of applications for student aid.

I would not sell my right to privacy for \$250. We should not require a whole genera-

tion of youth and their parents to do so. Let's hope Congress insists on reverting to democratic ideals with privacy as a guaranteed freedom for everyone.

WINNIE BENGLSDORF.

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

MISUSE OF TAX RETURNS

There was a time when citizens could assume that, except for examination by Internal Revenue Service agents, their federal income tax returns were reasonably safe from the prying eyes of curiosity seekers and others with more mischievous or malevolent motives.

But it's getting so that congressional committees have little trouble getting returns for investigations of one sort and another, and the forms seem to float hither and yon among officials in the executive branch without much thought to the traditional obligation of confidentiality.

This was dramatically demonstrated the other day in the disclosure of a White House memorandum which said President Nixon suggested in June 1969 that his staff be given access to the returns of former presidents so he could learn what deductions they had taken. While Mr. Nixon has denied seeing the returns and doesn't recall asking aides to obtain them, the memorandum was written by a former aide at a time when Mr. Nixon seemed intent on making use of every loophole available—and some that had been closed off—to lower his tax bill. That such use of tax returns is illegal apparently made little difference to the White House.

That is distressing enough but now we have an even more ominous invasion of the taxpayer's right to the privacy of his returns. Only recently some members of Congress discovered that President Nixon in early 1973 issued an executive order allowing the Department of Agriculture to examine the tax returns of the nation's three million farmers.

Apparently there was no evil intent in the department's wish to examine the returns. Evidently it wanted to compile statistical information about farmers that might be useful in formulating farm policies. But regardless of the motive, the mass examination of tax returns by any governmental agency not involved in the enforcement of income tax laws is completely unjustified.

We agree with Representative Alexander of Arkansas who saw the presidential order as foreshadowing a "frightening prospect" that other departments and agencies will be given access to personal income information of various classes of people. He raised the possibility, for example, of the Department of Commerce wanting to look at returns from businessmen, the Federal Housing Administration wanting to inspect returns from homeowners, or the Department of Labor wanting to examine returns of union members. Lest anyone think Alexander is far off base, a Justice Department official was quoted as saying that the presidential order was drafted as a model so that tax returns could be used for statistical purposes by other federal agencies.

President Nixon has made a big thing lately of the right to privacy. He also has protested allowing congressional committees investigating Watergate and impeachment to "paw" through the White House records on a "fishing expedition." If Mr. Nixon is serious about protecting privacy, he could start with rescinding the order involving farmers' tax returns. Neither the farmers nor any other citizens want Washington bureaucrats pawing through their income tax returns on a fishing or any other kind of expedition.

If the President doesn't rescind the order, the Congress ought to do it through legislation that would prohibit any such flagrant misuse.

CONGRESSMAN OBEY VIEWS REQUEST FOR DIEGO GARCIA IN DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, twice in the last week, in the defense supplemental authorization and appropriation requests, this body has had to vote on a \$29 million request of the Navy to start the construction of permanent base support facilities on the island of Diego Garcia half way around the world in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

It is most unfortunate that such a request was rushed through the House in a supplemental bill without the appropriate committees of Congress having an adequate opportunity to consider the many potentially significant strategic and foreign policy ramifications of such a base. If plans go ahead, this base will represent a major new type of presence, and perhaps commitment, in a part of the world where our profile was heretofore low and our policy one of restraint, and this construction would be undertaken without sufficient congressional examination.

Congressman OBEY's observations on the Diego Garcia request, which appeared as dissenting views in the Appropriations Committee's report on the defense supplemental bill, sum up well the many questions which this request raises—questions which remain and which still need consideration by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to consider Congressman OBEY's insightful remarks and reflect on the several important questions he raises:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID R. OBEY

It is simply not necessary to appropriate money in a supplemental appropriation for Diego Garcia. One has to go no farther than this Committee report to be convinced of that.

(1) This report says, for example, that the Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean "could" expand dramatically, and "could" threaten our supplies of raw materials. From those two "coulds" this report concludes that a supplemental appropriation for Diego Garcia is "urgent." There was certainly no evidence presented to this committee to indicate that either of these "coulds" were likely to occur in the immediate future. How do two "coulds" make an emergency which necessitates the appropriation of this money in a supplemental budget bill—just a few months before the regular appropriation bill is acted upon?

(2) This committee report says that Diego Garcia would be vulnerable during a conflict, and that the chief advantage of the facility is "an ability to show the flag . . ." It also says that the expansion of Diego Garcia will

aid the Navy "during peacetime." If this is true, where is the urgency which necessitates this supplemental finding?

(3) The committee says the approval of funds for the expansion of Diego Garcia "may forestall" further expansion of warmaking capability by the superpowers in the Indian Ocean. How can we forestall an expansion of warmaking capability of the superpowers by expanding the warmaking powers of one of the superpowers?

The purpose of the supplemental appropriation bills is, and should be, to deal with situations which are of a special or emergency nature. There is no emergency here that warrants the disruption of the regular appropriations process.

It is disturbing enough when agencies ask for funds in supplemental appropriation bills for programs which are not of an emergency nature. It is even more disturbing when Congress acquiesces in that practice.

The Appropriations Committee held approximately 1 hour of hearings on the question of funding for Diego Garcia and the hearing record totals only 40 pages. There are many questions which should be asked when discussing an expansion of U.S. forces in the Indian Ocean and the possibility of a costly arms race in that area—and that is what the money for Diego Garcia in this bill is all about. You won't find answers to those questions in this committee report or in the committee hearings on this bill. The Congress, and this committee especially, owes itself time to seek answers to those questions.

Before we rush pell-mell into approving this project, there are certain questions which need answers.

WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES?

What are the economic, political and strategic consequences of expanding our facilities on Diego Garcia? These consequences could be substantial and they deserve more attention than Members of this House and this committee can give them in a supplemental appropriation bill.

The "essential" reason given in the hearings for money now for the development of Diego Garcia is "time." The convenience of a construction schedule, however, should be minor in comparison with some of the other considerations—military and political—which are involved.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND OIL

We are told, for example, that an expansion at Diego Garcia is a natural result of the recent war in the Middle East, needed to protect the sea lanes in the Indian Ocean through which we get oil and other raw materials.

But if we expand facilities on Diego Garcia, is there any guarantee that our supplies of oil will not again be cut off—not in the seas but at the wellhead? It is obvious that the presence of a U.S. carrier task force in the Indian Ocean during the October war did not stop the Arabs from doing just that. And, it is also true that in the naval buildup in the Indian Ocean following the Indo-Pakistan and Arab-Israeli wars, the stand-off firepower provided by U.S. carriers was a sufficient match for anything that the Soviets could or did deploy.

Won't the Russians think twice about interfering with the oil flow from the Persian states when we could respond by massively interfering with their seaborne trade? They are not unmindful, I'm sure, that exits from the two major Soviet import-export areas, the Baltic and Black Seas, which together account for 85 percent of all Soviet seaborne trade, are narrow channels bordered by NATO countries (Turkey, Denmark, Norway), and the English Channel, 22 miles wide at its narrowest point, is bordered by two more (Britain and France). The only functioning

exit from the Mediterranean, the Straits of Gibraltar, is also dominated by a British base in a sea where six NATO countries maintain a large naval force.

THE SUEZ CANAL

We are told that an expansion of the facilities at Diego Garcia is needed because the Soviets will be able to use the soon to be opened Suez Canal to increase its presence in the Indian Ocean.

If the opening of the Suez Canal can have such serious consequences for our security, why is this government spending money to help open that canal? How much will the Russians rely on the Suez Canal if, as everyone seems to agree, the canal is vulnerable in a crisis and would leave Soviet ships far from their support facilities? Can the Soviets afford to send more ships into the Indian Ocean by transferring ships from their Atlantic, Mediterranean or Pacific fleets?

NEGOTIATIONS

We are told that the Soviets have not come up with any concrete proposals for a negotiated agreement on a limitation of force levels in the Indian Ocean. Have we done any better?

On two occasions—March and June 1971—the Soviets raised the question of a possible limitation of naval forces in the Indian Ocean by both the United States and the Soviet Union. What did we do to follow that up?

The printed hearings on this supplemental appropriation bill show that when questioned about the benefits of negotiations to limit our deployments in the Indian Ocean, thereby saving this country a great deal of money, "the Chief of Naval Operations refused to answer" the question. To further quote from the Committee report, "After a delay of 20 days, during which they were repeatedly requested to obtain a responsible answer, the Navy has agreed to initiate steps to obtain an answer from the Department of State."

Why shouldn't we have the benefit of that information before we vote on the question of funding for Diego Garcia?

PLAYING CATCH-UP

We are told that an expansion of facilities at Diego Garcia is needed to balance an increased Soviet force which is already there. But is it not possible that the Soviets feel they must catch-up with us?

The U.S. Navy has sought the use of islands in the Indian Ocean for naval bases since the late 1950's. Proposals similar to the one contained in this bill were made in 1967. But the Soviets did not start to deploy vessels in the Indian Ocean until March, 1968.

Several public hearings have also revealed that the total number of Russian major surface combat ships in the Indian Ocean has never been substantial, ranging between three and ten such ships, and averaging closer to the lower end of the scale.

Moreover it is irrelevant to talk just of the numbers of Soviet ships in that area. When you look more closely at the kinds of Soviet naval activities in the Indian Ocean, you see that by far the greatest portion of their increased activity is accounted for by minesweepers and other auxiliary ships. The picture then becomes far less grim than the Navy would have us believe.

The International Institute for Strategic Studies has recently published a paper, by Geoffrey Jukes, which suggests that the Soviets are in fact reacting to a US presence in the Indian Ocean. He points out, for example, the Soviet's concern with the stationing of US Polaris submarines in the Indian Ocean, putting within range of submarine-launched missiles the industrial heartland of Russia. Is it then unreasonable to suggest, as Jukes does, that the Russian Navy is in the

Indian Ocean as a flag-showing force, to familiarize its Navy with an area where it might have to contest the presence of US Polaris submarines and to create pressure on the United States to avoid a great power naval race in the Indian Ocean? If one accepts this thesis, the Soviet offer to negotiate naval limitations makes much sense.

Is it not possible that the Soviets feel the real reason for Diego Garcia is a maritime reconnaissance base from which US aircraft can track Soviet ships and submarines? Even if that is not our intent, is it unreasonable for the Soviets to think otherwise, and to increase their naval forces because they do think so?

The Soviets have a substantial fishing fleet in the Indian Ocean. Is it not possible that they are there, in some part, to protect those fleets?

COSTS

We are told that an expansion of facilities at Diego Garcia will make it less costly for the United States to deploy ships and aircraft in the Indian Ocean.

But isn't there a real possibility that an expansion of Diego Garcia, and the deployment of a carrier task force in the Indian Ocean on a regular basis could cost this government a very substantial sum of money?

Navy officials have stated that if we keep a carrier in the Indian Ocean for six months or more each year, it will require either a reduction of our forces in the Mediterranean or the Pacific or an increase in our carrier force levels, at an enormous cost. Are we ready to say now that we should thin out our 7th Fleet or spend billions of dollars for the procurement and operation of two or even more new aircraft carriers which may be needed?

STABILITY IN THE REGION

We are told that our military presence in the Indian Ocean provides tangible evidence of our concern for security and stability in the region where significant United States interests are located.

But we have also been told that strife which has occurred in the littoral states has come from historic tensions between the countries themselves. Examples are numerous: India-Pakistan, Iraq-Iran, Iraq-Kuwait, and Somalia-Ethiopia among others.

If historic rivalries are the basic tensions in the area, how can the development of Diego Garcia substantially help stabilize the region?

In fact there could be benefits in moving cautiously in this area. Many of the littoral states do not want a great-power arms race in the Indian Ocean. That view is held not only by India and Indonesia among others, but by New Zealand and Australia, two of our major allies.

And there are other questions.

At the present time we are giving significant amounts of military aid to a number of countries in the Indian Ocean, including Saudi Arabia and Iran. Does that, combined with the attempt to develop Diego Garcia, mean that the United States is consciously moving toward greater involvement in that entire region? Can the Soviets not interpret it that way in any event?

On the Southwest coast of Iran a \$600 million military base is being constructed by American contractors. Reportedly this will be the largest base of its kind in the Indian Ocean. The Russians are building smaller bases elsewhere in the littoral states. If we assume that the Russians are, or can, use these bases for their benefit, isn't it likely that the Russians assume we could use this Iranian base for our purposes?

Is it not true that Iran, an ally of the United States, has a great advantage in terms of the military balance of power in

the Persian Gulf, while India, supposedly the Soviet's most important ally in the area, has so far resisted attempts by the Soviets to acquire base rights in that country? Will the Indians continue their resistance if we develop Diego Garcia over their objections?

All these questions bear on the issue of whether we should provide funds in this supplemental appropriation bill for the development of facilities on Diego Garcia.

It may well be that our best interests require a permanent naval base on that island. My concern is that we don't know that now! The Navy has asked for \$29 million for the development of naval facilities on Diego Garcia and is trying to sell the idea to the Congress as a super-Texaco station in the middle of the Indian Ocean. The question which I have posed indicates, I think, that an expansion of those facilities can mean a great deal more than that. Certainly an appropriation of these funds, if they are justified, can wait at least until the consideration of the fiscal year 1975 budget in just a few short months!

A GREAT WOMAN RETIRES

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Premier Golda Meir, of Israel, has announced that she is submitting her resignation and that this act is intended to be irrevocable. Although like many others I would hope that such a move would not be a final act, it must be accepted at face value.

She resigns at a time when Israel is troubled politically as a result of the recent war. Some critics place blame upon her for some of the harm sustained by Israel in the Arab sneak attack. I shall make no judgments in that particular situation. Rather, I believe the Western World should view her in a clear, more correct perspective.

Golda Meir is the queen of democratic socialism. Emerging from the ghettos and pogroms of Eastern Europe, she was one of those bright lights and lively spirits who shared the noble dream that spread through the little Jewish towns of Eastern Europe. The shtetls, as they were known, lived in constant fear of organized, orchestrated governmental violence. In the Russia of that day, a Jew had the right to die, pay his taxes, and allow his son to be drafted in the czar's army.

Discriminated against, vilified, and reviled publicly, these people began to dream that special dream. It spoke of a new land, built upon the ruins of an old civilization, where Jews could come from around the world and live in their own state, secure from the persecution and violence attendant upon their residence in so many distant places.

Based upon the dream of Theodore Hertzl, who had seen the excesses perpetrated upon the Jews during the Dreyfus case, it became known as Zionism, a political expression of the ages-old dream of the Jewish Diaspora, enshrining the

concept of a return to the homeland of Zion that the Jewish people had never left.

It fell to the lot of that generation of Jews to emerge from these towns and hold this idea aloft to their brethren. At first, it was a faint light indeed. But the idea spread to thousands of little villages across Eastern Europe where the Jewish people endured and survived, awaiting the inevitable arrival of either a Messiah or the embodiment of a messianic ideal.

The Lord spoke to them in the form of a group of leaders who titled the collective chin of the Jewish people upward, so their eyes could behold the dream of a new life in an old place.

Among these people were David Ben-Gurion and Vladimir "Ze'ev" Jabotinsky. Also among them was Golda Meir.

Like missionaries, they labored with unstinting zeal to awaken the Jewish people to the potential reality of this dream. "Arise," they said, "for we can never continue to live in these places and under these kings and regimes."

"Lift up your eyes," they said, "and assert yourselves as human beings. Don't let yourselves be killed like sheep, for there is an alternative. We shall make our ancient land blossom with the labor of our hands and the sweat of our brows."

And people laughed at them, and called them crazy. Except a few. Namely the very young and idealistic. And they began the return to Zion, planting tiny settlements in the deserts of what was then Palestine, and reclaiming land that for nineteen centuries had been allowed to go back to wilderness.

Their efforts resulted in the Balfour Declaration in World War I, guaranteeing a Jewish homeland in a Palestine the Jews had never left. They struggled to plant colonies in the intervening years, prevailing in the face of Arab violence. And then came the holocaust, as European Jewry was annihilated in a calculated policy of genocide by Nazi Germany.

And Golda Meir and her colleagues made sure that the land of Israel was established to serve as a haven for the shattered remnants of this persecuted people. Invaded by five Arab armies in 1948, on the day of Israel's Declaration of Nationhood, they shattered the invading forces and proclaimed the resurrection of Zion. Since that time, under the leadership of Golda Meir, and others of that generation, most of whom have gone to their reward, the Jewish people have had the greatest resurgence in their history.

And from all four corners of the Earth, there has been proclaimed the ingathering of the exiles. And they have come. One million from Arab lands as persecuted refugees. At least another million from the concentration camps, bearing Hitler's tattoos on their arms and his terror in their minds. And from the Western World, and from Asia. Until today, a true Socialist democracy, Israel stands as the only free nation in the entire Middle East.

In the last several years, that sturdy democracy has been nurtured and led by Mrs. Meir, through all vicissitudes and conflict, both internal and external.

Unlike other women who might pose as national leaders, Golda is a true national leader, embodying in her person the strength and virtues of her people, who stand so alone in the world today.

I know that she will be revered and respected by the world at large and her people specifically for all she has done and represents. I also know that her dream will prevail as her nation grows. She has presided over a metamorphosis of the world's most ancient people, and today hands on their priceless heritage intact to her successors. She will not be forgotten, nor will her cause be abandoned.

If ever a woman represented what the Torah says she should represent, it is Golda Meir. That, by itself, is tribute enough.

BLOOM TOWNSHIP OF ILLINOIS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Bloom Township High School, of which I am an alumnus, recently won its super-sectional championship basketball game. I would like to insert the following telegram to the superintendent of Bloom Township High School and his reply for the interest of my colleagues:

Dr. RICHARD CARRABINE,
Superintendent Bloom Township Schools,
Dixie Highway and 10th Street, Chicago
Heights, Illinois

DEAR DICK: I want to extend my congratulations to your Bloom Township basketball team, coach Wes Mason and the entire student body of Bloom Township for their historic triumph of the super-sectional championship game against Rich Central.

Let's go all the way and bring home the bacon to Bloom Township and the entire city of Chicago Heights.

Sincerely,
Congressman BOB "CASEY" HANRAHAN,
Third District, Illinois,
Class of 1952

BLOOM TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL,
Chicago Heights, Ill., March 29, 1974.
Mr. ROBERT HANRAHAN,
U.S. Congressman,
Illinois Third District,
Oak Lawn, Ill.

DEAR BOB: Many thanks for your telegrams of encouragement and congratulations. We at Bloom are very proud of our basketball team and still believe them to be the best in Illinois. Unfortunately, we "ran out of gas" after having played such a tough game Saturday afternoon.

You can't believe the enthusiasm and spirit which was generated throughout the entire township at the homecoming festivities as evidenced by the parade and the rally which greeted us upon our return to McCann gym. Someone observed that they hadn't seen anything like it since the end of the

second world war. It was certainly beautiful to behold and your comments in the telegram at that assembly were well received.

Thank you for your continued interest as an alumnus of Bloom and the best to you as you continue your work in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD M. CARRABINE,
Superintendent.

HERBERT L. MATTHEWS REVISITED

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, on this 30th annual, official celebration of Pan American Day in the U.S. Congress, I would like to include an article written by the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph.D., D.D., our Acting Chaplain on all such occasions. This piece was prepared at the express suggestions of the Reverend John B. Breslin, S.J., book editor of "America," a national weekly published by the Fathers of the Company of Jesus in the U.S.A. and Canada.

The qualifications of Dr. Thorning for this particular assignment were ably described by the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of New Mexico on February 19, 1974—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Senate. Senator MONTOYA, himself an honor graduate of Regis College, Denver, Colo., and the Georgetown University Law School, where he earned the degree, "Juris Doctor," spoke about his friend, "The Padre of the Americas," in the following terms:

Mr. President, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph.D., D.D., who has served at various times as dean of the Graduate School of Georgetown University; European correspondent of "America"; and is now Honorary Chaplain of the Inter-American Defense Board and College as well as an associate editor of "World Affairs," has written articles . . . illustrating a special perspective which may be of interest to other Members of the Senate.

It is a matter of special importance, therefore, that I include the piece entitled "Herbert L. Matthews Revisited" in the RECORD today:

HERBERT L. MATTHEWS REVISITED

Few writers in the 20th century have enjoyed more exciting, colorful and controversial careers than Herbert L. Matthews. Although retired from the New York Times since 1967, he remains a romantic, fascinating figure. One reason for abiding interest and debate is his spate of books and articles about live issues. His name, his dispatches, his books, including memoirs, are quoted in surveys of foreign affairs. Nor are they apt to be overlooked by historians. If the peoples of this planet are in a revolutionary mood, Matthews can claim some degree of responsibility for the process.

Assignments from the Times, starting in New York (1922), covered a wide field: France (1931-35); Abyssinia (1935-36); Spain (1936-39); Italy (1939-42); India (1943); England (1945-49); Latin America and, again, New York.

No reason is given for his present self-imposed exile in Australia.

To gain an understanding of this correspondent and to comprehend his reactions to the glories and vicissitudes of his career, one must note an outstanding personality trait: Herbert L. Matthews was drawn, instinctively, toward those with whom he was associated. Above all, he felt at home with brave men on a battlefield. A victorious offensive found him jubilant. He shared the sorrow of the vanquished. Every fiber of his being impelled him to take sides.

Mr. Matthews was, and is, unequivocal and open about partisanship. He talks and writes candidly about his own "bias" and "prejudice," although he is savage in his denunciations of what he deems "bigotry" in others. Throughout the storms of criticism that marked certain stages of his career, however, he retained his love of adventure in wartime or travels; the joy of dangers and hardships shared; the exploration of and encounter with the unknown; the pursuit and capture of a front-page story.

His first journalistic, wartime experience was in Abyssinia. The invasion, although an expression of Fascist imperialism, exposed the emotional side of his nature. All too often, his reports indicated admiration for foot soldiers and airmen engaged in aggression. Nor did he hesitate, after the combat, to accept two decorations from the government of Benito Mussolini. With becoming modesty he points out that one, the "War Cross," was for "valor in the field." The other made him, what he still is, a "Grand Officer of the Crown of Italy." His first book was entitled "Eyewitness in Abyssinia." It is not a volume easy to locate in the Library of Congress.

On page 114 of a more recent work, "A World in Revolution," the author offers an explanation for his empathy with the invading Legionnaires in these words:

"If you start from the premise that a lot of rascals are having a fight, it is not unnatural to want to see the victory of the rascal you like, and I liked the Italians during that scrimmage more than I did the British or the Abyssinians."

The rapport Matthews was able to establish with the Italians in Ethiopia led him to request an assignment in Spain. His wish was fulfilled. It was a mission that set him upon a "road to Damascus," a "political and moral conversion." Today, although contending that his dispatches from the Spanish Civil War were "basically correct," he agrees that his original impressions were neither "objective" nor "impartial."

Writing in 1971, he states that his "feelings long ago ceased to be intensely emotional." His judgment, he adds, "is not as clouded as it was, and I know a great deal about the war that I could not have known at the time, especially features derogatory to the loyalists and to the internationals, including the Lincoln battalion." Experience and a study of the research of reputable historians have enlightened him about "the ways of statesmen and the functioning of ideologies and power politics."

What Mr. Matthews fails to see is that an earlier and deeper knowledge of what was happening would have enabled him to avoid his "two great battles with the New York Times." Spain was the setting for the first, in his own words, "Cuba was the second."

In a revised, paperback edition of "The Yoke and the Arrows" (1961 and 1970), the author records that evidence obliged him to write a letter of apology to the widow of General José Moscardó for having thrown doubt on the historicity of the Spanish officer's heroic refusal to surrender the Alcázar, Toledo, in return for the life of his son, Luis. The truth about this historical episode had been related by numerous university scholars, including Manuel Aznar, Hugh Thomas and Cecil Eby. In his recent work, Mr. Matthews

shows that he is familiar with the findings of such specialists.

The Timesman is accurate in reporting that Cuba was his second major struggle with the publisher, editors and readers of his newspaper. Nevertheless, it is right to emphasize that, thanks to Mr. Matthews' initiative and resourcefulness, Fidel Castro was proved to be alive and active in the mountains of eastern Cuba when spokesmen for Fulgencio Batista in Havana were trumpeting "news" (1957) of the rebel's death and the defeat of his movement. Otherwise, Castro, Raúl, his brother, and "Che" Guevara, as Matthews points out, might have remained unnoticed, unpublishized and "withered on the vine."

On the other hand, with the benefit of hindsight, the writer does make acknowledgments about Fidel that were not prominent in his *Times* evaluation of the "Maximum Leader." Matthews now discovers that "Castro's performances in the social, economic and political fields ranged from admirable to awful." This admission may be grounds for Fidel's complaint, recorded by Matthews, that "this old man treats me as if he were my father."

Matthews now believes that "power has corrupted" Castro, but "in a very human way." The docility displayed to the leader by his entourage renders him " temperamentally incapable" of sharing absolute control.

It is the impression of other observers, however, that overriding authority currently resides in the hands of Soviet overlords. The ultimate surrender, it is suggested, took place when Castro voiced approval of the military occupation of Czechoslovakia. His submission, in contrast to the attitude shown by Italian, French and British Marxists, was total. Indeed, many experts now consider it obvious that Fidel has less room for maneuver than a onetime Spanish viceroy or a U.S. "proconsul" in the days of North American influence.

The former Timesman, it is fascinating to note, has warm praise for Celia Sánchez, "the faithful and charming companion since *Sierra Maestra* days, with a shrewd mind and tough core behind her gentle manners." But Matthews hardly mentions Fidel's other women friends of many nationalities, colors, sizes and shapes.

A *World in Revolution* has been described by Matthews' onetime colleagues on *The Times* as a "sad book." One reason for their view is the author's catalogue of complaints, grievances and long-winded disputes with the publisher, Mr. Arthur ("Punch") Ochs Sulzberger, and various Managing Editors, including Turner Catledge and Clifton Daniel. Lester Markel, the then Editor of the *Sunday Magazine*, was another *Times* personality who refused to publish Matthews' later pieces about Cuba.

The debate was settled when publisher and news executives concluded, unanimously, that Matthews was making their newspaper "a laughing-stock of the newspaper world," adding that "it would be over their dead bodies" that the veteran correspondent ever again would be permitted the role of a reporter for *The New York Times*.

It is to their credit that they kept their word. Matthews' byline on a news story appeared for the last time on July 16, 1961. It was a typical HLM appraisal of the Castro revolution as a beneficent event, free of Soviet domination. One of the most vigorous protests against the despatch was registered by Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips, longtime Chief of *The Times* Bureau in Cuba.

Nevertheless, for six years (1961-67), Mr. Matthews remained in *The Times* organization as a member of the Editorial Board. Until his retirement, his views about Spain, Cuba, Latin America and other parts of the globe were expressed, freely, in numerous

editorials, some of them signed. Is it not an exaggeration, therefore, for the author to claim that he was "muzzled"?

Indeed, in the light of the record, might not the owner and editors of *The New York Times* have raised the following important question:

"Can a bad reporter become a good editor?" The question becomes all the more relevant when one considers HLM's 1973 volume, "Half of Spain Died". A single scholarly critique from a not unfriendly source, *America* (April 14, 1973) may be recorded. After dismissing "Half of Spain Died" as an "incredibly bad book", Dr. José M. Sánchez, chairman of the history department at St. Louis University, makes an excellent suggestion. His calls for a "popular reappraisal" of the Spanish Civil War.

THE CHURCH AS A POLITICAL FACTOR IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this date, the 30th official congressional celebration of Pan American Day, I would like to include a short book review by our Acting Chaplain on such occasions for 30 consecutive years. The essay by the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, an associate editor of *World Affairs*, the official quarterly of the most historic, authentic peace society in the United States; namely, the American Peace Society, founded early in the last century, was featured in *World Affairs*, Washington, D.C., in the autumn issue 1972.

The book under review was written, as can be seen, by Dr. David E. Mutchler, who did much of his research work in Santiago de Chile and other parts of the American Republics. A foreword to the book by Dr. Mutchler was contributed by Dr. Irving Louis Horowitz, who was chairman of the department of sociology at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., where Dr. David E. Mutchler earned his doctorate.

The book reviews follows:

[From *World Affairs*, Autumn, 1972]

The Church as a Political Factor in Latin America, With Particular Reference to Colombia and Chile (Praeger's Special Series in International Politics and Public Affairs Series), by David E. Mutchler. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, 460 pp., \$9.95.

In search of material for his doctoral dissertation, Mutchler visited the Centro Bellarmino, Santiago de Chile, and won the confidence of its director, Father Renato Poblete, S.J., one of the most trusted advisers of the Christian Democratic Party. As head of the Instituto Bellarmino and the coordinator of many projects in the socio-economic order, Father Poblete and his colleagues secured cooperation from university professors at home and abroad. His good counsel was often decisive, not only with Raúl Cardinal Henriquez in Chile, but also with Pedro Arrupe, the Jesuit General in Rome. Mutchler made copies of much of the correspondence which circulated among such leaders and their counterparts in the political order.

One of the Jesuit sociologists who exercised tremendous influence from his work in the Centro Bellarmino and who trusted Mutchler was Roger Vekemans, a Belgian graduate of Louvain University. After teaching only one semester in the Gregorian Pontifical University, he was despatched to Santiago and, with notable speed and effectiveness, organized a Jesuit Order "Center for Research and Social Action." His mission, patterned after such a unit already functioning in Colombia, was to provide programs of social reconstruction for labor unions, farm workers' organizations, a "Social Union of Christian Businessmen," miners' cooperatives, slum-dwellers' syndicates engaged in home-building operations, and many other grass roots groups striving for humane conditions of labor and life.

In order to achieve a more independent status and to obtain wider support for his efforts Father Vekemans founded his "Center for Economic and Social Development in Latin America," widely known as DESAL. Within an incredibly short time, the Belgian Jesuit persuaded U.S. aid agencies and foundations, including a conduit for CIA money, to contribute to his Center. Moreover, he tapped the resources of West European democracies and those of Chilean government sponsorship for the success of his social justice projects. In 1964, Eduardo Frei Montalva, the Christian Democrat, was elected President, defeating Salvador Allende Gossens by 400,000 votes. Unity among non-Marxist elements was a large factor in the victory.

Not the least fascinating feature of the research embodied in this survey is the confidential nature of numerous documents profusely quoted in its pages. The author undertook the work under the direction of Irving Louis Horowitz, who was chairman of the Department of Sociology at Washington University, St. Louis. The latter also contributes a Foreword.

It was in 1969, however, that the "rebels" and activists of the "Third World" broke away from the official wing of the Christian Democratic Party. A three-cornered presidential race ensued, resulting in the 1970 election of Dr. Allende. Jacques Chonchol, a onetime Christian Democrat, became Minister of Agriculture in the new Socialist-Communist regime. The Allende administration is also supported by Gonzalo Arroyo, a Jesuit with a Ph. D. in agronomy-economics, and a number of other Christian Democratic experts.

Nevertheless, one may believe that the seeds sown by the *Centro Bellarmino* and DESAL are bearing fruit in Chile. When 60,000 students, professors and employees of the National University voted for their president on April 27, 1972, they selected Edgardo Boeninger, an engineer and political independent, rather than Felipe Herrera, an Allende adherent and former head of the Inter-American Development Bank. Moreover, the Christian Democrats claimed victory in the June elections for national officers in the Central Union, a political bastion of Chile's left-wing government.

Mutchler's volume, although marred by occasional flaws in orthography and a few conclusions that leap-frog the facts, can be examined with profit by scholars.

JOSEPH F. THORNING.

MARINE HONORED

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud today to note that one of my

constituents who is a member of the U.S. Marine Corps has distinguished himself during his recruit training at the San Diego Marine Corps Recruit Depot.

Pfc. Arturo P. Chayra, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Arturo P. Chayra, Sr., of Monterey Park, Calif., was named honor-man of his four-platoon series at graduation on April 5, 1974.

He won this distinction in competition with 239 other young men by displaying an exceptional measure of skill and professional knowledge in a wide range of basic military subjects. He was judged superior in conduct, attitude, military bearing, and leadership potential during his 11 weeks of training.

I am certainly pleased to be able to report this, and I know that Arturo's parents are extremely proud of him.

THE WORKING WOUNDED, VICTIMS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I consistently have pressed for a complete reform of the Federal social security program. I believe the program now is generally recognized as being outmoded, cumbersome, and rife with inequities.

Until lately, Congress' approach to solving the problems of our senior citizens has been to increase their benefits in drips and dribbles. In so doing, however, it also increased the cost of the program and passed on this additional expense to contributors to the program. Over the years, Congress consequently created a new class of citizens in our society—the working wounded. These are young wage earners in the low and middle income class who find themselves crippled by high taxes and a soaring cost of living.

Recently, a number of us in the House proposed that the Federal Government become a full partner in the social security program. We believe that by paying a third of the cost, financed by slashing our ridiculous foreign aid giveaways, and raising the wage ceiling for social security payments, the Government can ease the financial burden on the working wounded.

This is a step in the right direction. But, as Mr. Bob McCarthy, an editorial writer for the Times-Express in Monroeville, Pa., pointed out in a recent article, it is not enough. Furthermore, he chides the Congress on its reputation for moving so slowly in critical areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of Mr. McCarthy's article into the Record for the attention and consideration of my colleagues:

SOME HELP FOR THE WORKING WOUNDED

(By Bob McCarthy)

Congress is getting the message... slowly, ever so slowly... but finally the words seem to be getting through.

The present system of financing our Social

Security benefits for the aged is about as unjust as it can be. Now it is reported 100 members of the House of Representatives have recognized that and are sponsoring legislation to change it.

Their remedy is to assist the working wounded by cutting the Social Security Tax on low income and middle income workers and make up the difference with a healthy infusion of dollars out of general fund revenues.

That's good, but not good enough.

It's good because to our knowledge this is the first time members of Congress have officially recognized that under the present system of Social Security taxes the people on the short end of the economy are providing most of the money paid out in benefits.

It's not good enough, however, because dipping into the Federal treasury to keep solvent a system that is meant to be debt free and self sufficient defeats the purpose of Social Security. It always has been a system whereby those who work contribute to provide benefits for those too old to work so that when the contributors reach the golden years they can rightfully lay claim to the same arrangement.

Today American workers pay a 5.85 percent tax on their income into Social Security up to a maximum of \$13,200. And therein lies the inequity. Above \$13,200 the worker pays nothing, whether his annual income soars to \$20,000, \$30,000 or higher.

It has become the practice in Washington to finance increased benefits by increasing the maximum pay figure. It might seem the fairest way to the people at the very bottom of the economic ladder, for they still pay the same amount. But there isn't anything fair about it. Certainly not when people in high income brackets are paying a decreasing percentage of their income to support Social Security the higher their income goes.

There is, in fact, some thought in Congress now to increase the maximum to \$25,000. But again, this doesn't reach everyone. Why should there be a maximum, any more than there is a maximum above which people pay no more income tax?

The care of the elderly is an obligation all of us share in, not because most of us will be old some day, but because humanity demands it of us. Our Federal government recognized this under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt four decades ago.

Since then inflation and the conscience of a nation have led to increased costs and benefits. Also increased has been the Social Security system's reliance on the American worker to pay more and more in Social Security taxes. And for some this has become a great burden, particularly those whose income is so low that a year's taxes add up to the equivalent of several week's wages.

Surely they are deserving of the relief they would gain if the wealthy paid a more proportionate share of their income into Social Security.

But Congress has been a long time coming to where these 100 members have now arrived. Who knows how much longer it will be before it dawns on many more of them that spreading the burden around to everyone based on the ability to pay is the most equitable way to finance Social Security?

MS. PEGGY GOAD—AN OUTSTANDING STUDENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the actions of a small minority of young-

sters, young people in general are often given a bad reputation. I would like to call to the House's attention a glaring exception.

High Point Senior High School has an individual who has distinguished herself as being a citizen in Prince George's County who is concerned over the betterment of her community. Ms. Peggy Goad, a student at High Point, has been responsible for organizing a dance marathon to raise money for the Great Oak Center in Beltsville, Md. In 3 years Ms. Goad has raised over \$7,000.

Ms. Goad has managed to actively participate in various charitable activities as well as maintain a B average and serve as senior class president.

All of this work was done without regard to personal recognition, yet, I feel we should take note of her public spiritedness. I am proud of Ms. Goad and her meritorious actions. Because so many have been quick to criticize young people we should also be quick to praise.

NASA TO LAUNCH 26 SATELLITES NEXT YEAR

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, NASA's program in space for the coming year is a limited but fruitful one. There is a need to strengthen both the automated and manned space program in the years ahead. However, significant effort will be continued in 1974 in space which merits the attention and understanding of the general public. An article in the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., December 21, 1973, by Mr. Al Rossiter, Jr., summarizes NASA's plans for the coming year and points to the many contributions that our national space program makes to our Nation and its people:

NASA TO LAUNCH 26 SATELLITES NEXT YEAR
(By Al Rossiter, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—There won't be any manned space shots for the next year and a half, but the space agency plans to double its unmanned satellite missions in 1974 with the heaviest emphasis yet on practical work.

Twenty-six satellites are on NASA's schedule for the new year, the most since the 28 flights in 1967. Twelve of the upcoming launchings are for communications satellites and five are for weather watchers. Most again will go from Cape Canaveral.

There were 13 civilian shots in 1973, including the launch of the Skylab space station in May and three crews rendezvousing with it in May, July and November. The final three-man team of Skylab astronauts is scheduled to return Feb. 8 after spending a record 12 weeks in orbit.

If the current flight in the big orbiting lab goes as long as planned, the nine Skylab crewmen will have logged more than 12,000 man-hours in space—almost double the time spent aloft by the men of America's 27 earlier spaceflights. But Project Skylab is conducting research for the future, while the 1974 unmanned missions will have a more immediate payoff.

Unless a Skylab rescue flight is required, the U.S. will not be launching astronauts

again until July, 1975, when three Apollo pilots will go into orbit to rendezvous and dock with a two-man Russian Soyuz spacecraft.

The new generation space shuttle rocket plane will be making major headway on the drawing boards and in the test labs of many aerospace contractors, but it won't fly in space until 1979 at the earliest.

Besides the ongoing Skylab mission, NASA has three unmanned spaceflights carrying into the new year. The Pioneer 10 probe is now on its way out of the solar system after an historic flight past Jupiter Dec. 3, and a twin called Pioneer 11 is cruising to a February rendezvous with Venus and on to a March passby of Mercury.

There are several new scientific missions on the 1974 schedule, including an unprecedented German-American probe close to the sun, but the communications and weather satellites will be the big job of the year.

Three of the radio relay satellites will be the first designed solely to relay messages, data and television communications within the United States. The first of the new relay stations, called Westar and owned by Western Union, is to be launched April 11 from Cape Canaveral.

Six other companies are moving into the domestic communications satellite business and the outlook appears unlimited. NASA's role is limited to launching and initial tracking services, for which it is reimbursed.

"You can get a feeling for the potential of the newly instituted domestic satellites by looking at current revenue of telephone, radio and TV which is about \$18 million a year," said NASA administrator James C. Fletcher.

The International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (INTELSAT), of which America's Comsat Corp., is the principal partner, is the pioneer in the commercial satellite business and now has an annual revenue of \$260 million and a global network of satellites.

Three more large INTELSAT 4 satellites are scheduled for launch in 1974 from the Florida spaceport. One is to go into a 22,300-mile high stationary orbit Jan. 30, the other two are set for flight in June and August.

In addition, Comsat is having two new satellites built to relay communications from ships at sea to all sides of the oceans. They are called Marisats and will be leased by the U.S. Navy at first and later used for commercial maritime traffic. The first Marisat is set for launch in September, with the second to fly two months later—both from Cape Canaveral.

NASA also will launch two Skynet 2 military communications satellites for Great Britain on Jan. 17 and in June. And the agency plans to orbit an experimental applications technology satellite in April that, among other things, will beam educational television to remote areas in the United States.

The last launch of 1974 is scheduled to be the first flight of a new experimental communications satellite, Symphonie, built by France and West Germany.

Three of the five weather satellites on the 1974 launch schedule will be new type spacecraft designed to soar into stationary orbits where each will be able to maintain a constant watch on the clouds over one third of the globe.

Like the communications satellites, they take advantage of the phenomenon whereby the orbital speed of a satellite 22,300 miles high matches the rotation of the earth—the satellite remains over one point.

NASA also will launch an operational, lower altitude weather satellite for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in July from the west coast space center at Vandenberg AFB, Calif. An ad-

vanced, experimental Nimbus weather satellite also is set for launch from California in June.

The only experimental rocket flight is set for Jan. 24 from the Cape when a combination of the Air Force's triple-barrelled Titan 3 and NASA's Centaur upper stage will be test flown into orbit. This Titan-Centaur is scheduled to launch Viking Mars landing craft in 1975.

THE ADOPTION OF "WATCHDOG" ANTI-INFLATIONARY LEGISLATION IS IMPERATIVE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty well known that this administration has recommended that the Economic Stabilization Act be permitted to expire at the end of this month of April and, in such event, it is quite clear that the White House intends to disband the Cost of Living Council. Some Members of Congress and other sources within the business and labor community have indicated agreement with the administration's position.

However, I would like to emphasize that a great many economic authorities have expressed the fear that, if the Economic Stabilization Act is terminated and nothing else is adopted to take its place, the American consumer may very well be impacted, over the next several months, by rapidly increasing inflationary pressures that could well exceed the disastrous wage-price spiral that occurred right after the end of World War II.

In the face of this warning by so many respected economic experts I do not believe that it is either wise or prudent for the Congress to entirely withdraw itself from any legislative concern about the inflationary hardships that may be additionally visited upon all American consumers shortly after the expected expiration of the Economic Stabilization Act on this coming April 30.

On the contrary, I very deeply believe that the Congress, under such circumstances, should positively evidence its continuing concern by considering and enacting a moderate kind of "watchdog" anti-inflationary measure in the public interest and that is the purpose of the bill that I am introducing today.

Because of the present convictions of some Members of Congress and outside sources against the retention of any price and wage or even standby controls after next April 30, this bill does not provide for any such retention.

However, in this time of constantly rising inflation and ever-increasing economic hardships that are being experienced by the great majority of American citizens and families, particularly the so-called middle income group, I believe that this bill, or a similar bill, could be used and ought to be used by the Congress as an instrument to curb and reduce the inflationary fires that are rag-

ing all around the country in this dangerous depression period and that is the purpose of this measure. It would provide for the continuation of the Cost of Living Council for two major reasons: First, to monitor the industries in our country that have been decontrolled by the administration over the last 9 months; and second, even more important, to establish a vehicle through which Congress could be kept informed on matters affecting the economic welfare of the country. This bill would additionally require the President to study and evaluate the relationship between excess profits, the stabilization of the economy and the creation of new jobs and further provide for the Cost of Living Council to report to the Congress any adverse effects on supply and demand that would tend to cause exorbitant price increases.

If the Cost of Living Council is totally eliminated I think it is obvious that the Congress would lose an available and valuable means of fulfilling its obligation to unceasingly fight inflation. If we do not adopt some kind of effective anti-inflationary legislation in the very near future and if inflation skyrockets in the months ahead I do not think that there is any doubt that we will all be hearing loud and clear the criticism and complaint of the American people that the Congress has abandoned them in their hour of greatest inflation control need. I do not think there is any doubt, if these circumstances develop, that the White House will take the lead in denouncing the Congress for being derelict in its duty.

In all sound reason and wisdom, therefore, I urge the House leadership to schedule early action on this "watchdog" type of anti-inflationary legislation in the public interest because, if we wait too long, the consumer outcry could grow to such an extent that the Congress, in overreaction, might well be tempted to impulsively approve price and wage control legislation that would be too rigid and inevitably result in hindering rather than improving the American economy. Let us be mindful of the sage advice that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and expeditiously act on this vitally important subject before it is too late.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PREVENT PAYMENT OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973. My bill would amend the original act to prevent payment of Federal subsidies to the trustees of any railroad in reorganization until the railroads have paid all their delinquent taxes to State and local governments.

I have introduced this measure because the Penn Central and the Jersey Central Railroads owe the city of Elizabeth, N.J.—largest community in the 12th District—more than \$2 million in delinquent taxes and interest. And there are many other communities in similar financial straits.

Mayor Thomas G. Dunn of Elizabeth testified on March 13 before the Rail Services Planning Office of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In his remarks, which follow, Mayor Dunn articulated the plight of Elizabeth and other cities forced to carry these delinquent tax accounts on their books:

REMARKS OF MAYOR THOMAS G. DUNN

I am Thomas G. Dunn of Elizabeth, New Jersey, a city with a population of approximately 120,000 people. I have been Mayor of this great city for the past nine years, and am also the State Senator of the State of New Jersey's 21st Legislative District comprising Elizabeth, Linden, Carteret and Winfield.

I welcome the opportunity to speak today before the Rail Services Planning Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the revitalization of railroads in the northeast because my legislative district, and Elizabeth, in particular, is integrally involved in your proposals to modernize rail systems. I feel certain that any laws or funding authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Department of Transportation will have a profound effect upon residents of Elizabeth and neighboring communities.

A problem which has been "nagging" the City of Elizabeth since 1967 is delinquent railroad taxes. Until these tax bills are paid in full, I cannot see how plans to "revitalize" or renew the Central Railroad of New Jersey or Penn Central Railroad can be considered unless mandatory payment of these back taxes are part of the overall proposal.

This is the sole thrust of my message to you today: Elizabeth respectfully requests an amendment to the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, Public Law 93-236, to include a provision requiring railroad companies to pay municipalities delinquent taxes before railroads become eligible for any more Federal "revitalization" funds.

I consider this to be a reasonable request in light of our situation in Elizabeth, where two railroads have outstanding tax bills in excess of two million dollars.

The Central Railroad of New Jersey's delinquency goes back to 1967, and totals \$1,350,000, plus an assessment of \$75,000 for paving and sewer work. Penn Central's account became delinquent in 1970, and it owes us \$205,000 in back taxes. In addition, the amount of interest owed by both railroads is estimated at \$445,000. This totals \$2,075,000, which is a lot of money to a city our size, no matter how you count it.

We cannot collect back taxes because both railroads are protected by the Federal Courts from foreclosure of property and assets, but, yet, State law requires that the property continue to be carried as taxable items!

Each year, at budget time, State law requires that we carry these as "anticipated revenue" even though we know full well that the arrearage is not going to be paid. Therefore, in the following year's budget, we must add the railroads' delinquency to an account called "reserve for uncollected taxes." In other words, we have to "make up" the shortage some other way. The way—by increasing the taxes that all the other taxpayers must pay—and do! The "little guy," as well as the other "big" taxpayers, sub-

sidize the railroads! This is hard for a taxpayer living on a fixed income to digest, and it is tough on a mayor to explain this totally unjust thing to the people he represents.

I feel that a formula for collecting this money should have been established a long time ago, but Federal judges not only have refused to release funds for the delinquent taxes, but have warned the city that any attempt to obtain this money in the courts can be interpreted as "contempt", because the courts have ordered us to discontinue our pursuit of justice. Yet, at the same time, the railroads continue to receive monies under net lease arrangements, from some tenants, specifically ear-marked for the payment of taxes. Instead of these monies being forwarded to the city "on account," the money paid for taxes by these tenants are used for operation and maintenance purposes by the railroads.

To Elizabeth, this whole thing is obviously unfair. So, I now respectfully ask you what will happen, under Public Law 93-236, to our two million dollars? It is our understanding, without having actually seen this law, that it may be completely lost in the shuffle. If the proposed legislation does not specifically provide for these delinquencies, I feel that an amendment should definitely be added giving relief.

Every conceivable legal alternative has been pursued by our staff of city attorneys to collect these back taxes, but to no avail! It has come down to the fact that we have exhausted the judicial alternatives, and now we are giving full attention to legislative methods of obtaining these funds. Hopefully, this bill will enable us to attain the legal basis for collecting money which is rightfully ours. We know we are correct, and so do the courts! But, as a public elected official of long tenure, I recognize that being right does not always result in justice being served!

It is our contention that Elizabeth would have a great deal to gain if an amendment to this bill directed railroads to pay delinquent taxes before they become eligible for any funding from the U.S. Department of Transportation or any other federal source.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your August body.

UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS CONTINUE TO BE PERSECUTED IN U.S.S.R.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the long and arduous attempt of Soviet novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn to escape physical and intellectual persecution in his native land is an inspiring story which has grasped the attention of the entire world. His plight symbolizes the almost unbelievable conditions faced by countless thousands of captive people still enslaved in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Another Soviet intellectual who reached the West this week said in an interview that the primary reason that both he and Solzhenitsyn were allowed to leave Russia relatively unharmed, was that their names were known in the West. Their professional reputations out-

side the Soviet Union accorded them a degree of protection against the usual KGB methods of dealing with dissenters. Thousands of lesser known individuals remain in prison camps behind the Iron Curtain, however.

Currently, 67 percent of all political prisoners in the U.S.S.R. are Ukrainian. This group constitutes the largest ethnic minority in the country, representing one-fifth of the total Soviet population. Yet, the plight of these millions goes almost unnoticed in the United States.

In order that our colleagues and the American public may know who some of these people held in Soviet concentration camps are, and that they are not merely faceless numbers but human beings deserving basic human rights, I ask that the related newsclippings and biographical information follow.

[From "Svoboda" Ukrainian Weekly, N.J., U.S.A., Feb. 16, 1974]

SAKHAROV, WIFE, FOUR OTHERS PLEAD FOR PLUSHCH

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Dr. Andrei A. Sakharov, the famed Soviet physicist and leading spokesman in defense of human rights, appealed to the New York based International League for the Rights of Man to intercede in behalf of Leonid Plushch, a 34-year-old Ukrainian cyberneticist incarcerated in an insane asylum.

The appeal, signed by Dr. Sakharov, his wife Eleanor Bonner and four other intellectuals, said Plushch was "near death" in a special psychiatric hospital in Dnipropetrovsk, which the signatories described as a "prison" known among "institutions of this type for the harshness of its conditions."

DRUGGED

Plushch, said the appeal, was confined "in an appalling condition of humiliation, persecution and physical suffering" brought on by the injection of "unregulated and senseless doses of haloperidol."

He could no longer read, write, or exercise, said the signatories, adding that he was suffering extreme aggression, continuous shivering, weakness, spasms and loss of appetite.

The appeal said that Plushch's wife had been refused information of the hospital diagnosis of her husband, his treatment or his health.

"He is near death," said the signatories of the appeal.

Plushch, a leading Ukrainian cyberneticist who worked at the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in Kiev, was dismissed in 1968 for alleged dissident activity. Plushch had spoken out in defense of human rights and against illegal repression, according to the appeal, and was a member of the Sakharov headed Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights.

TRIED IN ABSENTIA

He was arrested by the KGB in January of 1972, kept incommunicado first at the Serbsky Psychiatric Institute in Moscow then in a psychiatric hospital in Kiev. He was tried in absentia in January of 1973 and sentenced to confinement in an insane asylum for "an indefinite period of time." In April 1973, acting on an appeal, the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR modified the sentence from confinement in a "severe-regime" hospital to that in a "general-type" clinic.

The appeal, dated "Moscow, February 12," asked that the International League for the Rights of Man campaign to get an international inspection of the Dnipropetrovsk hospital and others of the same type.

It also asked an international commission

of psychiatrists to examine Pliushch's health and for his transfer to a hospital abroad.

"The appeal to you and through the world public opinion is the only means left to us to save his life," said the signatories.

U.N., RED CROSS INFORMED

Signing the appeal in addition to Dr. Sakharov and his wife were: Tatiana Deliknova, mathematician; Serhiy Kevalec, biologist; Andrei Tverdokhlebov, physicist; and Tatiana Khodorovych, linguist.

Spokesmen for the International League said that copies of the appeal had already been sent to U.N. Secretary-General Dr. Kurt Waldheim and to the Red Cross, as well as other international bodies.

Also, copies were made available to news media. The New York Times of Wednesday, February 20, carried the story, but identified Pliushch as a "Russian mathematician."

MOROZ AGAIN ASSAULTED IN PRISON

HEL, LUKYANENKO STAGE HUNGER STRIKE

New York, N.Y.—Valentyn Moroz, Ukrainian historian and outspoken critic of Kremlin's Russification policies in Ukraine, was again assaulted in prison, reports the news service of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (Abroad) citing dissident sources in the Soviet Union.

Moroz, who is presently incarcerated in the Vladimir prison, was reportedly beaten last January by criminals who were deliberately locked up with him. He was then thrown into solitary confinement in very poor health, reports the news service.

This is the second time that Moroz was attacked. About a year and a half ago Moroz was assaulted and knifed in prison by criminals with whom he was confined.

In the prison camps of the Perm region Ivan Hel and Levko Lukyanenko staged hunger strikes last December protesting the inhumane conditions in which the prisoners are kept and the torturings of inmates.

The news service also reported that copies of Evhen Sverstiuk's last statement, voiced during his trial, were received in the West.

Sverstiuk, now confined in the Perm region penal camps, said in his statement before the judges that he rejects the indictment and the verdict labeling his literary work as criminal.

"How was I to know that after four or five years my work would be classified as anti-Soviet," said the Ukrainian literary critic during his March 1973 trial.

"Before the law and my conscience I do not feel that I am guilty. I only hope that for a moment I was able to fulfill the demands of the times. Let the nation and history be my judge," concluded Sverstiuk.

A LIST OF SOME UKRAINIAN WOMEN ARRESTED AND PERSECUTED BETWEEN 1972-1973

(Association of Ukrainian Women in Great Britain, 49, Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG)

STEPHANIA SHABATURA

Stephania Shabatura, an artist born 1940, made many goblins with Ukrainian patriotic motifs. In 1970, she protested against the illegal arrest of Valentyn Moroz, for which she was persecuted, being arrested finally in Lviv in 1972. The K.G.B. began continuously to interrogate, Katala, an engineer, in connection with the case, and his refusal to give fake evidence led to his mysterious death in a prison in Lviv, on 28. May 1972. In August 1972 Stephanina Shabatura was sentenced to five years imprisonment and three years of exile. Together with other women prisoners, Shabatura sent a letter of protest against the enslavement of the Ukrainian nation by Mos-

cow to the Secretary General of the United Nations, in which they demanded an open trial in the Presence of a U.N. representative.

NINA KARAVANSKA-STROKATA

Nina Karavanska was born on the 31st of January 1925 in Odessa, after finishing secondary school she became a student in the Odessa Medical Institute, from where she graduated with distinction. For a period she worked in the Microbiological Institute in Odessa, and after that she practised six years as a doctor. From 1952 till 1971 she worked as a researcher in the Odessa Medical Institute, and was last working on her doctorate, having also published many scientific works. She is married to Svyatoslav Karavansky, who between 1944 and 1960 was imprisoned in concentration camps for having been active in the Odessa unit of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, which fought for the liberation of Ukraine. He was arrested again in 1965 for writing an article on the policy of the russification of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine and for appealing to the leaders of the Communist parties of Poland and Czechoslovakia in the matter of the political arrests in 1965 in Ukraine. For this he was sent back to serve out the nine remaining years of his 25 year sentence. In 1969 he was sentenced to a further eight years, thus making a total of 33 years imprisonment. At this trial Nina Karavanska-Strokata appeared as a witness, defending her husband and accused the Moscow bolshevik authorities of a cruel and brutal trial. Because of this, the Odessa Medical Institute demanded that she publicly denounce her husband, but as she refused, so in May of 1971 she was fired from her post and forbidden to defend her dissertation for a doctorate. Nina also came out in defence of persecuted Ukrainian patriots and signed a statement after this defending V. Moroz, who was unlawfully imprisoned. For a while harassment towards her was interrupted due to the fact that cholera epidemic had broken out and she was amongst the most active in combatting the epidemic and so saved many lives. After the epidemic was overcome, a new campaign of vilification was mounted against her in the press, and she was unable to find employment. Because of this, Nina was forced to leave Ukraine at the end of summer in 1971 and went to Nalchik (Kabardino-Balkaria), where she became a medical lecturer. But even here she was persecuted. On the 8th of December, 1971 while returning to Odessa from Nalchik, Nina was arrested by the KGB, the house searched, and various poems and books by her husband, were found.

The KGB stated that Nina had been arrested because she would not "forget" her husband's case and because of her contacts with the committee for Human Rights. She was officially charged under Article 62 of the Criminal Code of the USSR, and her trial which took place in Odessa, lasted from the 4th to the 19th of May 1972. She was tried together with the writer Alex Rysnykov and Alexander Prytyka. The latter pleaded guilty, while Strokata and Rysnykov stated they were innocent and refused to accept their defense lawyer, since he was on the prosecutor's side. Nina was sentenced to four years imprisonment. Rysnykov to five years, and Prytykra to two years. On the 10th of May 1973 Nina Strokata-Karavanska, Stefania Shabatura and Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets sent out a letter from a Mordovian concentration camp to the U.N. General Secretary, Kurt Waldheim, in which she protested against the enslavement of the Ukrainian nation and demanded for themselves an open trial in the presence of a U.N. Representative.

IRYNA STASIV—KALYNETS

Iryna Stasiv was born in 1940, graduated from Lviv University and became a teacher in secondary school. From there she went on to become a lecturer in Ukrainian Language and Literature in the preparatory faculty of the Lviv polytechnic institute. An authoress of several unpublished works, together with her husband Ihor Kalynets, she came out in defence of the persecuted Ukrainian patriots, and signed a collective protest letter in defence of V. Moroz. She also protested against the destruction of Ukrainian historical monuments. For this, she was fired from her post and continuously victimised, while officially her poetry was forbidden to be published. In 1971 she joined the "People's Committee for the defence of Nina Strokata," who had been arrested without any grounds. Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets was arrested in January and sentenced in July 1972 in Lviv to 6 years imprisonment and three years in exile. The couple have a ten year old daughter—Dzvinka, who was left orphaned because Ihor Kalynets was also sentenced to 12 years of prison and exile. Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets was sentenced under Article 62 of the Criminal Code of The USSR "for anti-soviet agitation and propaganda." She is serving her sentence in a Mordovian concentration camp from where on the 10th May 1973, together with Stefania Shabatura and Nina Strokata-Karavanska, they sent a letter to the General Secretary of the U.N., Kurt Waldheim in which they protested against the enslavement of the Ukrainian nation and demanded for themselves an open trial in the presence of a U.N. representative.

LYUBOV SEREDNIAK

In January, the KGB searched her home, and found a novel by Solzhenitsyn, a work by Grossman and similar literature for which she was arrested, and after four months of interrogation sentenced to a year's imprisonment, in 15, May 1972. However, Lyubov Seredniak is still in prison.

IRYNA SENYK

Iryna Senyk, a poetess, born in 1925, near Lviv. She was initially arrested in 1946 in Lviv, on the accusation that she belonged to the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, in which she acted as messenger for the O.U.N. Headquarters whose head was Roman Chuprynska, who was also the commander of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. She was sentenced to ten years hard labour. After finishing her term of imprisonment she left prison with TB of the bone. Afterwards she was rehabilitated for groundless punishment. After treatment for TB, she obtained her specialist qualifications. In her free time she wrote patriotic verses full of love for the Ukraine and hatred for the enemies of freedom. The publication of her works was interrupted by the arrest of Chornovil, who was to be the editor. From 1969 onwards Iryna Senyk and others wrote letters in defence of S. Karavansky and V. Moroz, for which she was persecuted. In 1970, the KGB searched her house, after which she was arrested, and sentenced to six years imprisonment and five years exile. The trial was "in camera"; she was charged with propagating literature; for possessing E. Rice's book, "The New Literary Current in the Ukraine" which was confiscated from her, and for her friendship with V. Moroz, V. Chornovil, M. Osadchy, and with the writer Olga Duchymynska. A Soviet newspaper reported that at her trial Iryna Senyk did not admit to guilt and even considered herself as suffering for the achievement of Ukrainian independence. Her place of confinement is unknown.

NADIA SVITLYCHNA

Nadia Svitlychna, sister of the literary critic Ivan Svitlychny, is a philologist, and the

wife of Danylo Shymuk who was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment; her son Yarema is 3 years old. Nadia Svitlychna worked in a Kiev library but was fired from her post for adding her signature to others on a petition demanding freedom for the Ukraine. Since then she has been without work and persecuted. After the murder of Alla Hors'ka she made a demand for an inquiry into the circumstances of the artist's mysterious death. The KGB searched Svitlychna's house and took Alla Hors'ka's files. From January to May 1972 Nadia Svitlychna had to report to the KGB every day, and in 19, May 1972 she was sentenced in a closed trial, to four years imprisonment (according to article 62 of the Constitution of the Ukrainian S.S.R.). Her little son was forced to enter a government orphanage. Her place of confinement is unknown.

ALLA OLEKSANDRIVNA HORS'KA
(Born 18th September 1929)

Was brought up in a russified Ukrainian family in Kiev. Completed her education at the Kiev Art Institute. She took an active part in the national rebirth within the community life in Kiev, which since the 1960's has attracted young generations of artists and intellectuals.

1962—became one of the organisers of a cultural club for young people which was closed down in 1964. She took part in organising literary and artistic meetings and exhibitions, in spreading underground publications and in organising aid and funds for the arrested and persecuted and their families.

May 1964—designed and produced a Shevchenko stained-glass panel exhibited in the foyer of the University of Kiev. The panel was destroyed for ideological reasons and Alla Horska expelled from the Ukrainian Artists' Union. She was then forced to find work outside Kiev, so together with other artists she organised a range of monumental and decorative panels in Donbas. During the following years she continued to take an active part in the Ukrainian cultural life.

December 1965—appeared as a witness in the pre-trial investigation of Yaroslav Hevrych. Throughout 1965 and 1966 she wrote complaints to the Ukr.SSR Procurator, to the Supreme Court and other officials protesting against the violation of the Soviet law system, against the persecution of Ukrainian cultural development.

1967—witnessed the trial of Vyacheslav Chornovil and later signed a collective protest letter against the unlawful nature of that trial.

July 1968—together with others she wrote an open protest letter to "Literary Ukraine" against O. Poltoratsky's article concerning Ukrainian intellectuals.

1969-70—supported Valentyn Moroz in public when he met with opposition towards his recent works such as "Among the Snows".

28th November, 1970—was murdered at her in-law's home in Vasyl'kiv, near Kiev. She was found murdered in the basement by her friends who after being unable to trace her whereabouts, demanded that the KGB let them into the in-law's house.

Her funeral was arranged for 4th December 1970. People from Kiev and far and wide on the outskirts came to the funeral. Unexpectedly, the funeral was postponed till the 7th December. Her family was forbidden to see her and to even take the coffin, which remained sealed from the time of her death, either into her home or studio. Despite all schemes and efforts on the part of the Soviet authorities to prevent a public funeral from taking place, about 150-200 people gathered for this occasion. Those who dared to pay the last tribute to her were threatened with reprisals. Searches were carried out at

their homes. On the day of her funeral, her friends held a post-mortem exhibition of all her works. Hundreds of people passed through her studio.

AMONG THE POTENTIAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH SENSITIVITY TRAINING

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Prof. James Likoudis, of Williamsville, in an article he wrote for the Social Justice Review, begins his article by quoting a very thoughtful and cogent editorial published in our Buffalo, N.Y., Catholic diocesan newspaper, with which I fully concur. The editorial said in part:

For centuries, the family unit has been regarded as the transmitter of cultural heritage, and respect for the dignity and authority of parents. However, in the past 50 years, attempts have been and are being made to erode these principles and the privacy of the family structure, particularly by many modern educators, psychologists and sociologists.

Mr. Speaker, Skinnerian philosophy manifested in sensitivity training and other behavioral modification techniques poses a real threat to the sanctity of the family unit and to the cherished right to privacy.

There has been much discussion over the past several years on the advisability of using so-called sensitivity training. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have read and heard much of the debate on this issue.

Unfortunately, too much of this debate has not been adequately based upon a full review of the facts and appreciation for the relevance of the hard facts used to formulate the positions which have been taken on this issue. This should not be the case any further, for in dealing with this issue we are dealing with the most vital and important aspects of human individuality.

I believe Professor Likoudis has made a significant contribution to the discussion on this issue, a contribution of singular clarity, one buttressed by extensive documentation and authority. It is entitled, "The Menace of Sensitivity Training: The Mind Manipulator," which appeared in the February 1973 issue of Social Justice Review.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include the text of the article:

THE MENACE OF SENSITIVITY TRAINING: THE MIND MANIPULATOR (By James Likoudis)

On July 27, 1972 the Buffalo, N.Y., diocesan newspaper, The Magnificat, published a remarkable lead-editorial which was reprinted in other Catholic newspapers. It was entitled: Threat to Family Life and deserves quotation in full.

"For centuries, the family unit has been regarded as the transmitter of cultural heritage and respect for the dignity and authority of parents. However, in the past 50 years, attempts have been and are being made to erode these principles and the pri-

vacuity of the family structure, particularly by many modern educators, psychologists and sociologists.

"There exists a movement generated by the National Educational Association and others, to introduce behavior modification techniques in schools to 'improve patterns of behavior and help adjustment.' In the questionable name of education, these programs constitute an invasion of privacy, of the freedom from coercion, and of the rights of parents to raise their children in their own value-system and beliefs.

"In essence, these behavior and modification techniques range from Skinnerian operant conditioning, family life programs including sex education, role-playing, psychological tests, sensitivity-training techniques of sorts, group confrontation techniques and group criticism. They are all akin to brain-washing techniques designed to promote attitudinal changes with trained teachers acting as parent surrogates. The idea is to transform American schools into human relations training institutes with social scientist teachers as 'effective trainers.'

"This trend is dangerous and unconstitutional, fraught with totalitarian aspects. There have been many fads in psychology and the current, widespread embracing of group encounters is the latest. Known as marathon encounters, sensitivity training, T-groups, nude therapy, encounter groups, etc., these groups are small gatherings of people in which interpersonal confrontations are encouraged for the purpose of influencing attitudes and developing skills towards more productive social interactions. While it sounds admirable, these techniques are not universally applicable and can be highly disturbing emotionally to some individuals. There is a 10% casualty rate in encounter groups and this form of therapy is not an accepted form of treatment by the American Psychiatric Association.

"Other dangers are that these techniques do not take into consideration the personality of the child; that teachers are not capable of handling crises; that they produce short-term effects; that some students can't take exposure of faults nor criticism; that borderline psychotic cases can collapse; that these techniques represent an invasion of a child's private thoughts. It is mandatory that schools return to the basic function of education, a formidable task in light of the fact that deficiencies in writing, spelling, grammar and reading are serious problems today. As someone aptly put it, we seem to be getting 'Woolworth education at Tiffany prices.'

"Sensitivity training techniques do not belong in the classroom as they lead to a totalitarian-style educational system with secrecy for the regime and constant surveillance of the students. Children need privacy as room to grow in, to explore the world within and without. They also need to identify with parental values, not those of educators whose morality and values may be different."

Yet another voice has been heard from within the councils of the U.S. Catholic bishops to question the morality of psychological techniques being utilized to alter human consciousness and awareness. At the Bishops' Conference in November 1972, Bishop Mark Hurley of Santa Rosa, California who heads a committee, the *Secretariat for Human Values*, spoke sharply concerning human values being increasingly denied by a "world that has become more and more secularized, depersonalized, and dehumanized."

"Is it not time," he said, "that some moral judgments be assessed on the experiments in the field of psychology? I refer specifically to sensitivity and encounter sessions. There

is a growing list of scientific books and articles which are beginning to question, to make value judgments. Some research suggests that sensitivity training sessions have caused deleterious effects to mental health in as high as seven in ten cases in the studies made. Two other questions are being asked as well: Do these sessions really protect the privacy of persons who participate? Do these sessions not tend to the violation of natural secrets and indeed, sometimes, of committed secrets?" (*Wanderer* 11-30-72)

This concern expressed by a bishop would appear to be timely in view of the alarming impact of the "sensitivity cult" in the Church itself. Widespread introduction of Group Dynamics and sensitivity training techniques into all forms and levels of Catholic education is intimately linked to the apostasy of certain priests and religious, decimation of the religious orders, virtual displacement of authentic religious education by "relationship education" or "experimental catechesis," shocking proliferation of naturalistic sex education in Catholic schools, and spiritually barren "horizontalism" characterizing the attitudes of liberal Catholics. Even Fr. Andrew Greeley (who has not scrupled to declare publicly that the American bishops were "intellectually, spiritually and morally bankrupt") has openly avowed:

"One wonders whether the current romance between American Catholicism and group dynamics can lead to anything but tragedy. The 'sensitivity' cult is a marvellous symbol of the superficial, shallow, anti-intellectual romanticism which presently besets the American Church and which seems likely to cause religious impotence.

"Make no mistake about it. Substantial segments of the elite groups in American Catholicism are hooked on an extraordinary collection of group experiences running all the way from the quite limited 'orthodox' T-groups sponsored by the National Training Laboratories to the berserk nude marathon sessions of the Esalen variety. If one can explain the overwhelming popularity, not to say virtually unquestionable sanctity of groupism to many Catholics, despite the fact that the theories behind such group experiences are questionable, the practical results are dubious and dangers are evident, one will have gone a long way toward the present crisis in the American Catholic Church. . . .

"The dramatic change created in the Church by the Vatican Council has destroyed many outmoded structures but, in the process, we have become a church without theological or organizational context. Emphasis on process and relationship are an excuse from the hard, difficult task of developing new intellectual visions and new organizational structures. Indeed the church seems to have become one gigantic T-group with little structure, high levels of anxiety, and vast regressions to infantile behavior patterns." (*National Catholic Reporter* 5-1-70, pp. 10-11)

It is perhaps well to recall at this point that Sensitivity Training is also known under many other names: Group Dynamics, Therapy for Normals, Leadership Training, Group Confession, Interpersonal Competence, Marathon Labs, Confrontation Sessions, Interpersonal Relations, Human Relations Lab, Self-Evaluation, Human Potential Workshop, T-Group Training, Auto-Criticism, Operant Conditioning, Self-Honesty Sessions, Non-Verbal Exercises, Body Awareness, Syanon Games Clubs, Basic Encounter Group, etc. Whatever the name utilized, the goal of sensitivity training is clearly to strip from the individual those inhibitory attitudes, feelings and values which prevent adjustment to al-

legedly more open, free, honest and authentic group standards. Individual thinking is, in effect, displaced by group feeling.

If, as shall be noted, there is already sufficient evidence to question the morality of Sensitivity Training techniques in the case of adults, the gross application of such techniques in the education of children is even more reprehensible.

For years, acute critics of American education have warned that it is no longer liberal in the traditional sense. Education, they have stressed, is increasingly considered a means of social experimentation, cultural control, and political indoctrination—with schools taking on the form and function of psychosocial "clinics" demanding the total control of the child. A young Catholic political philosopher, Paul Cole Beach, has written with profound insight:

"These new school trends are clearly seen in a sex education calculated to change radically the traditional concepts of sexual morality and the family, and to replace them with the values of a contraceptive society. New trends in teaching methods are most dramatic yet, particularly the stress on psychiatric techniques and behavioral psychology. Group Therapy methods which change a person's attitudes and values are being woven into every level of public education—from teacher training to the classroom itself. Students are being subjected to psychiatric techniques which are calculated to substitute group opinion for the integrity of personal judgment. Public education is now meant to reconcile students to the 'scientific' management of society—to make them complacent citizens of technopolis and to identify those considered 'socially undesirable' or 'socially dangerous.'" (quoted in "Sex Educationists Fight God," *SJR*, Dec. 1971, p. 267)

Beach focuses here upon the use of Sensitivity Training in sex education programs which are deliberately designed to change the attitudes and behavior of children and youth—in the direction, it should be pointed out—away from the norms of traditional *Judaeo-Christian sexual morality*. That modern sex education is of such a character is again strikingly evidenced in a blatantly candid article "Sex Education and the New Morality" written by Chicago Planned Parenthood's Mr. Jerome Becwar in the Nov. 1972 *The American Biology Teacher*. Like most other sex educators, Mr. Becwar praises a "rational approach to human sexuality": i.e., one which will assure that "sexual activity does not result in the conception of an unwanted child"; where "neither sexual partner knowingly transmits a venereal disease to the other"; where "neither sexual partner exploits the other as a sexual object"; and which frankly promotes a "relativistic ethics." A "relativistic ethics" is unhesitatingly defined as "one that acknowledges no particular view of sexual conduct is antithetical to the idea of individual freedom in a democratic society." In Mr. Becwar's judgment Catholics and other Christians who adhere to an *absolutist* sexual ethic are apparently to be considered enemies of individual freedom and a democratic society!

What appears increasingly obvious is that the tremendous advances in science and technology, and the explosion in the behavioral sciences—psychology, sociology, and anthropology—has resulted in a tremendous contemporary effort to engage the schools in the process of *human engineering*—and this, of course, has all sorts of totalitarian resonances. The triumph of John Dewey's progressivism in American Education has now entered a new phase. Progressivist Liberal educators are now using sophisticated behavioral techniques to

deliberately eradicate all social, economic and sexual inequalities—through the schools. Schools have the function to change society—to reconstruct society along the lines of the democrat-socialist political model: Teachers assume the mantle of behavioral "change agents" dedicated to unfreezing *those older beliefs and attitudes* which might serve as an obstacle to the implementation of the new, socially-relevant concepts dear to the educationist planners of the National Educational Association (NEA)—perhaps the most powerful lobbying organization in the United States. Their concept of the "new society" bears a startling resemblance to a democrat-socialist political and economic order where a maximum of personal freedom is cunningly publicized by a Leviathan secular State ready to impose population controls and other anti-Christian legislation! Their contradictions are many.

How do educational "change agents" accomplish their purpose of changing human personalities for the emerging technocratic "new order"? They do this by utilizing sensitivity training techniques. These are methods for inducing *planned change*. They are the methods used in group meetings, large or small, conducted by teachers become "trainers" and "clinicians" to publicly discuss intimate and personal matters and opinions, values or beliefs—and to act out emotions and feelings toward one another in a group, using group confession and mutual criticism. Prof. Max Birnbaum, an associate professor and director of Boston University's Human Relations Laboratory, has explained the genesis of Sensitivity Training:

"Responsible for the development of human relations training . . . was Leland Bradford, then director of the Adult Education Division of the NEA, together with his old friends and collaborators, Ronald Lipplit, now of the University of Michigan, and Kenneth Benne, now of the Boston University Human Relations Center. . . . Drawing on the work of the great social psychologist Kurt Lewin, they established the first training center more than 2 decades ago at Bethel, Maine, and founded the National Training Laboratories (NTL). And it was Bradford's tough and dogged fight against strong opposition within education that finally won sanction and support for human relations training, first from industry, then from the social and behavioral scientists, and finally from the educational hierarchy itself. Now, as he is about to retire as director of NTL, Lee Bradford has the satisfaction of seeing human relations training widely embraced by the education world. . . . The trend toward a psychological emphasis appeared in the 1950's when the movement began to attract a large number of people trained in clinical psychology or psychiatry." ("Sense About Sensitivity Training" in *Saturday Review of Literature* 11-15-69).

Prof. Birnbaum's article is especially interesting for its frank admissions concerning the grave dangers to human personality stemming from the misuse of T-group methods, whose "intense emotional impact" he stresses. Whatever value the T-group may have in improving "the human relations skills of normal people" in industrial and commercial organizations—to improve efficiency and production, he acknowledges that Sensitivity Training can worsen the problems of emotionally-disturbed people. Prof. Birnbaum confesses that where Sensitivity Training is designed to "stimulate the individual's personal growth," the more glaring abuses take place. Serious psychological and emotional damage results when individuals are exposed to disturbing experiences by unskilled and unlicensed quacks posing as therapists.

There are countless incidents like this one recounted in the San Diego Union of Nov. 1968:

"My son is 17. Last night he returned from church in tears. He had attended an 'encounter group' meeting for 'sensitivity training.' The members meet twice a week. They pick a victim for each meeting. Then the members tell him what they don't like about him. My son's friends criticized his manners, haircut, eye color, acne scars, intelligence, vocational plans, clothes, car, and even his parents. They were brutal, and extremely unfair. An assistant minister leads the group. He has had no training in counseling or as a psychologist. The man publicly called my son 'chicken' for getting upset. Do you approve of encounter groups, Dr. Barbour?"

Esalen encounter groups have received a greater measure of notoriety in the mass-media. As Time magazine reported, they can be a "shocking experience."

"People touch, hold hands, kiss, throw each other up in the air, fight, use all the dirty words, tell each other cruel truths. Every aspect of so-called proper behavior is discarded. Every emotion is out in the open—everybody's property. Feelings are not spared. In time, the group develops a tribal loyalty to its own values, as fiercely protective as it is critical." (Time, 11-9-70).

AN EQUITABLE LEGISLATIVE COMPROMISE

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent legislative compromise which increases the prospects for passage this year of an equitable and balanced measure to extend the coverage and protection of the National Labor Relations Act to employees of nonprofit hospitals.

I refer to S. 3203, a bill with broad bipartisan cosponsorship, which was reported out of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on April 2, 1974, by California's Senator ALAN CRANSTON, one of the original authors of the measure.

This bill is supported both by the Service Employees International Union, whose international president is Mr. George Hardy of San Francisco, as well as by the California Hospital Association.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of S. 3203 and the text of the committee report—Senate Report 93-766—on the bill, along with a thoughtful statement on the proposal by Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, also a sponsor of S. 3203, which was made at the time of the bill's introduction:

S. 3203

[In the Senate of the United States, March 20, 1974]

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SCHWEIKER) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and re-

ferred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

[Reported by Mr. CRANSTON, without amendment, April 2, 1974]

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend its coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(14) The term 'health care institution' shall include any hospital, convalescent hospital, health maintenance organization, health clinic, nursing home, extended care facility, or other institution devoted to the care of sick, infirm, or aged persons".

(c) The last sentence of section 8(d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "the sixty-day" and inserting in lieu thereof "any notice" and by inserting before the words "shall lose" a comma and the following: "or who engages in any strike within the appropriate period specified in subsection (g) of this section."

(d) (1) The last paragraph of section 8(d) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Whenever the collective bargaining involves employees of a health care institution, the provisions of this section 8(d) shall be modified as follows:

"(A) The notice period of section 8(d) (1) shall be ninety days; the notice period of section 8(d) (3) shall be sixty days; and the contract period of section 8(d) (4) shall be ninety days.

"(B) Where the bargaining is for an initial agreement following certification or recognition, at least thirty days' notice of the existence of a dispute shall be given by the labor organization to the agencies set forth in section 8(d) (3).

or (B) of this sentence, the Service shall promptly communicate with the parties and use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement. The parties shall participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Service for the purpose of aiding in a settlement of the dispute."

(e) Section 8 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) A labor organization before engaging in any picketing, striking, or other concerted refusal to work at any health care institution shall, not less than ten days prior to such action, notify the institution in writing and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service of that intention, except that in the case of bargaining for an initial agreement following certification or recognition the notice required by this sentence shall not be given until the expiration of the period specified in clause (B) of the last sentence of section 8(d) of this Act. The notice shall state the date and time that such action will commence. The notice, once given, may be extended by the written agreement of both parties."

COVERAGE OF NONPROFIT HOSPITALS UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

(S. Rept. No. 93-766)

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to which was referred the bill (S. 3203)

to amend the National Labor Relations Act to extend its coverage and protection to employees of nonprofit hospitals, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

SUMMARY

The National Labor Relations Act governs the collective bargaining relationship of millions of workers including employees of proprietary hospitals, proprietary nursing homes and nonprofit nursing homes. It specifically exempts from coverage employees of private nonprofit hospitals. This bill repeals the present exemption, establishes certain new procedures governing labor relations in health care institutions, and creates a new definition of health care institution to include hospitals, nursing homes, health maintenance organizations, extended care facilities, health and medical clinics and other similar institutions caring for the sick, infirm or aged. The bill also contains several additional special provisions designed to facilitate collective bargaining settlements and to provide advance notice of any strike or picketing involving a health care institution, as follows:

1. The requirement for notice of termination or expiration of a contract will be 90 days;

2. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service [FMCS] must be given 60 days notice of such termination or expiration;

3. In initial contract negotiations a 30 day notice of a dispute to FMCS will be required;

4. The health care institution and labor organization will be required to participate in mediation at the direction of the FMCS.

5. The health care institution must be given a 10 day notice by a labor organization before any picketing or strike (whether or not related to bargaining) can take place.

On February 7, 1973, S. 794 was introduced by Senators Cranston and Javits and on July 31, 1973, S. 2292 was introduced by Senator Taft. The Subcommittee on Labor conducted hearings on these bills on July 31, August 1, 2 and October 4, 1973.

During the course of these hearings testimony was received from a number of interested groups, including the U.S. Department of Labor; AFL-CIO; the Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO; American Hospital Association; Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO; Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Workers Union; American Nurses Association; Communication Workers of America, AFL-CIO; General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO; New Jersey Hospital Association; Committee of Interns and Residents of New York City; Colorado Hospital Association; Federation of American Hospitals; Catholic Hospital Association Board of Trustees; Commission on Economic and General Welfare of the American Nurses' Association; Hospital Association of Pennsylvania; Texas Hospital Association; Iowa Hospital Association; International Union of Operating Engineers; Ohio Hospital Association; Minnesota Hospital Association; National Rights to Work Committee; Mt. Sinai Hospital; National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses; Physicians National House-staff Association; United States Industrial Council; California Hospital Association; New York University Medical Center; and Mount Sinai Medical Center.

On February 28, 1974, S. 3088 was introduced by Senator Taft and on March 13, 1974, the full Committee discharged the Subcommittee from further consideration of S. 794, S. 2292 and S. 3088. On March 20, 1974, S. 3203 was introduced by Senators Williams, Cranston, Javits, Taft, Stafford, Pell, Kennedy, Eagleton, Hughes, and Schweiker. The Com-

mittee considered the legislation in executive session on March 20, 1974, and ordered S. 3203 reported by voice vote.

During the executive session an amendment proposed by Senator Mondale was offered. It would have required the NLRB to cede jurisdiction to certain state agencies covering nonprofit hospitals where the state law was in existence prior to 1947. The amendment was defeated by voice vote.

BACKGROUND

Section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act defines the term "employer" as not to include "any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

The original Wagner Act of 1935 did not contain this exemption and in the only reported case relating to coverage of nonprofit hospitals, the NLRB and the Court of Appeals upheld the coverage.¹

In 1947, the Wagner Act was amended by the Taft-Hartley Act. Included in these amendments was a provision, added as a floor amendment in the Senate, to exempt nonprofit hospitals. This amendment was retained in conference.

In 1972, the House passed H.R. 11357 which would have repealed the exemption. No action was taken by the Senate beyond hearings on the bill.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The bill removes the existing exemption in section 2(2) of the NLRA for employees of non-profit hospitals and extends the protections of the Act to such employees to the same extent as currently applicable to employees of nursing homes and proprietary hospitals.

The Committee could find no acceptable reason why 1,427,012 employees of these non-profit, non-public hospitals, representing 56% of all hospital employees, should continue to be excluded from the coverage and protections of the Act. In the Committee's deliberations on this measure, it was recognized that the needs of patients in health care institutions required special consideration in the Act including a provision requiring hospitals to have sufficient notice of any strike or picketing to allow for appropriate arrangements to be made for the continuance of patient care in the event of a work stoppage. In this respect the Committee believed that the special notice requirements should be extended to all proprietary and nonprofit hospitals, convalescent hospitals, health maintenance organizations, health or medical clinics, nursing homes, extended care facilities or other institutions devoted to the care of sick, infirm or aged persons. Accordingly this bill will provide the same procedures for employees of all health care institutions.

The Committee was also impressed with the fact, emphasized by many witnesses, that the exemption of nonprofit hospitals from the Act had resulted in numerous instances of recognition strikes and picketing. Coverage under the Act should completely eliminate the need for any such activity, since the procedures of the Act will be available to resolve organizational and recognition disputes.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Repeal of existing exemption

The present exemption in Section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act for "any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or

individual" is removed from the Act by this bill.

Definition of health care institution

The bill adds to the Act a definition of health care institution which includes any hospital, convalescent hospital, health maintenance organization, health clinic, nursing home, extended care facility, or other institution devoted to the care of sick, infirm, or aged persons.

By so defining a health care institution the Committee does not intend to affect the exemption for "the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation * * * or any State or political subdivision thereof" as set forth in Section 2(2) of the Act.

Ten day notice

It is in the public interest to insure the continuity of health care to the community and the care and well being of patients by providing for a statutory advance notice of any anticipated strike or picketing. For this reason, the Committee approved an amendment adding a new Section 8(g) which generally prohibits a labor organization from striking or picketing a health care institution without first giving 10 days' notice. Violation of this provision will constitute an unfair labor practice. The failure to give the statutory notice will be remedial under Section 10(j) of the Act. This notice period will also give the National Labor Relations Board the opportunity, when charges are filed, to make a determination as to the legality of any strike or picketing before it occurs.²

The 10-day notice is intended to give health care institutions sufficient advance notice of a strike or picketing to permit them to make arrangements for the continuity of patient care. It is not the intention of the Committee that a labor organization shall be required to commence a strike or picketing at the precise time specified in the notice; on the other hand, it would be inconsistent with the Committee's intent if a labor organization failed to act within a reasonable time after the time specified in the notice. Thus, it would be unreasonable, in the Committee's judgment, if a strike or picketing commenced more than 72 hours after the time specified in the notice. In addition, since the purpose of the notice is to give a health care institution advance notice of the actual commencement of a strike or picketing, if a labor organization does not strike at the time specified in the notice, at least 12 hours notice should be given of the actual time for commencement of the action.

Repeatedly serving such ten day notices upon the employer is to be construed as constituting evidence of a refusal to bargain in good faith by the labor organization.

Likewise, the public interest demands that employees of health care institutions be accorded the same type of treatment under the law as other employees in our society, and that the notice not be utilized to deprive employees of their statutory rights. It is clear, therefore, that a labor organization will not be required to serve a ten day notice or to wait until the expiration of the ten day notice when the employer has committed unfair labor practices as in *Mastro Plastics Corp. v. NLRB*, 350 U.S. 270, 37 L.R.R.M. 2587 (1956).

Moreover, it is the sense of the Committee that during the ten-day notice period the employer should remain free to take whatever action is necessary to maintain health care, but not to use the ten-day period to undermine the bargaining relationship that would otherwise exist. For example, the employer would not be free to bring in large numbers of supervisory help, nurses, staff and other personnel from other facilities for

replacement purposes. It would clearly be free to receive supplies, but it would not be free to take extraordinary steps to stock up on ordinary supplies for an unduly extended period. While not necessarily a violation of the Act, violation of these principles would serve to release the labor organization from its obligation not to engage in economic action during the course of the ten-day notice period.

The Committee is aware that a work interruption at particular hospitals, such as those in rural areas, could pose special problems of continuation of patient care. It is the Committee's hope that parties to a dispute in such an institution would be cognizant of such special problems and take steps, either in advance of any dispute, or during its resolution, to mitigate the effect of a scarcity of alternative local resources.

Contract notice requirements

Under the existing provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, an employer or a labor organization is required, where a collective bargaining agreement is in effect, to provide written notice to the other party before termination or modification of the agreement. This notice of termination or modification must be given at least 60 days prior to the termination or modification date. In addition, present law requires the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to receive 30 days notice.

The bill extends the 60 day notice to 90 days and requires the FMCS to receive 60 days notice instead of 30 days, in the case of health care institutions.

Under existing law there is no obligation on either party to engage in mediation. The bill provides for mandatory mediation by the parties with the FMCS in the case of collective bargaining involving health care institutions.

Under present law there is no notification requirement to any party with regard to initial contract negotiations. The bill requires 30 days notice to the FMCS, in the case of collective bargaining involving health care institutions.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAW

Bargaining units

Due consideration should be given by the Board to preventing proliferation of bargaining units in the health care industry. In this connection, the Committee notes with approval the recent Board decisions in *Four Seasons Nursing Center*, 208 NLRB No. 50, 85 LRRM 1093 (1974), and *Woodland Park Hospital*, 205 NLRB No. 144, 84 LRRM 1075 (1973), as well as the trend toward broader units enunciated in *Extendicare of West Virginia*, 203 NLRB No. 170 83 LRRM 1242 (1973).³

Ally doctrine

It has been held that where during the course of a labor dispute, a secondary employer performs work that, but for the existence of such labor dispute, would have been performed by the striking employees of the primary employer, the secondary employer loses his status as a neutral, and the labor organization is entitled to extend its economic activity to the secondary employer.

It is the sense of the Committee that where such secondary institutions accept the patients of a primary employer or otherwise provide life-sustaining services to the primary employer, by providing the primary employer with an employee or employees who possess critical skills, such as an EKG technician, such conduct shall not be sufficient to cause the secondary employer to lose its

¹ *Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital* 44 NLRB 533 (1942), 145 F.2d 852 (1944), cert. den. 655 ct. 684.

² For example, the picketing may be a violation of Section 8(b) (4).

³ By our reference to *Extendicare*, we do not necessarily approve all of the holdings of that decision.

neutral status. It should be clear, however, that where a secondary employer enmeshes itself into the primary dispute by providing supervisors, nurses or staff other than those described, it loses its status of neutrality.

Supervisors

Various organizations representing health care professionals have urged an amendment to Section 2(11) of the Act so as to exclude such professionals from the definition of "supervisor". The Committee has studied this definition with particular reference to health care professionals, such as registered nurses, interns, residents, fellows, and salaried physicians and concludes that the proposed amendment is unnecessary because of existing Board decisions. The Committee notes that the Board has carefully avoided applying the definition of "supervisor" to a health care professional who gives direction to other employees in the exercise of professional judgment, which direction is incidental to the professional's treatment of patients and thus is not the exercise of supervisory authority in the interest of the employer.

The Committee expects the Board to continue evaluating the facts of each case in this manner when making its determinations.

Recognition Picketing

In recognition picketing cases under Section 8(b)(7)(C), the National Labor Relations Board has ruled that a reasonable period of time is thirty days absent unusual circumstances such as violence or intimidation. It is the sense of the Committee that picketing of a health care institution would in itself constitute an unusual circumstance justifying the application of a period of time less than thirty days.

PRIORITY CASE HANDLING

Many of the witnesses before the Committee, including both employee and employer witnesses, stressed the uniqueness of health

care institutions. There was a recognized concern for the need to avoid disruption of patient care wherever possible.

It was this sensitivity to the need for continuity of patient care that led the Committee to adopt amendments with regard to notice requirements and other procedures related to potential strikes and picketing.

The Board's priorities for handling various types of cases were carefully considered by the Committee and some observations and directions to the Board are reflected in the following commentary.

The Committee notes the present existence of priority case handling directives to the Board under Section 10(1) of the Act with respect to charges filed under Sections 8(b)(4), 8(b)(7) or 8(e) and other priority directives under 10(m).

Because of the need for continuity of patient care, the Committee expects the NLRB to give special attention and priority to all charges of employer, employee and labor organization unfair labor practices involving health care institutions consistent with the existing statutory priority requirements for particular classes of cases. The General Counsel and Chairman are directed to take such steps as necessary to provide appropriate investigatory and other resources needed to give this requisite priority to unfair labor practice cases involving health care institutions.

COST ESTIMATE

The estimated cost of this legislation is \$1.2 million in each of the five years following enactment.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT TAFT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation that is a result of protracted negotiations on the issue of extension of coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to the health care field. This leg-

islation contains elements of a proposal I advanced earlier on this subject, S. 2203, and like any proposed compromise, it is not precisely what parties in interest would view as an optimum solution. I do believe, however, the statutory language I present today when combined with meaningful legislative report language in the areas of bargaining units, priority board action, expedited relief, recognition picketing, supervisors, and the ally doctrine will provide a constructive basis for resolution of this issue.

The National Labor Relations Act is an extremely delicately balanced law and any changes, modifications, or additions to it must not upset this balance. The proposal and legislative report categories I suggest I believe properly reflect this concern and emphasize to the board that health care labor matters are of a special nature. The approach I suggest also is consistent with the principle of continuity of health care to a community.

I realize there will be sentiment among certain health care institutions that no change in the law is necessary and the exclusion of coverage of hospitals from the act should continue under any circumstances. I reject this approach as labor-management relations have, and will continue to be channeled into self-help situations without any governing guidelines for resolution of such disputes. This approach can only jeopardize patient care and cannot be considered in the public interest. I also reject the suggestion that mere repeal of the exemption is the only necessary step to take to settle the labor relations problems that have surfaced in the health care field. The National Labor Relations Act must reflect the principle that disputes that jeopardize patient care must be considered on a priority basis and that no labor-management dispute is above the public interest of continuity of health care to a community.