

April 23, 1974

I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 14322. A bill to prescribe a standard for increasing the money supply; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14323. A bill to protect the constitutional right of privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable information is recorded by enacting principles of information practices in furtherance of articles I, III, IV, V, IX, X, and XIV of amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual shall be entitled to a tax credit equal to the amount by which the purchasing power of his adjusted gross income for the taxable year is reduced by inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 14325. A bill to provide for a program of assistance to State governments in reforming their real property tax laws and providing relief from real property taxes for low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 14326. A bill to amend Federal programs so as to encourage and assist in the provision of safe and sanitary housing, with comprehensive provisions for essential services for Older Americans and those individuals with enduring handicaps; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 14327. A bill to amend section 103(a) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14328. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tinuation of youth fares, to authorize reduced-rate transportation for the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 982. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1974, as National Arthritis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.J. Res. 983. Joint resolution calling for the President to transmit a report to Congress within 60 days which contains recommendations for the solution of the economic problems identified in this resolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself and Mr. RHODES):

H.J. Res. 984. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 985. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself and Mr. FULTON):

H. Con. Res. 480. Concurrent resolution urging the telephone and hearing-aid industries to provide full access to telephone communications for hearing aid users; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H. Res. 1055. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

437. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to negotiations between the Department of State and the Government of Mexico for the reestablishment of the bracero program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 14329. A bill for the relief of Rosa C. Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 14330. A bill for the relief of Morgan McCool, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas:

H.R. 14331. A bill for the relief of Luisa Marillac Hughes, Marco Antonio Hughes, Maria del Cisne Hughes, Maria Augusta Hughes, Miguel Vicente Hughes, Veronica del Rocio Hughes, and Ivan Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

429. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors, Buffalo County, Wis., relative to community action programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

430. Also, petition of Allan G. Kaplan, Paterson, N.J., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1975 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 1—AS OF APRIL 11, 1974

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staffs, and others, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 1, as of April 11, 1974." This is the first report in the 1975 budget scorekeeping series for the current session of Congress, as prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

The purpose of this scorekeeping report is to show the impact of congressional actions in the current session on the President's budget estimates for new budget authority, outlays, and receipts, and on the estimated deficit position. This is the seventh year in which this series of reports has been published.

This first report in the 1975 series includes the scorekeeping highlights of action to the beginning of the recent Easter recess, together with text and special informational tables designed to supply ready reference to budgetary data significant to the analysis of the Federal fiscal position.

Of course, very little congressional action had been completed to April 11; however, a number of notable actions are pending. The Scorekeeping Highlights from the report which I will include here point up the completed action and the major pending legislative actions taken to date. These excerpts from the 1975 Scorekeeping Report No. 1 follow:

SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

FISCAL YEAR 1975

Outlays

Completed congressional actions taken this session to date, April 11, 1974, on the President's budgeted 1975 outlay requests, are shown in this report for 3 legislative measures carrying mandatory spending provisions. The outlay impact of these completed actions is as follows:

[In millions]

Civil Service minimum retirement	+\$172.0
Civil Service survivor benefits	++4.6
Rejection of executive pay raise	-34.0

Incomplete legislative actions, which would have further impact on the budgeted 1975 outlay requests, are also reflected. These actions pertain to 2 pending appropriation bills, and 10 legislative measures involving backdoor or mandatory spending. The major incomplete actions include:

Appropriation bills passed by the House: 1974 Second Supplemental bill reductions would have the effect of reducing 1975 outlays by about \$300 million; and

1975 Legislative bill changes would reduce 1975 outlays by \$5.4 million.

Urban mass transit operating subsidies as

reported by the conference committee would increase outlays by about \$400 million;

Civil Service survivor annuity modifications pending in the House would cost an additional \$362 million;

Veterans educational benefit increases passed by the House would increase outlays by about \$361 million over Administration requests;

Veterans disability benefit increases reported on the House would increase outlays by about \$104 million over the Administration request;

The outlay impact of increased backdoor authority for housing programs as passed by the Senate are as yet undetermined.

Budget authority

Completed congressional action to date having impact on the President's 1975 budget authority requests pertain to the same 3 mandatory legislative measures shown above for outlays: Civil Service retirement and survivor benefit increases amounting to \$176.6 million and a reduction of \$34 million resulting from the rejection of proposed executive pay raises.

Incomplete congressional actions affecting budget authority shown in this report pertain to one regular 1975 appropriation bill and 12 legislative measures increasing backdoor or mandatory budget authority. Major items are:

Legislative appropriations: the House passed bill reduced budget authority by \$5.9 million.

Housing and community development: additional borrowing authority of about \$1.6 billion was passed by the Senate;

Urban mass transit operating subsidies: new contract authority of \$400 million has been reported by the conference committee;

Civil Service survivor annuity modification: additional federal payments to trust fund of \$362 million are pending action in the House;

Veterans educational benefits: mandatory increases passed by the House will increase budget authority by \$361 million over Administration requests;

Veterans disability benefits: mandatory increase reported in the House will increase budget authority by \$104 million over the Administration request.

Private pension protection: new borrowing authority of \$100 million for this purpose is now pending in conference.

FISCAL YEAR 1974

The Second Supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1974, as passed by the House, would reduce official budget requests by \$1.7 billion in budget authority and about \$875 million in outlays. This bill provides for the rescission of \$1 billion in budget authority previously appropriated for public assistance, as compared with the Administration rescission request of \$783 million. The rescission request, which involved outlay reduction of \$550 million, was not reflected in the revised 1974 budget estimates transmitted February 4, and resulted from recent reestimates of program requirements.

Legislative bills having impact on budgeted 1974 outlays include 4 mandatory changes on which action has been completed, as follows:

[In millions]

Unemployment benefit extension	+\$161.0
Social Security benefit extension for presumptive disability	+24.0
Indian loan revolving fund	-1.0
Rejection of executive pay raise	-7.0

Other legislative measures still pending which may have impact on fiscal 1974 include \$400 million in backdoor contract authority and outlays for urban mass transit operating subsidies and two bills involving special incentive pay.

This first report of the new 1975 scorekeeping series includes considerable summary and background information regarding fiscal years 1975 and 1974, together with a number of special tabulations and sections dealing with various factors in the budgetary process. I would call special attention to this material, most particularly that summarizing the 1975 budget requests and assumptions, and analyzing the controllability of the budget through current congressional action.

I am inserting here, for the convenience of those interested in budgetary detail, an extract of the "table of contents" from the 1975 Scorekeeping Report No. 1. This listing of the report's contents is essentially an outline of the organization of the materials in the report, showing the main sections of the text, the regular scorekeeping and supporting tables, and the special informational and historical data.

The organization and contents of this first report have been designed to cover a number of areas of importance in the Federal budgetary process. Some of the special tabulations will not be repeated in all of the future periodic reports in this series. I would suggest, for this reason, that users of the scorekeeping reports may wish to review and perhaps retain this material for possible future reference.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTRACT OF THE TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE 1975 SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 1

Introduction.

Scorekeeping highlights to date:

Fiscal year 1975.

Fiscal year 1974.

The 1975 budget requests—summaries and analysis:

Summary.

Economic assumptions.

Proposed legislation.

Revenue.

Controllability through current action by Congress:

Portion of 1975 budget requiring current action by Congress.

Controllability of 1975 budget.

Unexpended balances—the pipeline.

Fiscal year 1974—review and analysis:

The revised 1974 estimates.

Reconciliation of 1974 budget outlay estimates.

Last session—1974 budget scorekeeping.

Other budgetary factors:

Federal debt subject to limitation.

Budgetary reserves (impoundments).

Annexed budgets.

Budget projections—1976 and five-year.

Scorekeeping tables:

Table 1—Estimated effect of congressional actions during the 2d session of the 93d Congress on individual bills.

Table 2—Revenue proposals affecting fiscal year 1975 budget.

Table 3—Summary—box score presentation of fiscal years 1975 and 1974 federal budgets.

Supporting tables:

Table 4—Appropriation bills, 2d session, 93d Congress.

Legislative proposals in 1975 budget:

Table 5—Reduction proposals.

Table 6—New or expanded programs.

Table 7—Legislative proposals not reflected in fiscal year 1975 budget:

Part A—Backdoor and mandatory authorizations.

Part B—Nonmandatory (discretionary) authorizations.

Table 8—Authorizing legislation required prior to enactment of 1975 appropriations.

Informational and historical data.

Table 9—Fiscal year 1975 budget authority and outlay requests.

Table 10—Revised fiscal year 1974 budget authority and outlay estimates.

Table 11—Controllable and uncontrollable portions of 1975 budget (gross).

Table 12—Offsetting receipts.

Table 13—Unexpended balances, fiscal years 1974-1975.

Table 14—Functional breakdown of the budget for fiscal years 1973-1975, with 1976 projections.

Table 15—Variations between original budget estimate and actual, 1955-1975.

Table 16—Appropriation record, 1935-1973.

Table 17—Federal and trust funds and unified budget, 1960-1975.

Table 18—Budget scorekeeping record, fiscal years 1969-1974.

Part A—By fiscal year.

Part B—By fiscal year and session of Congress.

Explanatory notes—guidelines for users. See pages IV and 16.

LEWISTOWN, PA.—ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, Lewistown, Pa., was officially designated All-American City by the National

Municipal League last Monday. This is a fitting tribute to the remarkable recovery made by the people of Lewistown in the wake of Hurricane Agnes.

Faced with the wholesale destruction that came with the Agnes floods, and the subsequent flight of businesses and industries vital to its economy, Lewistown wasted no time in setting about the business of rebuilding. In less than 2 years since Agnes struck, Lewistown has succeeded in attracting new jobs and industry, greatly improving community health services, and going a long way toward rebuilding retail business areas destroyed by the floods. Lewistown has rightfully earned the title of "The Town That Wouldn't Quit."

Mr. President, I join with all Pennsylvanians in congratulating the people of the Lewistown area for their inspiring accomplishment, and ask that two newspaper articles on this All-American City designation be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUCCESS WRITES THE LATEST CHAPTER ABOUT "TOWN THAT WOULDN'T QUIT"

(By Dennis Dible)

LEWISTOWN.—This community's successful bid for All-America City status adds another chapter to the inspiring story of the "town that wouldn't quit."

It is a story of a community that was racked by two catastrophic events in the summer of 1972—and a community that used those twin tragedies as a catapult to recovery and even greater accomplishments in less than two years.

The move toward All-America City status began in mid-1973, when the Juniata Valley Chamber of Commerce entered the competition on behalf of the borough, and ended today with the announcement that Lewistown has become the third Pennsylvania community within the past eight years to win the prestigious designation.

Clearfield was an All-American City in 1968, and Johnstown followed suit in 1972.

The original entries numbered more than 100, and in mid-October, Chamber officials were notified that Lewistown had been chosen as one of the 18 semifinalists in the annual competition sponsored by the National Municipal League.

The final presentation of the borough's achievements came during mid-November, when Chamber executives William Gray and John Connally trekked to Dallas, Texas, to try to catapult this city into All-America status.

A Sentinel reporter on the scene in Dallas covered the event, and reported on the apparently enthusiastic reaction to Gray and Connally's "sales pitch."

The two local men utilized a professional presentation with color slides, taped remarks from politicians and a live speech to "sell" this community's accomplishments to a panel headed by George H. Gallup, chairman of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

In addition, the area was flooded with red-and-blue cloth badges proclaiming "we've got the spirit," in an effort to instill an All-America feeling in residents.

The Chamber presentation leaned heavily on three major areas of accomplishment in the borough: economic recovery, improved health services and downtown redevelopment.

The economic recovery cited by the Chamber representatives included the location of at least 10 new industries in this area following the devastating effects of Hurricane Agnes in June 1972.

Under improved health services, the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

presentation to the panel pointed to the unification of the two local hospitals and their staffs into the new Lewistown Hospital, dedicated in 1973.

Redevelopment focused on a two-block area of downtown Lewistown, where new construction has resulted in a sparkling shopping mall accommodating a host of retail stores.

After the presentation by Gray and Connally, the National Municipal League sent representatives to the area early this year to verify the testimony presented in Dallas.

This was the first year that the local Chamber had entered the All-America City competition, and Lewistown was the only finalist named from Pennsylvania.

Finalist communities ranged in size from Dade County, Fla., with its population topping one million residents, to tiny Ravenna, Neb., where 1,360 make their homes.

The Sentinel will publish a special edition to commemorate the official announcement of the award, which is to be made on April 15.

[From the Lewistown (Pa.) Sentinel, Mar. 19, 1974]

LEWISTOWN IS ALL-AMERICAN CITY

LEWISTOWN.—All-American City honors have been awarded the Borough of Lewistown by the National Municipal League, it was revealed today.

In a letter to Christopher W. Buehl, Juanita Valley Area Chamber of Commerce executive director, the NML "saluted the citizens of Lewistown area whose effective action won this award," Buehl said in a meeting yesterday afternoon.

The award is based on the accomplishments of the entire area in coming back from the disastrous effects of Hurricane Agnes and the flood it brought in 1972.

Lewistown and environs thus became the only Pennsylvania community to receive the award for 1973, and one of a dozen or less in the nation, out of more than 100 applicants.

In a letter to Buehl NML, executive director William N. Cassella, Jr. offered congratulations, and noted that official announcement of the award will be made April 15.

None of the names of other winners were released here, and NML senior associate William G. Andersen Jr. told The Sentinel Monday that "we leave the announcements up to the local communities."

Buehl said yesterday that a committee has been named to plan a program marking the official acceptance of the award and that Mervin Krentzman will chair the group.

Cassella's letter said that the decision to name Lewistown a winner "was reached by the All-America Cities Award Jury last November following the presentations in Dallas, Texas. Subsequent investigation confirmed this decision."

The "subsequent investigation" was carried out by the NML in cooperation with The Sentinel, which supplied a confidential list of persons to be contacted in the area for information on various phases of community achievement.

"The National Municipal League salutes the citizens of the Lewistown area," Cassella said in his letter, "and sincerely hopes they will view this honor as a further incentive to play a positive role in the affairs of their community."

An All-America Cities flag and a framed award certificate to be presented to Mayor John Lawler will be given the borough by the NML. Lawler is out-of-town today, and unavailable for comment.

The stories of the winning communities will appear in the "National Civic Review," the May issue of "American City" magazine, and possibly in the June issue of "Harper's" magazine.

Andersen told The Sentinel yesterday, however, that there has been some difficulty with the commitment by "Harper's."

The story was to have appeared in the May issue of the magazine, which will go on sale

in mid-April, but has been postponed. Andersen said negotiations are under way with another national magazine to carry the story.

DECLARATION ON THE ELIMINATION OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at its last session, the General Assembly of the United Nations asked the Commission on Human Rights to give priority to the matter of drafting a declaration on the elimination of religious intolerance. Pertinent to this discussion is the statement before the UN Commission on Human Rights by Dr. Isaac Lewin, a distinguished member of the faculty of Yeshiva University, who spoke on behalf of the Agudas Israel World Organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Dr. Lewin be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN

The old Romans used to say: *Habent sua fata libelli*. Every book has its own fate. Every literary achievement has its own story. And indeed no other project which was undertaken by the United Nations in the quarter century of its existence has had so unusual a history as the Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance.

Its story begins on November 19, 1946, when the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution presented by Egypt "that it is in the higher interest of humanity to put an immediate end to religious and so-called racial persecution and discrimination." This resolution mentions religious discrimination first and lists racial discrimination second.

As might be expected, any action on the resolution had to be preceded by a study of the facts. Only after a clear picture of the situation was obtained, could proposals for elimination of religious intolerance be advanced and ultimately adopted by the United Nations. The organ assigned to make the study was the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. At its fifth session, in October 1952, this Sub-Commission worked on a plan to make a study of various forms of discrimination. To our great surprise, however, the studies proposed concerned only the following forms of discrimination: (1) in education; (2) in employment and occupation; (3) in political rights; (4) in residence and movement; (5) in immigration and travel; and (6) in the right to choose a spouse and enjoy family rights. Religious discrimination was overlooked.

I happened to attend this session of the Sub-Commission and I drew its attention to this unfortunate omission. On behalf of my organization, the Agudas Israel World Organization, which represents religious Jews in 23 countries, I asked that the Sub-Commission embark on a study of discrimination in the field of religious rights and practices.

The Sub-Commission agreed with my suggestion. According to the Summary Record, Mr. Hiscocks of the United Kingdom then expressed the hope "that the authors of the draft resolution . . . would agree to add to the cases of discrimination to be studied, discriminatory measures based on religion, of which the representative of the

April 23, 1974

Agudas Israel World Organization had just spoken." At the next meeting (quoting again from the Summary Record) "Mr. Ekstrand (from Sweden) proposed the insertion of the words 'religious rights' after 'political rights' in the last paragraph . . . to meet the point raised by the representative of the Agudas Israel World Organization at the previous meeting. Mr. Daniels (from the United States) accepted that amendment." In this way, the Sub-Commission decided in favor of undertaking a study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices.

The study was conducted by the expert from India, Mr. Arcot Krishnaswami, who delivered his first report at the ninth session of the Sub-Commission, in November 1956. He began his report (E/CN.4 Sub. 2/182) with the words: "A study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices was suggested to the Sub-Commission at its fifth session by Agudas Israel, a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (category B), and was included by the Sub-Commission in its list of projected studies, later approved by the Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Krishnaswami later submitted additional reports, and they led to the adoption by the Sub-Commission of Draft Principles on Freedom and Non-Discrimination in the matter of Religious Rights and Practices. The Principles reached the Commission on Human Rights at its 18th session in 1962. They were then approved and sent to the governments for an expression of opinion.

Independently of the Sub-Commission and the Commission on Human Rights, the General Assembly decided on December 7, 1962, to ask the Commission on Human Rights to prepare a Declaration and a Convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. This decision set in motion a rapid sequence of events. On November 20, 1963, the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly. Two years later, on December 21, 1965, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted by the General Assembly and opened for signature and ratification.

One question remains: What happened to the work on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, which had initially been mentioned in the original General Assembly decision of November 19, 1946, even ahead of racial persecution and discrimination?

In resolution 1781, dated December 7, 1962, the General Assembly asked the Commission on Human Rights to prepare a draft declaration and a draft international convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, with the view that the declaration be submitted to the General Assembly in 1963 and that the convention be submitted in 1964 and not later than 1965. This schedule has, unfortunately, not materialized.

Only six articles of a draft declaration, discussed and approved by the Sub-Commission in 1964, passed through the Commission on Human Rights and made the trip on to the Third Committee of the General Assembly. The whole project was dormant until 1972, when the General Assembly decided to accord priority to the completion of the Declaration.

Hope was expressed that in 1973 the Declaration might be adopted by the General Assembly as part, if possible, of the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Things again have developed differently, however. We now have a situation in which the Commission on Human Rights must prepare the text of the Declaration and submit it to the next session of the General Assembly.

My intervention, at this moment, has a dual purpose. As a historian, I would like to stress briefly the importance of a declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. I might do so by emphasizing the terrible damage that religious intolerance has caused to mankind. Consider, for a moment, the Thirty Years War of 1618-1648, which was a religious war and was the most savage and cruel conflict in modern history. Essentially, it was a struggle between the Protestant Union and the Catholic League. Religious intolerance caused the death and immense suffering of countless men, women and children. Practically all of Europe was involved: Germany, Sweden, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain. This terrible war came to an end on October 24, 1648, when the Holy Roman Empire made peace with France and with Sweden. The peace treaty, known as the Peace of Westphalia, provided for freedom of conscience and liberty to adhere to any religious worship. In essence, the Peace of Westphalia may be viewed as the forerunner of contemporary declarations on the elimination of religious intolerance.

Germany subscribed to religious tolerance. But, under the domination of Hitler and his brutal hordes, Germany put into effect the most savage religious persecution of all time. On the night of November 9, 1938, even before the formal outbreak of war, Nazi Germany destroyed hundreds of Jewish synagogues. This action was planned and executed with bestial determination and cold-blooded precision. The wild hatred against Jews was transformed into a senseless destruction of places of worship, masterpieces of architecture. The same wild and savage religious intolerance was later demonstrated when thousands of Jewish cemeteries all over Europe were overturned and the bones of dead Jews were thrown from their graves and their tombstones used to pave the streets. This was followed by the murder of six million innocent Jews in gas chambers. Auschwitz, Dachau, Buchenwald, Treblinka, Drancy, Westerbork are places notorious in history for their association with Nazi cruelty and bestiality. It must remind us of the words of Voltaire, who said in his "Trait sur la Tolérance": "Intolerance is absurd and barbarian. Those who practice it are more horrible than the tigers. For tigers devour only for food, and those who are intolerant exterminate themselves and others for the sake of legal clauses."

What the Nazis did to synagogues and cemeteries was done basically in a spirit of religious intolerance. The walls of a synagogue and the stone on a grave can obviously cause no harm. It was the Jewish religion which the Nazis wished to suppress, and they did so by reviving the infamous blood libel, by prohibiting the Jewish method of slaughtering animals for food, and by other cruel and senseless persecution.

We need look no further to emphasize the importance and the urgency of the adoption of a declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. The fact that some governments even prefer the immediate adoption of a convention, which would have binding power, proves conclusively that the idea of condemning religious intolerance is universal. The General Assembly has, however, decided that there must first be a declaration. I hope that the present session of the Commission on Human Rights will stand in history as the turning point in the struggle for religious tolerance throughout the world.

The danger that I see is that again the work on a detailed declaration might be so time-consuming that technical difficulties will prevent the adoption of a text, since such language must be submitted still this year to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly. I therefore take the liberty of proposing a short draft which includes the necessary elements without going into the substantial detail which might be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

left for a convention. This text was once before presented by me to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and it reads as follows:

Art. 1. Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of their religion or belief is a denial of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of the human rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Art. 2. No State shall make or tolerate any discrimination in the treatment of persons on grounds of their religion or belief.

Art. 3. No individual or group shall be subjected on the ground of religion or belief to any discrimination in the exercise or enjoyment of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Art. 4. No State shall make or tolerate discrimination based on religion or belief in the field of civil rights and access to citizenship, education, employment, occupation and housing.

Art. 5. Everyone is free to worship in public and in private and, in association with other persons of like religion or belief, to establish and to maintain houses of worship, religious schools and charitable institutions for religious purposes.

Art. 6. Everyone has the right to form and to maintain, in association with others, religious congregations, to train ministers and teachers of his religion, and is free to have contacts with communities and institutions belonging to the same religion or belief both within the country and abroad.

Art. 7. Everyone has the right to observe his religious practices including the dietary practices prescribed by his religion or belief.

Art. 8. Recognition shall be given by law to the prescriptions of each religion or belief relating to holy days and days of rest, and all discrimination in this regard between persons of different religions or beliefs shall be prohibited.

Art. 9. Recognition shall be given by law to the right of every religious group to disseminate its teachings by publication of religious books and texts.

Art. 10. Where the State controls the means of production and distribution, it shall make available these means to the religious groups for the production and distribution of religious articles, including those necessary for dietary practices.

Art. 11. The State shall give legal protection to places of worship, cemeteries and ritual objects, and give free access to religious shrines and holy places to visitors and pilgrims.

Art. 12. Recognition shall be given by law to the prescriptions of the religion or belief concerning the burial of a deceased person.

Art. 13. Recognition shall be given by law to the principle that the parents or, when applicable, legal guardians have the right to decide upon the religious education of minor children. In the case of a child who has been deprived of its parents, the expressed or presumed wish of the parents shall be duly taken into account.

Art. 14. Recognition shall be given by law to the principle that no one shall be compelled to take an oath of a religious nature contrary to his convictions.

Art. 15. All incitement to hatred or acts of violence, whether by individuals or organizations, against any group of persons belonging to a religious community shall be punishable.

Art. 16. Every State shall promote respect for and observance of religious tolerance and shall undertake all necessary measures in order to implement fully, faithfully and without delay the principles contained in this Declaration, as based on the natural rights of every human being.

Let me conclude with an observation made by a great expert in problems of discrimination who said in a recently published book: "The prohibition of discrimination is being universally demanded, but the protection

against discrimination is being increasingly concentrated on the policy of the United Nations against *apartheid*. In this way it is being hidden that there are discriminations against human rights which must be prevented and attacked wherever they may occur."

The quotation is from the preface to a book in German called "Diskriminierungsschutz und Diskriminierungsverbot in der Arbeit der Vereinten Nationen," published in Vienna in 1971. Its author is Professor Felix Ermacora.

A GOOD TRY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in a year of elections and during a time of extensive opinion polling, a recent article in "Punch" seems most appropriate:

A Good Try

It has been said that this is an Election which has avoided most of the really important issues. It's certainly true that no-one yet has asked the most important question of all—how accurate will the General Election be? And it's a question we put to the head of Ace Opinion Polls, Professor Ludwig Einstein.

"First of all, you must remember that an election can never be as accurate as an opinion poll. In a poll you have a carefully, scientifically selected cross-section of the public. You have a variety of questions designed to complement and control each other. You have skilled questioners trained to elicit responses from people and to make sure they are fully understanding of the procedures. Above all, of course, you can have an opinion poll whenever you want.

"An election has none of these advantages. Beyond eliminating young people, it exercises no safeguards over the sample. It asks one very simple question, phrased so loosely as to mean almost nothing. The voter is left absolutely to his own devices, with no guidance, and the results are supposed to be valid for as long as five years.

"Well, by even the most primitive standards this is very slipshod polling, and the only surprising thing about our General Elections is not that they are wildly out—though, of course, they are always wrong by a bigger or smaller margin—but that they get as close to the truth as they do. Generally, an election differs from the opinion poll forecasts by about 4%, which isn't a bad margin of error at all. What is so upsetting is when that 4% makes a great difference, as it did at the last Election. The polls had clearly indicated that the country was more Labour than Tory. Not by much, but marginally. The General Election was a few percent out—and showed Tory as the winner!

"The reason for this? Well, inefficient voting, for a start—people who go in the booth and change their mind or forget what they were going to vote. People who were swayed by a last minute political development and changed their vote for a few days. What the General Election can't show is the subsequent change of mind after the Election.

"I'm not against General Elections as such. I just want to stress that they are only a rough and ready guide to public feeling, and that politicians should pay much less attention to them, as we already do in the opinion poll world."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

THE ECKHARDT ROLLBACK
PROPOSAL

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues Congressman BOB ECKHARDT's Quarterly Report for spring 1974.

Always a creative and imaginative newsletter, this particular issue is especially timely, since it discusses in detail, under the title "Oil Prices and Inflation," Bob's proposal to roll back the average price of domestic crude oil to November 1, 1973, levels.

Since the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which Bob and I serve, today approved his proposal as an amendment to the Standby Emergency Energy Act, I insert the entire newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

[From BOB ECKHARDT's Quarterly Report, spring 1974]

OIL PRICES AND INFLATION

Hardly anybody was thinking about an energy shortage in the winter of 1970 as commuters were driving to work, one to the car, at 80 miles per hour. The President had made no proposals for energy related legislation outside some moves toward mass transit.

Within industry it is true that some were sounding warnings about an impending energy crisis. The Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association said that the United States had no more surplus producing capacity.

But Humble Oil Company a little more than a year later told the Office of Emergency Preparedness that the shortfall in domestic petroleum at that time was due to market conditions rather than a decline in production capacity and concluded that "there was no need for additional imports in 1972."

PRICE TRADITIONALLY SET BY THE MAJORS

Though it is popular in oil industry circles to blame government policies for petroleum shortages, control of supply and price of crude has been maintained by the major oil companies through various types of governmental regulation instituted at the behest of industry since the discovery of the East Texas Field in 1930.

Until the 1950's, control of supply of crude was maintained largely by a system of state prorationing. More recently import quotas contributed most in giving to the major oil companies control over crude oil prices, and it is interesting that the quota system was removed only 6 months before the Arab oil producing nations announced their embargo on oil shipments to the United States.

The salient point is that oil prices, both here and abroad, have been and are now largely controlled by the major oil companies. For most of the recent years the world price of crude oil averaged \$1.25 to \$1.50 below the domestic price. Thus, import controls kept prices up in this country.

Both domestic and foreign oil is produced largely by a few major oil companies—either U.S. companies or U.S. affiliated companies. For instance, 7 of the 8 companies that produce about 80% of the western world's crude (excluding the U.S. and Canada) are of this type. They are Exxon, British Petroleum, Shell, Gulf, Texaco, Standard (California) and Mobil.

Though there are some 10-12 thousand producing companies in the United States, the top eight produce more than half, and the top 20, more than 70%, of our domestic crude oil. The practice has always been that they, the biggest buyers and biggest sellers,

post the price they will pay in a field for a grade of crude, and that is what it sells for.

OUR ECONOMY HELD HOSTAGE

Today, through this power, and with the tacit approval of the Administration, the major oil companies are holding our economy hostage. We are called upon to ransom it for \$20 billion in increased petroleum energy related costs in the year 1974. This would come about by an increase to an average of \$7 per barrel for both old and new domestic crude oil and \$8.50 per barrel for foreign crude. Here is how the Administration has supported that program.

In presenting to the Senate Finance Committee¹ the President's proposal for an excise tax on crude oil price increases, Federal Energy Administrator William E. Simon argued as follows: By gradually adjusting the price base on which the tax would be levied upward toward the \$7 per barrel price, the Administration proposal would retain incentives for new investments in oil exploration and development. He argued that the \$7 per barrel figure was the Treasury's best estimate for the long-term supply price needed to meet U.S. needs.

This proposition and plan for oil price increases is interesting and appalling. If it comes about, it would, according to Heller and Perry,² increase the presently anticipated inflation in 1974 by about 55%. We should then see the oil companies enrich themselves, (while thus contributing to inflation) by some \$13 billion, even after paying the Nixon excise taxes on price increases—if such are indeed imposed.

When it is considered that the consumer price index advanced nearly 9% in 1973, against the Administration's projection of a 3% rise, and that the inflationary rate over the last several months would indicate an annual increase at about 10% (Heller and Perry project 5½% plus an additional 3% for the "oil factor"), the imposition of these inordinately high prices of crude petroleum must be viewed as cruel exactions, indeed.

The "oil factor" in inflation does not just reflect the 50% now anticipated as the increase in the price of gasoline from last summer to this one. The price of steel includes a 17% energy component. Agriculture consumes about 30% of the fuel consumption in the U.S. Thus, agricultural commodities and products made of steel, as well as nearly all other goods and services, will reflect this "oil factor."

HOW PRICES HAVE ADVANCED AND SHOULD BE ROLLED BACK

We must roll back oil prices if this most undesirable inflation is to be avoided. But let us first see how they have rolled forward. During the 10 years after 1962 the price of crude petroleum hovered around \$3 per barrel, and oil companies earned income on investment at an average of about 11.5% during that period. But the price of oil rose enormously in 1973, as is shown by monthly average prices below:

1973 Domestic crude prices

January	\$3.40
February	3.40
March	3.41
April	3.47
May	3.62
June	3.78
July	3.79
August	3.86
September	4.27
October	4.49
November	4.73
December	6.31

¹ January 22-23, 1974.

² See study "The U.S. Economic Outlook for 1974," prepared for National City Bank of Minneapolis, January 1974. Walter W. Heller was former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and George L. Perry is a fellow at Brookings Institution.

The Federal Energy Office has held only "old oil"³ (which constitutes about 71% of the total) within price bounds, but even this oil was permitted to advance in the fall and winter of 1973 as follows:

September	\$4.18
October	4.11
November	4.25
December	5.25

New oil is not subject to price control, and it has advanced as follows:

1973	
September	\$5.12
October	5.62
November	6.17
December	9.51

1974

January	10.35
---------	-------

This has brought the average price of all oil sold to \$6.75 on January 1, 1974. I am proposing legislation to roll that high price back to the price prevailing on November 1, 1973—for old oil to an average of \$4.25 per barrel.

But my proposal would provide a margin of increase above this level for new oil generally. New oil was at an average price on November 1, 1973 of \$6.17 and the rollback is to the actual price in each category on November 1, 1973.

As will be seen later, my proposal would not limit the price on new oil produced by "independents" (those who produce two tenths of one percent or less of U.S. crude oil and lease condensate production—about 18,400 barrels daily or less). The reasons for this will be pointed out later.

EXPLORATION BY MAJORS NOT INHIBITED

It will be noted that under my proposal the rollback would be to a time when the average price of domestic crude oil was about \$4.73. Would such figure permit exploration that would bring in new sources of supply? Oil men and petroleum councils have said that it would.

The \$4.73 figure, an average price of both old and new oil, is higher than that which the National Petroleum Council or the Independent Petroleum Association of America said in 1972 would be adequate to assure the United States one hundred percent self-sufficiency by 1980. (IPAA's figure was \$4.10 but it should be adjusted in present dollars to \$4.55—still within the \$4.73 average. The National Petroleum Council's figure, adjusted in present dollars, is \$4.35.)

In July 1972 *Business Week* quoted John G. McLean, Chairman of Continental Oil Company, to the effect that, if domestic crude prices should rise to \$4 a barrel (from the then average of \$3.40 per barrel) deeper drilling in older oil fields—tertiary recovery—would be economical.

On October 24, 1973—when the average price of crude was about \$4.50—John E. Swearingen, chairman of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, thought this enough to provide "additional incentives and additional funds for intensified exploration for new supplies of oil and gas." "Our company," he said, "has embarked upon the most extensive exploration and development program in its history with particular emphasis on the U.S."

As for increased drilling for new oil the price would be governed by the actual price in the field which, as we have seen, averaged on November 1, 1973, \$6.17. At this time the Petroleum Independent published by the Independent Petroleum Association of America, in its November 1973 issue, quoted a Houston producer-geologist as saying:

There's no doubt that prospects are for in-

³ Old oil is the volume of crude produced by a well, not exceeding that volume produced in 1972. Presently if a well produces more crude than it produced in 1972, the excess is "new oil" and is not subject to price controls.

creased drilling. Everybody I know is planning on it. With new oil prices from \$5.30 to \$6.00 per barrel, there's incentive now to go looking for oil.

1973 PRICES GENERATED ENORMOUS PROFITS

But the most telling point in favor of the proposition that a rollback of domestic oil prices on old oil (and on new oil of the majors) would not prevent generation of enough capital to permit exploration and development of additional resources is the profit picture of the eight largest domestic producers. Profits for 1973 were as follows:

Company	1973 profits (millions)	Increase in 3d quarter 1973 (percent)	Increase over 1972 (percent)
Exxon	\$2,440	81	59.3
Mobil	843	64	46.7
Texaco	1,292	48	45.4
Gulf	800	91	79.0
Standard (California)	843	51	54.0
Shell	333	23	28.0
Standard (Indiana)	511	37	36.4
ARCO	270	16	40.3

Even more significant is the increase in profits realized by these companies in the third quarter of 1973 over their profits for the third quarter in 1972. (See second column, above.) This is directly pertinent because they were enjoying returns for prices in that quarter at less than the rate permitted under my proposed rollback. For the third quarter, oil prices were considerably lower than would be permitted under my proposal. Yet note the very substantial increase in profits in the case of each of the companies.

In summary, the profits of the eight largest oil companies have shown a marked upward trend from 1970 through 1973:

NET INCOME AFTER TAXES AS PERCENT OF STOCKHOLDER EQUITY

Company	1970	1971	1972	1973
Exxon	12.0	12.6	12.5	18.8
Mobil	10.6	11.2	11.2	15.5
Texaco	13.1	13.4	12.4	9.8
Gulf	10.4	10.2	8.2	14.6
Standard (California)	9.8	10.4	10.5	15.3
Shell	8.7	8.7	8.9	11.0
Standard (Indiana)	9.3	9.6	9.9	12.9
ARCO	7.4	6.9	6.6	8.8

¹ Figures for 1970-72 are based on "Moody's Industrial Manual." Figures for 1973 are from Mar. 7, 1974 "National Petroleum News."

FLEXIBILITY FOR NEW OIL EXPLORATION BY INDEPENDENTS

I believe it is desirable to leave open an area of oil pricing to permit profitable exploration and recovery of the really hard-to-get and high priced new oil. To do so would answer the last argument that could be made against a general rollback. My proposal is not a general rollback.

That last argument is that we should not reverse incentives generated by oil prices in the \$10 and up range that are bringing independents back into exploration and development of oil in the bold and enterprising way that they used to operate when new discoveries, largely by independents, were swelling known domestic reserves. There is evidence that they were leaving this field.

Data developed by Chase Manhattan and the National Petroleum Council show that in 1956 major companies spent \$2.621 billion and independents \$2.454 billion in such activity. By 1971, the majors remained stable at \$2.74 billion and independents had declined to \$1.16 billion, a drop of some \$1.3 billion. This means that their domestic exploration and development investment must increase to bring them back into the game at the level that they used to play it.

What we have pointed out in the last two

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sections of this report is not apposite to the independents in all respects. As we have said, the majors' production is about three fourths in old oil. The increase in price for old oil, which is not much more expensive to produce than it was at the beginning of 1973, is producing a tremendous cash flow for them. They not only produce a higher proportion of old oil but a vastly greater amount than do the independents.

Therefore, both in order to afford a sufficient flexibility in the legislation to permit the development of all feasibly recoverable reserves, and to be sure that undue restraints are not placed on the most vulnerable and speculative elements of the industry, the price of new oil by independents is left uncontrolled.

CONCLUSION

This proposal would have the following desirable effects:

(1) It could save consumers billions of dollars next year by curbing that part of this coming year's inflation caused by the "oil factor." It also takes care of two objectionable features in the Energy Emergency Conference Report. First, it does not provide an available and possible "roll forward" of the price of old oil to \$7.09. Second, it takes care of a legitimate concern of independents concerning financing of their exploration which the Energy Emergency Conference Report did not do.

(2) It would permit the majors enough earning margin to meet exploration and development expense by virtue (a) of their increased earnings at the \$4.25 level for old oil (about 75% of their production), and (b) the fact that their prices for new oil are rolled back only to the price of new oil on November 1, 1973, which averaged \$6.17.

(3) It would leave independents free of price restraint in recovering the really hard-to-get, high-priced new oil. But as their production increased, their advantage in producing new oil without price restraint would be curbed by price competition from the majors. Thus, while demand outruns supply, they would be given a needed stimulus; and the economy would benefit by their discoveries and resultant increase in U.S. productive capacity.

Curbing inflation and carefully devising legislative machinery that does not dampen incentive to discover and bring into production new petroleum reserves is a job for Congress. Congress must undertake it without fear of Presidential veto or special interest opposition.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL STATUS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, Martin Tolchin of the New York Times has requested members of the New York State delegation to make public certain information concerning their taxes and information concerning the ownership or positions of leadership in corporations or organizations which might pose a conflict of interest. Since I now make a report before April 30 in each year to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of financial interests and associations which is a public record, as provided by House rule XLIV, I am not at this time making any further report in this area.

However, since the taxes paid by public officials have become a matter of public interest, I paid the following taxes for

calendar year 1973: Federal income tax, \$18,169.68; New York State income tax, \$6,026.92; real estate taxes, \$3,364.39.

DEMOCRACY IN THAILAND

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in an era when many authoritarian leaders are strengthening their controls over freedom of the press and speech, it is a refreshing change to observe a Southeast Asian nation which permits more freedom for its citizens. In the past few months Thailand's National Assembly has become more representative, and a new constitution is being written.

While militaristic rulers hold the reins of political power in many nations in the vicinity of Thailand, the Thais are engaged in a rare experiment to test government by the people. Thailand's press has been described as free and vigorous. Political activity is open and rapidly becoming more acceptable.

Perhaps the Thais will emerge as leaders in this area of the world by demonstrating that a representative government can be a viable alternative to repressive regimes.

An article which appeared in the April 11, 1974, Christian Science Monitor described the infusion of democracy into Thailand's political system:

DEMOCRACY IN THAILAND: "THE CHANGE THAT COULD NOT HAPPEN"

(By Daniel Southerland)

(Thailand's new National Assembly is the most representative in the country's history. Debate on a new constitution is leading to broad popular elections. Press is free and vigorous. Political activity is open, widely based, with the King staying mostly in the background as a stabilizer.)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Thailand seems to be out of step with the rest of Southeast Asia.

The Thais are trying to implement democratic reforms at a time when authoritarian rulers elsewhere in the region are tightening their controls.

Once considered one of the most tradition-bound nations in Asia, Thailand suddenly has become, in many ways, one of the most open.

Some Western experts concluded years ago that what the Thais really wanted was authoritarian government. But half a million demonstrators swarming through the streets of Bangkok and the overthrow of the country's military rulers last October proved them wrong.

Many Thais are uneasy with the new situation. They contend that changes are coming too quickly and that the country's current caretaker government is weak and unable to maintain law and order.

Other Thais, particularly the country's impatient students, complain that, on the contrary, not enough has changed and that the same old corrupt and conservative elite is running the country.

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

But the central fact remains that things are changing. Perhaps more slowly than many of the students would like. But more rapidly than they had in several previous decades. And some of the changes are likely to be irreversible.

This was recognized by Seksan Prasertkul,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

one of the key organizers of last October's student-led revolt, in a recent interview with a Bangkok newspaper.

"On the surface, many people are beginning to feel pessimistic because they expected sudden change in the social system," he said. "I used to feel the same way."

But Mr. Seksan went on to say that last year's student uprising has had "an impact on the power relations of the ruling cliques."

"It's now more difficult for one group to get and hold absolute power," he said.

"Furthermore, in power struggles, factions will have to rely on popular support. . . .

"Looking at society as a whole, people have now become more politically aware," said Mr. Seksan. "Hyde Park speeches and panel discussions are being held in nearly all the provinces, and books on social problems are selling better than others."

For conservative Thailand, that's saying a lot.

Things are happening here now which would have been unthinkable just a year ago under military rule:

It has become fashionable in Thai political circles, for instance, to say that Thailand needs "a little more socialism." What people usually mean by this is paying more attention to the needs of the poor, or instituting a social security system, legalizing labor unions, and increasing the number of industries offering a minimum wage.

But regardless of what the word socialism may mean to the Thais, all the talk about it does seem to indicate a greater awareness of the gap between the rich and the poor and the need to do something about it.

When a very respectable association of Thai ladies invited a girl student activist to speak the other day, she gave them a stern lecture. The student warned her elders that they were spending too much money on cosmetics and beauty parlors. In many parts of the world, that might have seemed far from revolutionary. But in Thailand, it was talked about.

FARMERS ON THE MARCH

A small group of young women appeared in front of the National Assembly without invitation recently to demand constitutional guarantees of women's rights, and it made front-page news in the Bangkok press.

When photographers tried to take pictures of the eight or nine women, they hid shyly behind their protest banners. But the fact that they were out there at all was news for Thailand.

The Thai press, which was never completely tame, now feels free to criticize all sorts of official failings. The only taboo subject is King Bhumibol Adulyadej. He is considered above criticism.

But allowing for that one exception, the Thai press is now by far the freest in Southeast Asia. That distinction used to belong to the Philippines, but Manila's newspapers currently are languishing under martial law.

Of course, most of the new ideas, criticisms, and protests are surfacing in the capital city of Bangkok, and not in the countryside where the majority of the people live. But even out there one can discern the stirrings of greater interest in what goes on in the capital.

A few weeks ago, more than 1,000 farmers marched into Bangkok and staged a demonstration, demanding higher prices for their rice. The Thai press said that it was the first time such a thing ever had occurred in the country's history.

Prime Minister Sanya Thammasak promptly met with representatives elected by the farmers and listened attentively to their grievances.

"Nobody would have dared to hold a demonstration like that under the old regime," said Seni Pramoj, head of Thailand's Democratic Party. "People know now that they can make their voices heard."

Many of the students who helped bring about these changes are fearful that the

military will step in, stage a coup, and take over again. Thailand has had so many coups that it would be foolish to rule this possibility out altogether.

But it is likely that the Thais will get their chance to hold elections and to experiment with democracy for quite some time before the generals dare even contemplate stepping in again. Military intervention at this time would trigger considerable popular resentment.

Most of all, the military would have to think twice before countering moves toward the establishment of parliamentary democracy which have the strong support of Thailand's revered King Bhumibol.

WIDE REPRESENTATION

It was the King who some three months ago appointed a convention to select new National Assembly members.

Some Thais argue that the new Assembly is too conservative. But it is in many ways more representative than any which Thailand has had in the past.

About two-thirds of the members of the previous National Assembly were military and police officers. In the new legislative body (299), only an eighth of the total (36) belong to the armed forces or police. They are outnumbered by the Assembly's 47 university lecturers and professors.

There are 15 journalists serving as legislators, something which would have been unthinkable in the past. The largest single group in the Assembly consists of civil servants, nearly 100 of them.

The new assembly currently is debating the merits of a draft constitution. It will be at least three to four months before it approves the constitution and the country can get on with holding elections.

But the politicians are already jockeying for position, forming and breaking alliances and talking about their election prospects.

"The rest of Southeast Asia is going to be watching the Thai experiment," said a diplomat in Bangkok. "If the Thais pull this off, they will be demonstrating an alternative not only to communism but also to right-wing dictatorship."

THAIS LEAD THE WAY—COMPARISON OF GOVERNMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Burma

Although it recently went through motions of reintroducing constitutional rule, the country is run by a one-party government under President (formerly General) Ne Win. He relinquished his military title several years ago, but the Army still dominates.

Cambodia

President Lon Nol introduced tough emergency measures in early 1973, following the bombing of his palace. The National Assembly rubber-stamped a request to suspend civil liberties.

Malaysia

Democratic processes were restored—with some restrictions—three years ago. Government works through a constitutional framework; but the Malays, the largest single racial group, retain certain rights and privileges denied to the Chinese who are a sizable minority.

Singapore

Highly efficient, one-party government under Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew maintains firm control over press, labor, universities, and politics.

Philippines

President Marcos imposed martial law in late 1972, jailed opponents, closed the Legislature, and began ruling through presidential decrees.

North Vietnam

One-party, Communist control has remained firm for more than two decades.

South Vietnam

President Nguyen Van Thieu has consolidated his control to the point where there is

April 23, 1974

little significant political activity in South Vietnam. Martial law was imposed in 1972, followed by tough press law and banning of demonstrations.

Indonesia

Army-dominated government keeps a tight rein on press, students, and political parties. But President Suharto has demonstrated considerably more flexibility than some other Asian military rulers.

THE DRAINAGE OF THE CACHE: THE FARMERS POINT OF VIEW

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have supported a project which would provide drainage for the residents of the Cache River-Bayou DeView Basin and protect thousands of acres of fertile farmland from the threat of annual flooding. I have also worked to insure the adoption of a drainage plan which would cause the least disturbance to the environment and wildlife of the area. My colleagues have shared with me letters from their constituents opposing this plan for "ecological" reasons. I would like to take this opportunity to share with them the other side of the question. Reprinted here is an open letter from one of my constituents which clearly sets out the reasons for draining the basin and explains the setbacks the farmers of the region have endured because of flooding.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CITIZENS OF WOODRUFF AND SURROUNDING COUNTIES

This is a letter long over due to the people of Arkansas about the Cache River Drainage project. I hope everyone that reads this will stand up and cheer for draining of the Cache to help the farmer. There has been very little said about the farmer, and why he had to clear the land. I am writing you to let you hear the true story of the farmers side of the drainage project.

When the land in Woodruff county and surrounding counties was first cleared up for farming purposes it was a wilderness. I have read my abstract titles that states this: The men that came here and cleared our country had a struggle to make it on their own years ago. This land was handed down to their families from one generation to another, and today they are the big land owners. For years they rented their land to the small farmer and this farmer would farm 75 to 100 acres by himself and pay $\frac{1}{4}$ of it rent. This was small farmers that lived here or moved here to farm because the land was good and produced more.

Twenty or 30 years ago a farm of 4,000 acres that was owned by one family had at least 35 to 40 families farming for them. As the new modern machinery was invented it took less man power to farm that many acres. The land owners could buy all the new machinery and have men by the day work for them and receive all his land produced instead of the one-fourth he was receiving from the small farmer.

No one should blame a land owner for wanting all he can get from his land. After all it is his, and he was having to pay the high taxes and the up keep of farm houses that he doesn't have to now.

This is what has put the small farmer out of land and he had to turn to anything he could get to farm, and part of his land was the Cache River bottoms.

Now, let me put the man from Cotton

Plant straight on this matter. It was not Greedy farmers, or the up price in soybeans for your information Mr. Cotton Plant Man. Soybeans didn't have an increase in price until the summer of 1973, I know. This land has been in cultivation for 15 years or more, and I don't know of any farmer that farms the Cache river land or any other lands for that matter that farms because he is greedy. He farms to make a living for his family, and to try to do better each year, as all of us do.

Now, I would like to ask the man in Little Rock, Texarkana and Baltimore, Maryland, also all the people from the other states that have so disapproved this drainage. Have you ever come down here and talked to the farmers about how channelization would affect him? Have you asked him what can we do to help you? Remember this is a man that is working to feed you Mr. City Man who has a good job in a warm office with a secretary and carpet three inches thick on your floor.

I have for 31 years worked with the farmers. Some of them work the land in Cache bottoms when they couldn't rent better land.

I have heard them say when the rains were coming, I don't know what I will do. Looks like the Cache river will get my crop. Now that crop was what the man had worked for all summer so he could feed his family, clothe them and send them to school.

Now, Mr. Big Man that has spoken out the loudest about stopping this drainage. I have a few questions for you. No. 1, have you ever seen a farmer wet, cold and muddy to his knees from trying to get his crop out before the water gets it? Well, I have. I have had them come in to our office like that. I have offered them a hot cup of coffee and have them say, "My hands are too dirty to take it." As I stated in the beginning this farmer had to work this land if he farmed because that was all that was left.

Remember this, our population is growing every day, but there is no land being grown. We have to use what is here one way or another to feed the people.

Most of the land in Cache river has been cleared, why try to stop it now? If the river was cleaned out and a deep channel made the water would flow more freely making fishing much better.

Why would a party of people that have good jobs want to save this land so they could take their leisure time hunting at a farmer's expense? You can only hunt 30 days a year. You can join a duck club for very little to do this. A farmer has to work 365 days a year to make a living.

Now, I know people that will read this and say, "No wonder she would like to see the channelization done, they have land in Cache river bottoms. This is true, we do own 287 acres about one-mile from the Cache river. We paid a big price for this land because it was all that was left. We cleaned it up and rented it for a one-fourth to a young farmer that was just starting in to farm. After 3 or 4 years harvesting about one-half of a crop he turned the land back to us. Our son-in-law has farmed this land for the past few years. He has made only a half crop up until the fall of 1973. He got all of his crop out last year.

Let me set the record straight. This letter is not for our land, because we are building a 9 foot high 40 foot wide levee around ours to keep the water out. Unfortunately everyone that farms down there can't do that. I wish they could. If the Corps of Engineers are left alone they can make Cache river bottoms as good a land as our McClelland bottoms. It is one of the beautiful garden spots of Woodruff county, which had to have a levee built around it some 30 years ago.

I see signs on a few cars and trucks around that read "Save the Cache."

These are on people's vehicles that don't own any land down there, and pay no taxes, but like to hunt and fish at the tax payers expense. If I was making a sign to put on my car it would read (Drain the Cache and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

get rid of the free loaders.) Some day when I have time I just might have some printed like that.

This letter is to state the farmers' side, because it hasn't been told. This is the True story.

I am going to close this letter, but not like the man from Cotton Plant did. He said he couldn't sign his name because he was in business.

I, too, am in business, and have been for 31 years, a very good business am happy to say. One that was built on truth, honesty and hard work.

I am happy to sign my name.

The Farmers Friend, Mrs. Murray Lockhart, Secretary, Lockhardt-Thompson Grain Company.

SPACE—WHAT IS IN IT FOR YOU?

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in March, Lt. Gen. Kenneth W. Schultz, commander of the Space and Missile Systems Organization of the U.S. Air Force, spoke before the Orange County Forum of the Town Hall of California on the subject of America's Armed Forces as a valuable national asset, particularly in relation to our space program. In these days when too many people think that Federal space expenditures are "an unaffordable luxury in this country today," General Schultz points out the manifold benefits of the space program to all Americans.

Our Armed Forces have developed a weapon system that can travel through space, thus extending their primary defense mission. But the spinoff of our defense system are equally impressive, for the Military Establishment has provided peacetime dividends such as improving national health standards and pushing equal opportunities for minorities and women.

Yet General Schultz' speech focuses on the benefits of the space program to all Americans and stresses its impact on the economy. For, while strengthening U.S. defenses, our space effort increases our gross national product by about \$5 billion. The space program also contributes greatly to research on how to meet our future energy needs, specifically in solar energy applications for homes.

Because General Schultz has so eloquently presented these views in his interesting speech, I want to share his remarks with my colleagues:

SPACE—WHAT'S IN IT FOR YOU?

(By Lt. Gen. Kenneth W. Schultz)

We are celebrating this year the 20th anniversary of the first organized step taken by the United States into space. On 1 July, 1954 the Western Development Division, the forerunner of my present command, the Space and Missile Systems Organization of the Air Force, was established.

As many of you may remember, a number of things had come together at that point in our history that made the action at that moment both necessary and right. The Soviets were known to be pressing development of long-range ballistic missiles that could give them an enormous strategic advantage over this country. The United States had just succeeded in developing a hydrogen bomb so much smaller than the original atomic bomb

that it became feasible for the first time to create a warhead small and light enough for delivery through space by long-range ballistic missile. And a concerned American people and Congress were solidly behind the Air Force determination to retain the strategic superiority that had kept the "cold war" cold since the end of World War II.

The Western Development Division began in an abandoned schoolhouse in Inglewood. It has gone through a good many organizational changes since that time, but its basic mission has remained that of providing the United States with the best possible ballistic missile strategic capability. As the ballistic missiles made possible the first actual moves into space, that mission expanded to include the exploration and development of the total potential of space for strengthening the country's defense posture.

The practical conquest of space was made possible initially by military developments undertaken in that schoolhouse; the military continues to play a major role in our total United States space effort. And no government program in the history of this country has yielded a higher return per dollar invested, in terms of benefits already realized and potential still to be developed, than the space program in its 20 years of existence.

Now, in the wave of anti-militarism generated by the unpopular war in Vietnam, many Americans have tended to lose sight of the fact that our country's armed forces are a national resource to an extent far beyond even their primary defense mission. Since the days when the troops built the Panama Canal—and won the battle with yellow fever that went with that project, the American economy and society have drawn peacetime dividends from their investment in their defense establishment. Eight out of ten of all the commercial jet airliners operating in the free world today were designed and built in the United States. And one out of every four of these American-built airliners traces its lineage directly to a single military bomber program. Ninety percent of the most significant technological advances in United States aviation between 1925 and 1972 were the result of Government sponsored research and development; 70 percent of these came from programs funded by the military, which also pioneered operation of about 75 percent of them.

The armed forces have done much to improve national health standards. They have trained millions of Americans, given them during their military service new trades, new avenues to civilian livelihood. They have been in the vanguard in pushing equal opportunity for minorities and women. And the Armed Forces are a source of strength and aid to our citizens in times of natural disaster or civil crisis.

But it now appears that the real jackpot of all defense-related dividends was set up back there in 1954 with the decision to undertake organized, priority development of a weapon system that could travel through space to its target. Not only did that decision result in a whole new dimension of defense capabilities, it also created a focal point and a thrust for the country's scientific and technological talents and energies. It gave the mid-century technological revolution somewhere to go. And that revolution has barreled along scattering spinoff like sparks in its wake ever since.

In view of the progress of the past 20 years—and the promise of the next 20, it's ironical that in establishing priorities for government resources many Americans seem to consider space research and development the most dispensable item on the list. Actually, in many instances, space research is one of our best sources for solutions to problems considered competitive with the space program for government dollars.

I don't think that we who have been associated with the space program have made this fact as clear to the public as we should

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

have. The glamour and novelty of the space program have inevitably waned since the high excitement of its earlier days. Many of the dividends already realized have become so much a part of our daily lives that we're no longer really aware of them as such. Generations of children in our schools today never knew a time when there was not a weather satellite shaping the daily predictions, and communications satellites bringing us the Olympics from Japan or a royal wedding from England. A typical day for any one of us includes countless space spin-offs so familiar now they don't even register with us.

A significant number of Americans have begun to feel that the space program is alien to their real everyday interests and concerns, remote, perhaps unnecessary. "What's in it for me?" they think. "Now, if we put some of that money into the welfare program, or fighting pollution or crime, or finding new energy sources, or curing any of the other headaches my life and the papers are full of these days, instead of just shooting all that money into space . . ."

So I want to tell you today just what is in it for you, for all of us. I want to give you a few of the many possible examples of the impact of space research and development here in our own area of Southern California. . . how it figures in the problems that all of us are wrestling with and reading about in our morning newspaper.

First, I should remind that composite citizen I quoted a moment ago that, of course, none of the money budgeted to the space program is ever shot into space. Hardware goes aloft; but the dollars that paid for it remain right here on earth creating jobs and stimulating the economy.

Seventy-six percent of it goes into salaries. Our Space and Missile Systems Organization budget of slightly under \$2 billion annually, for instance, is transfused by the salaries of our people into some 135 different communities in a five-county area.

It also buys space and missile hardware and knowhow, contributing to the aerospace industry's \$14 billion annual business in this area—and creating many more salaries in the process. In the terms of the economists it has an additional "cascading" effect. It increases the annual Gross National Product by something like \$5 billion, sustains or creates more than 12,000 aerospace jobs and about 18,000 non-aerospace jobs, and produces over one and one-half billion dollars in tax receipts.

Secondly, it accomplishes its primary objective, the strengthening of our United States defenses, essential for the future security of every one of us. The land-based ballistic missiles are a major element of our strategic aerospace power. With the submarine-based missiles and the long-range bombers they constitute a Triad of strengths that give us the capability to survive and effectively respond to a broad spectrum of dangers. By treaty we do not develop our military space systems as weapons. They are developed for a number of functions that can be more effectively—or only—accomplished in space and that will enhance the capabilities of our more conventional defenses.

We have developed several generations of military satellite communication systems for the United States, the United Kingdom and NATO, and are at present working on a Fleet Satellite Communications System for the United States Navy. We have developed and launched a series of nuclear detonation detection satellites that monitor the nuclear test ban treaty as no earth based system could. We have satellites for early warning of attack; have launched a number of investigative scientific satellites to explore the space environment; are in the early phases of a navigation satellite that can precisely locate even supersonic jet aircraft. This system has an additional potential for civilian use to provide safer traffic control of crowded

air lanes. We are also presently working with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the space shuttle, which, by dramatically reducing today's launch costs, will be a major breakthrough in the economics of space operations.

But the boost to the economy given by space dollars, and the far more important contribution to present and future national security are only the beginnings of what's in space for all of us as citizens.

Let's consider, for instance, what is probably the number one problem in this area, and throughout the country—at the moment, the energy crisis.

Now, I'm not going to tell you that the space program has come up with a quick, do-it-yourself formula for making gasoline from potato peelings in your own kitchen—though I wish I could. But the program has given us new capabilities for discovering untapped sources of both fossil fuels and other types of energy. And it has significantly contributed to a number of new approaches to the problems of heating and lighting a world that is rapidly exhausting traditional sources of power.

NASA's Earth Resources Technology Satellite, ERTS, launched in July of 1972, covers 100 million square miles of the earth each week, passing over and photographing approximately the same 115-mile strip at the same time of day every 18 days. Among other pinpointings of new targets for drilling, the ERTS scanning system has reported unsuspected geological features in the Prudhoe area of Alaska that indicate oil deposits there may be considerably greater than originally estimated.

Oil production as well as exploration is benefitting from space technology. New metals developed in aerospace research especially the titanium alloys, are coming into use in oil refineries, where corrosive chemicals soon destroy ordinary steel valves.

Space research is also paying dividends in the search for alternatives or supplements to the traditional fossil fuels. Among the projects of NASA's Skylab 3 was a survey for new sources of geothermal energy, natural occurrences of steam and hot water geysers and hot rocks close to the earth's surface. As you probably know, California is one of the richest areas of geothermal energy in the world. The only electric power producing geothermal field in the United States is just north of San Francisco. The first competitive leasing of geothermal lands in this country took place two months ago in Sacramento. The unexpectedly high bids clearly indicated the new importance of this type of energy, in spite of the technical difficulties still to be solved in its conversion to practical power. A bill now in the United States House of Representatives would provide \$80 million for the study and implementation of geothermal energy.

In the continuing effort to find effective power for space systems, extensive research was done on fuel cells for the Apollo program. The results of that work have been the basis of experimental programs of some 28 utilities companies throughout the country, among them the Southern California Gas Company. One of the earliest experimental commercial installations in the country was down in El Segundo next door to our SAMSO headquarters. It has now been dismantled after two years of successful operation for study of parts wear. A larger experimental installation was also set up powering a mobile home community over in Riverside.

Though fuel cells appear to be limited in their potential to fairly small applications, they are reasonably pollution free and have excellent possibilities for providing supplemental power at periods of peak load. One of our aerospace contractors, which produced small fuel cells for the Apollo, Skylab and space shuttle programs, recently announced tentative orders totaling \$250 million for development and production of fifty-six 26-

April 23, 1974

000 kilowatt fuel cells for nine electric utility companies throughout the country. A demonstration unit is scheduled for 1976 and would be designed to provide electrical requirements for a community of 20,000 people.

Also receiving new emphasis in the energy crisis are magneto-hydrodynamic generators developed originally to simulate re-entry conditions for ballistic missiles. MHD generators have promise for electric utility applications, where they could generate electricity from coal and other fuels 50% more effectively, and with less pollution than present systems. Avco Everett Research Laboratory, which developed the systems originally for Air Force use, believes that it is possible to have a large, coal-fueled commercial MHD generator in operation by the mid-1980's.

Another energy source pioneered in space research is the solar cell, a primary energy source for our space systems. Some of these unmanned systems have been operating faithfully and accurately with this power for many years now, sometimes far beyond the life expectancy for which they were designed. Unfortunately, in their present state of development, solar cells are prohibitively costly for earth use.

Production techniques entail precise hand craftsmanship. Work is being done to develop cheaper production methods, and this could be a two-way street. If we can come up with mass production methods that make the cells economically feasible as an earth power source, our space program will also benefit enormously from the reduced costs.

Meanwhile, several aerospace companies are working on less "far out" solar energy applications for homes. And NASA has already funded an even "farther out" project studying ways to use giant satellites to convert sunlight into electricity and beam it to earth for the nation's use. The idea is not new, but this is the first step toward a practical realization of the concept. Some indication of its full potential was given to us in August of 1972. Sensors on our Orbiting Solar Observatory at that time showed that the energy released in one hour by an intense solar storm was equal to the entire U.S. electrical power consumption for 100 million years at the present rate of use.

What's in such studies for us or our children or even grandchildren? Perhaps survival.

Or consider the problem of earthquakes, always with us here in California.

The Multispectral Scanner (MSS) aboard the Earth Resources Technology Satellite has among its projects the taking of detailed photographs of earthquake faults in the Southern California area. The photographs are used to assemble maps and seismic risk graphs that may someday be used to avert earthquake disasters. The satellite photos have given us a much more complete and accurate mapping of the total fault system than was possible with earlier surface and aerial observations. By pinpointing dangerous building sites, highway routings, etc. they could help to save many lives in future.

Right here in Anaheim your Autonetics Division of Rockwell International has developed for the California Division of Mines and Geology two electronic tiltmeters to measure potential earthquake activity along the San Andreas Fault. The electronic meters were adapted from the guidance control equipment of the Minuteman III, our most advanced operational ballistic missile.

They are part of a program aimed at developing the capability to predict earthquakes and volcanic eruptions hours, or even days, before they occur by early detection of tell-tale advance warpings of the earth.

Or let's assume that the problem in today's headlines is pollution of our Southern California air and coastal waters. Satellites show us as no other observations can the extent and source of water pollution, including oil spills. And ERTS, busily covering the globe 20 times a year, has among its programs one for monitoring and analyzing the smog over

the greater Los Angeles area. Other smog studies are being pursued by a long-time local center for space research, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena. JPL scientists have developed a sophisticated pollutant detector called a high speed interferometer that was first put to work monitoring pollution over the busy Santa Monica freeway.

Or perhaps the problem is water shortage in this area that water has literally wrested from the desert. Space research has an input there too. Systems engineering techniques developed for management of such kingsize complex programs as the Minuteman ballistic missile and the Apollo moon landings are now being used in the multi-billion dollar California State Water Project. It will move more than four million acre feet of water annually from areas of surplus to more arid portions of the state where the need is acute, particularly here in the Southern California megapolis.

If the problem is better control of the rising crime rate, common to most large urban areas today, space research has left its mark on that also. About the middle of next month (April) the Los Angeles County Sheriff will open a new communications center featuring an automated dispatching system. Calls will be typed onto tapes as received and put immediately into the automated system that replaces the old telephone/radio cycle in use since the 1940's. In tests of the new system the time lapse between receipt of a call reporting trouble and dispatch of a patrol car has been cut as little as 20 seconds.

The system has been designed, using techniques and expertise developed in the space program, by the Systems Development Corporation, a major contractor for command and control systems for our SAMSO Satellite Control Facility at Sunnyvale, California. The Sunnyvale facility is the nerve center of a world-wide network of installations that daily command, control and receive data from more than 50 orbiting United States space systems.

Such instances of dividends from space research are legion, even within our immediate area here. But let me close with one example that has an especially strong economic impact in this part of the country.

Among the major industries of Southern California—and Orange County—is electronics. Within that field American computer exports have increased some 1,400 percent in the last ten years, and experts estimate that by 1985 electronics will be a \$20 billion plus business annually in the United States. A pioneer in the business (Robert Sarnoff of RCA) recently noted that "the Industrial Revolution took more than a century to gather full momentum. The Electronic Revolution may do so in the next two decades."

Historically, the space program and the electronic revolution have progressed hand-in-hand from the beginning. The War Department joined with the University of Pennsylvania to produce the first completely electronic computer, ENIAC, in 1946 for use in ballistic research. By the late 1940's, with improvements in the ruggedness and reliability of transistors, electronic equipments were rapidly becoming the brains and nervous systems of increasingly complex aerospace defense systems. When development of the ballistic missile began in earnest in the 50's, and led to the earliest space ventures, the Air Force invested heavily in the experimental development of molecular electronics, integrated circuits that combined light weight, minimum mass and high reliability for space applications.

In 1962 the Minuteman III became the first major weapon system to use integrated circuitry, as we sought to achieve longer range for the missile by reducing the weight of the guidance system.

Autonetics Division of North American Aviation, here in Orange County, developed and produced that guidance system that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

represented a giant step forward in integrated circuitry, and resulted in a 50% reduction in weight, a range increase of many miles for the Minuteman II and greatly improved reliability.

Since that time development and refinement of integrated circuits have continued, with a growing number of commercial applications. One of the latest, and economically most remarkable of these is the mini or pocket calculator, ranging from the scientific and electronic slide rule types to the simpler four-function calculators so handy in balancing the checkbook or figuring income taxes. The calculators, with prices dropping steadily in a time of generally inflating prices, have become an economic phenomenon, reversing a growing trend in the country to import more than twice as many high technology products as we export.

In 1971 the Japanese had some 85% of the United States electronic calculator market. The magazine *Business Week* recently estimated that in 1973, with the mini or consumer calculators outselling larger standard models by three to one, Japanese industry appeared to be getting less than one quarter of the United States calculator business.

What's in space for American business and industry? Economic transfusions like this—and many many more as we explore the unique possibilities of manufacturing in space, possibilities of which *Skylab 3* has already brought back to us the first exciting practical indications.

With the exception of a sudden rude awakening to the need for energy research and development, these are not hospitable times to government R&D in general. There seems to be an indifference, even hostility, to space research in particular. It is a dangerous misunderstanding that sees space research as an unaffordable luxury in this country today, a competitor for funds that would be better allocated to solving the multiple problems of our beleaguered society. In fact, in these first two decades of the U.S. space program, space research has already amply proved itself a master tool for helping to solve many of those very problems. And we have only begun to explore its vast potential.

The Good Book tells us that "Where there is no vision the people perish." It is a time for vision. And I most earnestly hope that we can keep clearly within our nation's sights the vital importance to our future of maintaining our momentum in space research and development.

FUGITIVE FATHERS ACT

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, although the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has implemented procedural reforms designed to prevent certain welfare abuses, many other specific abuses require legislation. On February 26, I introduced the Fugitive Fathers Act of 1974 which would make it a Federal crime to flee across State borders to avoid complying with court-ordered support payments. This is a real problem for local welfare administrators and district attorneys. Many of my constituents, including many serving on county boards of supervisors, have supported this specific reform. I include at this point in the RECORD, the resolution passed on April 17 by the Pierce County, Wis., Board of Supervisors, supporting my bill and explaining the dimensions of this specific

problem in this rural, western Wisconsin county of 7,300 households:

RESOLUTION NO. 74-6—FUGITIVE FATHERS LEGISLATION

Whereas Seventy percent of the families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children are the result of divorce; and

Whereas of ninety such cases only twenty-six make regular support payments; and

Whereas of sixty-four non-supporting fathers, forty are living outside of Wisconsin; and

Whereas the cost of this non-support for Pierce County alone exceeds \$150,000.00 per year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pierce County Board of Supervisors go on record favoring the Fugitive Fathers Bill being introduced by Congressman Vernon Thomson, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman Thomson, Senators Nelson and Proxmire, and to the Social Service Board of each Wisconsin County.

COUNTDOWN ON CONTROLS

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are now only a little more than 1 week away from the expiration of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. However, the 8 days remaining will be 8 days more of a distorted economic picture.

Clearly, the end of the line has to be reached on wage and price controls with such disturbing headlines as the fall of the GNP by 5.8 percent, the jump of the inflation rate to 10.8 percent, or that the drop in output has been the worst since 1958.

The supposed cure for our economic ills has only meant the worsening of the symptoms of galloping inflation, rising prices, and diminishing supply.

The Washington Post's lead article on Friday, April 19, addressed itself to the economy in no uncertain terms.

The article follows:

COUNTDOWN ON CONTROLS

The nation's economic output dropped drastically in the first three months of 1974, the Commerce Department reported yesterday, but the inflation rate reached 10.8 percent a year, the highest since the Korean War.

The Gross National Product declined at an annual rate of 5.8 per cent from the last quarter of 1973 to the first quarter of this year, the most severe drop since 1958.

The main reasons were the fall in automobile production and housing, the statisticians said.

The new figures add to the dispute whether the country is in a recession, and what to do about it.

The remedy, the administration declared, is to try to curb inflation rather than stepping up consumer demand.

The consumer is now buying less only because inflation is rising faster than his earning power, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Sidney L. Jones told a press conference.

"I still think that we will have growth in the second half of the year—but we are seeing a brutal effect of inflation," Jones said.

The consumer is not "sitting in a cave" hoarding his money, Jones argued. Instead, people are spending more than ever and the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

savings rates are falling. But their income does not buy as much as it did last fall.

Jones defended the administration's standard forecast, which shows the GNP returning to a growth rate in the range of 4 per cent annually by the end of the year, and inflation falling to about 6 per cent a year.

But he emphasized that it will take strong demand throughout the economy to achieve that recovery.

The administration's strongest single concern now is the housing industry, which is being hit very hard by unprecedentedly high interest rates.

A rising level of housing construction is built into the administration's forecast. Officials tend to take the view that the automobile industry is going to have to take care of itself and its troubles lie chiefly in turning around to meet a changing market.

But housing depends crucially on interest rates. Jones speculated that banks would soon find that they have pushed their present rates too high.

But he added, like other administration figures in recent days, that if he proves wrong and the high mortgage charges begin to chill housing production, "I'm sure there will be some effort to stimulate it."

Housing starts, after hitting a rate of 2.5 million a year in early 1972, began to fall sharply about a year ago and sank to a rate of 1.5 million in January. The rate moved up in February but now seems to be going down again. The Commerce Department reported a drop of 32 per cent in housing construction in the first quarter of this year.

The new GNP figures show that the economy has been through an enormous swing over the past year. In the first quarter of 1973, it was rising at a rate of 8.7 per cent a year. By the last quarter of the year it had dropped to a modest 1.6 per cent, and in the most recent quarter it was falling.

That drop was considerably greater than the administration was expecting before the figures started to roll in.

But Jones reiterated the administration's view that the GNP would be stable—neither rising nor falling much—over the three months from now until June.

The long-term growth trend of the national economy, required to keep employment rising as fast as the work force, is considered to be about 4 per cent a year.

The inflation of 10.8 per cent for the first quarter is calculated by a measure known as the GNP deflator. Since the GNP is the total of all of the goods and services sold for money in the country, the deflator is the broadest and most comprehensive measure of prices.

Another indicator of inflation, the monthly Consumer Price Index for March, measuring those things that consumers buy, will be published by the Department of Commerce today.

The GNP deflator shows a fairly steady rise from an annual inflation rate of about 1.6 per cent in the spring of 1972 to the present 10.8 per cent, as the effect of controls wore off.

Jones argued that the end of wage and price controls on April 30, might actually reduce inflationary pressure by easing supply bottlenecks.

He also rejected tax cuts as a means to stimulate the economy, on grounds that the effect would come too late.

In New York the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Julius Shiskin, said that a recent study showed employment declining 0.3 per cent in "energy critical" industries since Nov. 1, but growing 0.4 per cent in the rest of the economy.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of March I mailed a questionnaire to the people in the 15th Ohio Congressional District. I must admit that I was surprised when a computer analysis of the first 11,035 responses to my most recent questionnaire showed a 50-50 percent division of opinion, not on just one issue, but on three separate issues. Over the years, I have rarely had an even division of opinion on any response to one of my questions.

The people of the 15th Congressional District apparently are equally divided on: First, whether the President's authority to impose wage and price controls should be extended; second, whether a coupon rationing system should be instituted if the gasoline shortage should become really acute, and third, whether there should be some form of national health insurance administered by the Federal Government.

The people of my congressional district are overwhelmingly opposed to continuation of the Watergate investigation beyond April 30, 79 percent; to further pursuit, on the basis of information now publicly available, of House impeachment proceedings against the President, 61 percent, and to decontrolling gasoline prices to reduce demand, 70 percent?

I was not surprised by these findings

because they reflect expressions in mail I have been receiving, nor was I surprised particularly by the fact that 62 percent of my constituents would relax automobile emission control standards to conserve gasoline.

But I was surprised, to some extent, by the overwhelming opinion—69 percent—that the oil shortage has been contrived by the oil companies.

These are some of the highlights of the analysis of the first 11,035 returns received. At this writing some 10,000 more have been received and they still are coming in. These are being analyzed and fed into the compilation. I am releasing the first results now because skilled statistical analysts tell me there is very little chance of any significant change in the results, since the original "sample" involved so many returns from such a broad spectrum of the district's population.

An interesting fact about the analysis is that it shows no great difference of opinions between me and women in responses to the various questions, but that it does show in some cases a wide disparity between the bottom and top age groups. For example, 62 percent of those in the 18 to 27 years group would continue impeachment proceedings and 57 percent would terminate the Watergate hearings. By contrast, in the 58 and above group, only 22 percent would pursue the impeachment proceedings and 90 percent would cut off the Watergate hearings.

With the help of the Census Bureau we determined that there are an equal number of people living in the 15th Congressional District in the four age categories designated on my questionnaires. I think it is interesting to note that on each questionnaire response, considerably more people age 42 and above responded than in the lower age groups. For example, in answer to question No. 10, the breakdown in responses is as follows:

[In percent]

Age	No designation 4 percent		
	Yes	No	Age
18 to 27	16	62	38
28 to 41	25	46	54
42 to 57	29	32	68
58 and up	26	22	78

[In percent]

	His		Hers		Composite	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Would you vote to extend the authority of the President to impose wage and price controls beyond Apr. 30, 1974?	48	52	52	48	50	50
2. The energy shortage has commanded much of the Nation's attention in recent weeks. One of the most important aspects of this problem is the situation regarding gasoline. We are told that if the oil embargo is lifted or if we get a break on the weather, we could avoid Government regulations. If the gasoline shortage becomes acute, how should it be handled?						
(a) A coupon rationing system	50	50	50	50	50	50
(b) Uncontrolled price increases to reduce demand	35	65	25	75	30	70
(c) A system where even license tag number scan purchase gas on even number days and odd tag numbers	64	36	70	30	67	33
(d) Other						
3. Do you feel that the oil shortage has been contrived by the oil companies?	68	32	70	30	69	31
4. Would you favor relaxing the automobile emission control standards as a means of conserving gasoline?	64	36	60	40	62	38
5. Should the Federal Government provide funds for operating expenses for urban mass transportation authorities?	58	42	59	41	58	42
6. Do you favor financing of Presidential and congressional elections through Federal funds?	38	62	37	63	37	63
7. Do you favor some form of national health insurance administered by the Federal Government?	50	50	50	50	50	50
8. Would you favor Congress attempting an annual spending limit that could not exceed tax revenues?	83	17	86	14	84	16
9. Do you believe that the Watergate hearings should be terminated with the findings made public no later than April 30 and the matter then left to the courts?	78	22	80	20	79	21
10. On the basis of information now publicly available, do you believe impeachment proceedings should be pursued against President Nixon?	38	62	36	64	38	62

1. Would you vote to extend the authority of the President to impose wage and price controls beyond Apr. 30, 1974?
2. The energy shortage has commanded much of the Nation's attention in recent weeks. One of the most important aspects of this problem is the situation regarding gasoline. We are told that if the oil embargo is lifted or if we get a break on the weather, we could avoid Government regulations. If the gasoline shortage becomes acute, how should it be handled?
 - (a) A coupon rationing system
 - (b) Uncontrolled price increases to reduce demand
 - (c) A system where even license tag number scan purchase gas on even number days and odd tag numbers
 - (d) Other
3. Do you feel that the oil shortage has been contrived by the oil companies?
4. Would you favor relaxing the automobile emission control standards as a means of conserving gasoline?
5. Should the Federal Government provide funds for operating expenses for urban mass transportation authorities?
6. Do you favor financing of Presidential and congressional elections through Federal funds?
7. Do you favor some form of national health insurance administered by the Federal Government?
8. Would you favor Congress attempting an annual spending limit that could not exceed tax revenues?
9. Do you believe that the Watergate hearings should be terminated with the findings made public no later than April 30 and the matter then left to the courts?
10. On the basis of information now publicly available, do you believe impeachment proceedings should be pursued against President Nixon?

REPRESENTATIVE KEMP PROPOSES
LEGISLATION TO GIVE INDIVIDUALS A TAX CREDIT AS A BRAKE
ON THE CALAMITOUS EFFECTS OF
INFLATION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, inflation is the severest problem now facing our Nation. It borders on crisis proportions. Every public opinion poll shows the people believe inflation to be our biggest problem. As an issue, it far outweighs any other facing us.

Inflation threatens to weaken irreparably the strength of the dollar and our economy.

Inflation robs each of us of our purchasing power, making us poorer in dollar terms.

Inflation eats away the true value of money—money we had been saving—saving to send our children to college, or to buy a new home, or to retire.

Inflation endangers the future of each of us, for those who are now, or will be, on fixed incomes—principally annuitants, pensioners, and social security recipients—are hurt the hardest by a loss of purchasing power. Prices go up, but their income either remains the same or goes up as an after-the-fact occurrence.

And, inflation erodes the economic security which has formed the basis for our free society.

Why, then, has it not been either stopped or slowed down? Because too many of those who helped to create the problem are incapable or unwilling to come to grips with the matter.

Of whom do I speak? Principally, of politicians. Politicians who spend too much of the taxpayers' money. Politicians who authorize the printing of more and more paper money to cover the costs of Government. Politicians who must raise taxes to meet expenditures—which they are unwilling to do—or who increase the public debt load borne by each and every citizen—which they are far too willing to do.

As I have said many times before in this Chamber, inflation is not an act of God. It is an act of politicians. And, as such, it is as susceptible to immediate alleviation and eventual resolution as it was to creation.

Let me tell you how strongly I feel about this matter: If the elected officials of this country continue to contribute to the causes of inflation—rather than to its alleviation, the people, the voters should hold them fully accountable and then turn them out of office. It is that simple.

We need men and women in elective offices who will tell the truth to the American people, and who can hold the line against inflation. Officials who can say "no" to the countless proposals for spending the taxpayers' money. Officials who can say that there is a limit beyond which Government cannot continue to go in taking the wealth of the people away from them in the form of ever

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

higher taxes. Officials who can say, "stop," when the Federal Reserve Board wants to print money that has nothing new in productivity to stand behind it.

WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO TO HOLD THE LINE
AGAINST INFLATION

There is much that the Congress can do to hold the line against inflation. It is, indeed, unfortunate that most of these measures have not already been instituted.

We can stop spending money in excess of projected revenues. By so doing, we would lessen the need for a tax increase. We would stop the continuing increases in the national public debt. I have sponsored bills to require only balanced budgets be submitted to the Congress, and to limit the rate of increase in money supply.

We can stop our foolish reliance on Government-imposed price controls as a means to halt inflation. Price controls may be well-intentioned, but they do not work. Inflation rose at an annualized rate of 3.3 percent prior to mandatory price controls being instituted in 1971. Did they work? No; thereafter, they rose at a rate of 8.8 percent per year. And, last week we were told that, if inflation continued at the same rate it did for the period January through March, it would be 14.5 percent for 1974. This cannot be allowed to happen. The marketplace has always kept prices down lower than Government regulation has. I have long opposed the so-called price control program because I know it could not work.

We can also limit the annualized rate at which the Federal Reserve Board can issue new money. Increased money supply does fuel inflation. A careful study of American history reveals that there has never been a significant inflation which has not been preceded by a rapid increase in the money supply and that there has not been a recession in the United States in the last 100 years which was not preceded by a nonincreasing money supply. I will soon sponsor a bill to tighten up the Board's money issuing authority.

But, what about the taxpayer while the Congress debates the major issues associated with inflation? What can we do for him to give him some hedge against the effects of inflation? Is there nothing we can do?

There is something which can be done, and I am today introducing a bill to do it. We can give the taxpayers a hedge on the effects of inflation by giving them a tax credit equal to the amount by which the purchasing power of their adjusted gross income for the taxable year has been reduced by inflation. My bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals with such a tax credit.

The rate of inflation for any taxable year would be the amount—as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or his designate and as expressed in terms of a percentage—by which the level of the Consumer Price Index—all items, U.S. city average—published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, at the close of the taxable year, exceeds the level of such index at the beginning

of such a year. Thus, if the rate of inflation were 8 percent, the credit would be allowed accordingly. And, I have proposed that this calendar year of 1974 be used as the first such year. I see no need for waiting, and I know the people will agree with me.

The bill goes one step further: It allows a credit in excess of the tax liability—if such excess were caused by the calculation of the anti-inflation factor—to be refunded to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, chaired by the able gentleman from Arkansas, the highly respected Mr. MILLS, to consider this proposal as it weighs measures to reform our tax structure this session.

I think the Congress would be well served to enact this measure, and I am confident the people would be the better for it.

RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLICIZING
LOTTERY RESULTS SHOULD BE
LIFTED

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would amend existing Federal law so as to remove certain restrictions on the operations of State-conducted lotteries as well as those operated by private, charitable, nonprofit organizations.

Specifically, my bill would amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to permit the broadcasting of advertising, lists of prizes or information concerning a lottery conducted by a State agency, a nonprofit organization, or by a radio or television station within that State. It would also permit the mailing of newspapers, published in the State, containing advertisements, lists of prizes, or information concerning a State-supported lottery or one conducted for charitable purposes. Additional amendments would permit the transportation or mailing of tickets and other information concerning these lotteries within the States where they are operated.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963, the State of New Hampshire commenced the first State-operated lottery of modern times. Since that time, it has been joined by my own State of New York as well as New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maryland, Maine, Illinois, Michigan, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Ohio in embracing the lottery mechanism as a means of raising revenue for public purposes. Under the New York law, the proceeds from the State-run lottery are devoted exclusively to improving the quality of education in our State.

However, at present, States are hampered in their efforts to promote these lotteries by existing provisions and prohibitions in the Federal law. The result is that many winners never learn that they have in fact won. Another result is a lessening of the potential revenues for a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

public good such as improved educational facilities. Similarly, charities and other nonprofit groups are restrained from realizing the full potential of their fundraising efforts for needy causes.

It is my understanding that the Subcommittee on Claims and Governmental Relations of the House Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings this week on the subject of pending lottery legislation. It is my further understanding that the bill I introduce today is the only one which seeks to eliminate the advertising and mailing restrictions as they relate to nonprofit organizations as well as State-conducted lotteries. It seems to me that both types of fundraising efforts should be free to operate, within the borders of their own State, without being unduly restricted by Federal law. I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Claims will see the merits of such legislation in a favorable light and take action on it in this session.

EMERGENCY AID FOR ISRAEL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the fighting intensifies between Israel and Syria on the Golan Heights, and as Arab terrorists in Israel step up their cowardly destructive acts, more and more of Israel's limited resources must be spent to assure both foreign and domestic security.

In this light, the impounding of emergency aid for Israel voted late last year by this Congress for Israel, and signed by the President December 26, becomes especially onerous for Israel's financial future. Of the \$2.2 billion voted by the Congress, 1.5 billion was to be in the form of a grant and the balance would be available to Israel in the way of credits. Thus far, however, the administration has refused to release this money to Israel.

Moreover, there are signs that the administration may even seek to circumvent the will of Congress by making less than the \$1.5 billion figure available to Israel in the form of grants. Israel may be forced to borrow much of this money, thus further increasing the enormous debts she has taken on since the October 1973 war. The testimony earlier this month by Secretary of State Kissinger before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hardly served to dispel Israeli fears that the administration is seeking to reduce the grant moneys previously voted by the Congress.

Clearly, the October war has dealt an enormous blow to the Israeli economy. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union continues to supply arms to the Arab countries through "an absolutely open spigot," as Deputy Secretary of Defense William P. Clements recently told the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In addition, Israel still must bear the financial burden

of resettling thousands of refugees from the Soviet Union who arrive monthly.

The administration by having refused thus far to live up to the intent of congressional legislation regarding grants for Israel adds to Arab intransigence in the negotiating arena. One wonders whether Syria would still be seeking to drive Israel from positions atop Mt. Hermon were the United States clearly providing Israel with these moneys.

The administration must provide the funds voted by the Congress to Israel immediately.

NO JOBS MAKES THE WELFARE PROBLEM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read an article which will be of interest to those who are concerned with the problem of welfare. Mr. James Dumpson, New York City's Human Resources commissioner, sheds a revealing light on the nature of welfare and those who are forced to use it to sustain their lives.

The article, from a recent edition of the New York Amsterdam News, follows: **WELFARE RECIPIENTS DON'T WORK BECAUSE OF NO JOBS—DUMPSON**

(By Don Rojas)

"Welfare is not a cause, it's an effect . . . we go on attacking people in need rather than the malfunctioning systems that created their need," said James Dumpson, the city's Human Resources Administrator in his first public address since his appointment in January.

Speaking before 1200 people at the annual luncheon of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies at the Americana Hotel, Dumpson called for reorganization of the city's welfare system and disclosed his recommendations for realigning the agency to intensify its delivery of service.

ACCOUNTABILITY

"I do not believe Mayor Beame intended the word dismantle to be interpreted as meaning the amputation of services from people or the dismemberment of the services themselves. Rather the interpretation should be on the restructuring of the method for providing all services in the most responsible, efficient and accountable way possible," Dumpson said.

The HRA Administrator, who is also New York City's Social Services Commissioner, stated that he would propose to Mayor Beame the establishment of a "four-office services structure" because the service function "has for too long been underemphasized."

Dumpson's address was eloquent and well-received by the many welfare workers, city officials and community representatives who attended the luncheon.

INBREEDING

He drew applause when he said that welfare continues to be the "wastebasket" for the failures of variety of our social and economic systems. He attributed this to "an incestuous inbreeding" of malfunctioning systems of education, health services, housing and the vagaries of an economy that seems to make "the rich richer and the poor poorer."

"The welfare system has never been one of America's best loved institutions, and, given the economic realities of New York City in 1974, public sentiment is not likely to undergo any quick changes," Dumpson said.

Charging government with insensitivity to the problems of welfare recipients, Dumpson noted that until this country develops and adopts a "national, humane, human resource policy" there will continue to be conflicting, damaging social and economic policies insofar as human welfare is concerned.

NO JOBS

"We must take positive steps to dispell what is again and again proven a myth—that welfare recipients don't want to work," the city official urged his listeners. "The real reason is that there are no jobs."

In the light of this Dumpson said that HRA has already proposed the conversion of the Work Relief Employment Program (WREP) from half-time to full-time status. Dumpson sees HRA making available a broad range of preventative, curative and development welfare services that will include income support and "humane, sensible" programs administered by or for HRA.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. AND THE HONORABLE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the consciousness of every just man and woman today, there exists a little more understanding, a little more concern, a little more wisdom because of the lives of two great men who died on this day, April 4.

They raised our minds to understand better the role the individual can play in a society built on pluralism. They raised our hearts to the cries of those whom the system has forsaken. They raised their hands with ours to give aid to those in need. They raised our souls to understand the meaning of brotherhood.

As a black man, I am proud that two such men as these walked with black feet in Selma and Montgomery and Harlem and Washington, and that I was privileged to share in their cause of justice.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a giant among men, inspired this Nation with his dedication to the principles of freedom and justice for all men and women. He lived for peace, and was honored for his efforts by international acclaim and the Nobel Prize for Peace. He lived to bring to others the sense that God created man equal and righteous. He was gunned down by an assassin who could not deal with the truths he brought.

Adam Clayton Powell was a pioneer in one of the toughest jobs a man can have—representing the needs and the rights of his people. He fought for social legislation when it was not popular. He fought for equal and decent education for all our children; he took the leadership in showing that a black man could

break through and bring about meaningful change on a national legislative level.

Today, as we commemorate the deaths of these men, we rejoice that some of their dreams have come true, that some of the hopes for their fellow man has been fulfilled. We rejoice that their leadership has inspired others to follow their footsteps. And we build on their work to provide a decent quality of life for all our brothers and sisters, whatever their color or religion or place of birth, around the world.

JOSEPH C. PLUMB, JR.

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, "Charlie" Plumb was a prisoner of war for 5½ years in Vietnam. He is the former Lt. Cmdr. Joseph C. Plumb, Jr., who flew a F-4B Phantom jet bomber which was hit May 19, 1967, while flying south of Hanoi.

Charlie Plumb has returned to the United States with an attitude and character that is heartwarming. He has been traveling around mid-America speaking to more than 300 audiences in the last year. He was recently a guest speaker in Emporia, Kans., and those who heard him are still echoing the zest for life which Charlie Plumb has come to know, live, and share with others.

I thought my colleagues might be interested in the following article, a reprint from the Emporia Gazette—the famous newspaper begun by William Allen White. It is hard to imagine a man totally confined from the progress and day to day life of this country for 5½ years. It is interesting to note Charlie's closing words which is an observation of his first look at America upon returning:

I feel now that while the looks of Americans may have changed, the hearts of Americans are the same. For that I'm thankful.

The article follows:

FIRST YEARS AS A PRISONER WERE WORST,
PLUMB SAYS

(By E. N. Erley)

For nearly six years, former Lieut. Comdr. Joseph C. Plumb was a prisoner of war in a North Vietnamese camp in Hanoi.

A fighter pilot in the Navy, "Charlie" Plumb was captured five days before his tour of duty in Vietnam was scheduled to end. His F4-B Phantom jet bomber was hit May 19th, 1967, while flying south of Hanoi.

Mr. Plumb recalls looking down as he and his parachute slowly floated to the ground. There was no chance of escape. Viet Cong, dressed in their black pajama-type uniforms, looked like ants in the green foliage below him. He was scared.

"I remember just before I hit the ground I shut my eyes and prayed, 'Lord, give me strength.' It was a prayer Mr. Plumb would repeat several times while he was a P.O.W.

He was immediately stripped and beaten. In the next few days he was tortured, degraded and starved.

Ropes were tied on his hands and legs and then his body was twisted, pulled and contorted in many different and painful positions. The torture was called the "rope trick"

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

by the many P.O.W.'s who survived it—some did not.

After two days of torture, Mr. Plumb quit refusing to answer the Viet Cong's questions. He began telling them almost unbelievable lies.

"One of the first things we learned was to lie. Viet Cong people would lose face if they could not make you talk. They would not accept a 'no' answer and they would torture you until you died. So we told them lies. Afterward, the Viet Cong would not punish you for lying because to do so would force them to admit that they had been outsmarted—which also caused them to lose face," Mr. Plumb explained. For two years Mr. Plumb was in isolation. Surrounded by the dirt walls of an eight-by-eight-foot cell, he was forbidden even to try to look at other Americans. The punishment for any type of communication was a severe beating.

Left alone, Mr. Plumb was plagued with boredom. "We overlook, here in America, one of our most simple freedoms, the freedom to communicate with an English speaking American."

One day, Mr. Plumb made a deck of cards out of toilet paper. When his North Vietnamese guards found him playing with the cards, they beat him. He says he still has scars from the beatings.

When he finally was released, he returned home to Kansas City to discover that his wife had filed for a divorce four months before his release. After waiting almost five and a half years she was ready to call it quits. She has since re-married.

But through the hardships, Charlie Plumb still says, "I'm no hero."

A crowd of more than 350 Emporians at the Granada Theater Wednesday night apparently disagreed. The crowd gave Mr. Plumb two standing ovations and after his speech surrounded him with questions, smiles and praises.

A young man dressed in a suit told Mr. Plumb, "I was over there too. It was tough."

An older Emporia woman, shaking Mr. Plumb's hand like it was a pump handle, said, "You're an inspiration."

Another standing near Mr. Plumb added that he has the type of attitude "which America needs."

Since his return last year to Kansas, Mr. Plumb has spoken to more than 300 audiences. Mr. Plumb says he has received a standing ovation at each appearance.

Mr. Plumb is no longer a Navy officer. He resigned his commission in January, almost exactly one year after he was released from captivity. He now works for Informed Inc., a public relations firm in Lenexa. When he is not booked for speaking engagements, he helps the public relations firm with some of its clients.

Mr. Plumb's experiences as a P. O. W. are recorded in a book entitled, "I'm No Hero." The book is sold after his speeches.

Another employee of Informed Inc., who travels with Mr. Plumb, says Mr. Plumb's success is because of his personality and way of life. "Charlie tells an audience about a way of life they admire and then he does something even more important—he lives that type of life."

Ushered in by Girl Scouts, holding the hands of two small Brownie Scouts, the American flag preceding him down the aisle, Mr. Plumb approached the speaker's podium at the Fox Theater amid loud applause.

Without notes, he began telling the crowd of his P. O. W. experiences, but he prefaced his remarks by explaining that three things gave him the courage to endure torture and keep his sanity.

"I endured six years of hell because of my faith in God. I knew He was with us, and His will would be done. Also, because of my great love of country, and because of self-discipline and pride."

He quickly added, "But I'm no hero. Many Americans are prisoners in America right now. They are held in prisons of mental bars, not metal bars, but they also can endure if they take stock in the same three things which gave me the power to make it."

Mr. Plumb was reared in a small town on the Kaw River in Kansas, and later moved to Overland Park.

After high school he attended the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md. He then was assigned to the USS Kitty Hawk. Before he was shot down he had flown 75 combat missions and received eight medals.

In his speech, he told how prisoners communicated while they were in isolation cells. He said some men would write notes on toilet paper and wrap them on small stones which were tossed from cell to cell. "That was called air mail," he said jokingly.

"We also developed an elaborate code of coughs and sneezes. The Viet Cong are always coughing, sneezing, grunting or spitting, so they did not notice if we did the same. Often I would wake up to the sound of a loud cough followed by a grunt, which meant 'Good Morning.'"

Other codes developed, but after two years in isolation, the prisoners were given cell mates.

Mr. Plumb recalls that boredom again became the biggest problem in camp. To keep "the cogs in our heads from becoming covered with cobwebs we began a daily routine of activities."

The prisoners challenged each other in exercise drills. By tapping on the walls and using other signals the men would begin exercise drills and then compare the results. "At first the best we could do would be around 25 push-ups and 100 sit-ups. After six years the champion pushup record was close to 1,500 and the sit-up record was near 10,000."

The prisoners also amused themselves by telling each other about movies they had seen. "When he first came to our camp, one man told us about a movie he had seen. It took him about 10 minutes. After five years in prison it took the same man three hours to tell about the movie and it had grown from a PG rating to triple X."

Mr. Plumb said the prisoners were aware of anti-war activities in the United States. Speakers in each of the cells, over which they had no control, carried "news" from the Voice of Vietnam, dubbed "Hanoi Hannah" by the prisoners.

"We didn't believe a lot of it because it was blown way out of proportion by Communist propaganda," Mr. Plumb recalled. "We would very much have liked to see a united America behind us, but for myself, I was proud to serve a country with freedom of speech and freedom of action."

Visits to North Vietnam by some anti-war activists like Ramsey Clark, former U.S. attorney general, and movie star Jane Fonda, troubled him, Mr. Plumb said.

"Personally, I was quite disenchanted to see a good looking American woman speaking to me in English, saying the same thing that the Vietnamese had said for years."

Mr. Plumb is against amnesty for draft evaders. They severed an unwritten commitment when they refused to serve, he says. "Now that the sun is shining they want to come home—I don't think they should be allowed to." His remarks interrupted by loud applause from the Emporia audience.

Mr. Plumb feels America's involvement in Vietnam helped stop communist aggression. He does not feel the fighting between the North and South will ever end, and he does not feel America should ever send troops back to fight.

"Sending troops to Vietnam was a mistake from the beginning. I think if we try hard enough in the future we can solve our problems diplomatically."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He says one reason he is against sending troops back is because Vietnam is involved in a political war. "We were not allowed to fight and win the war or lose it because of politics."

"In the air war we were extremely careful not to drop bombs on civilians. I was threatened on several occasions with court martial if my bombs didn't hit their targets. It was a terrible pressure, because we were dropping bombs from 5,000 feet, with everyone shooting at us, and we were only supposed to hit a 60-foot bridge in the center of a town."

Mr. Plumb believes President Nixon's bombing escalation helped end the war. He said, "We P. O. W.s were glad to see it."

Prison life improved during the 1970's, Mr. Plumb says, because of increased interest in P. O. W.s by Americans. "That's when people started wearing P. O. W. bracelets and were interested. The Viet Cong realized we were valuable and took better care of us."

Mr. Plumb is not encouraging to parents, wives, and sweethearts of soldiers still missing. He feels most of them are dead.

When asked about his future, Mr. Plumb says he has decided he will serve in politics if he can find a job which will not make him lower his standards. He has no particular office in mind.

He also said that during the last year over-friendly politicians who were anxious to get on the "Charlie Plumb bandwagon" became angry at him when he was friendly to their political opponents. He does not like such political bickering.

In closing, Mr. Plumb said that while he was imprisoned he had a lot of time to think about why he was fighting. He remembered a different America than what he returned to. Mini-skirts, X-rated movies and long hair shocked him at first. "I thought I was returning to a nation of beatniks. I feel now, however, that while the looks of Americans may have changed, the hearts of Americans are the same. For that I'm thankful," he says.

RESOLUTION NO. 2205

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from the St. Louis County Council which concerns the proposed Chicago-Kansas City interstate highway. This is a matter of great concern to my constituents and I am sure it is to many Members of the House as well:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Congress has authorized the study of the feasibility of building an interstate highway between Kansas City and Chicago; and

Whereas, Missouri and Illinois state highway engineers are presently studying such a highway system; and

Whereas, a diversion of such magnitude of the normal flow of traffic in the Midwest could seriously damage the economy of the St. Louis area which rests in great part upon the area's position as a major transportation center; and

Whereas, members of the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis have indicated their intention to adopt a resolution opposing the Kansas City-Chicago interstate highway; and

Whereas, a united effort between the City and County of St. Louis to oppose the direct Kansas City-Chicago interstate highway is considered essential;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the County Council of St. Louis County, Missouri, as follows:

That the members of the County Council of St. Louis County, Missouri, do hereby join with the members of the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis in declaring their opposition to a direct interstate highway system between Kansas City and Chicago.

That the members of the Council further join with the members of the Board of Aldermen in urging the Supervisor of St. Louis County and the Mayor of the City of St. Louis to initiate a meeting with the members of the St. Louis area's Congressional delegation to obtain their commitment in opposing this project and to initiate a meeting with Missouri and Illinois state highway engineers to explain the St. Louis area's opposition to the project.

Be it further resolved that the Administrative Director is hereby authorized and directed to deliver a copy of this resolution to the members of the St. Louis area's Congressional delegation.

MAURICE L. STEWART,
Chairman.
HARRY E. VON ROMER,
JAMES R. BUTLER,
GERALD A. RIMMELL,
MILTON J. BISCHOF, Jr.,
BRAINERD W. LA TOURETTE, Jr.,
CARL W. BREIHAN.

COLLEAGUE CECIL KING, A MEMBER'S MENTOR

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a score plus 10 years, the beloved Cecil King of California, represented our State well in the Congress of the United States. In the decade before 1942, King represented part of Los Angeles County in the California Legislature.

King's monument obviously will be the bill he jointly pioneered with Senator Clinton Anderson of New Mexico—the King-Anderson medicare bill, the central theme and accomplishment of the Kennedy era—the legislation that to this day promotes longevity of millions of older Americans who know that their necessary hospital and doctor bills will be not only paid, but the necessary treatment rendered.

When others shied from the task of dabbling in this socialistic experiment, it was Cecil King, a Senior Democrat in the House of Representatives on the Ways and Means Committee, who rose to the occasion; later getting the necessary support of Chairman MILLS and accomplishing substantial change on the face of American health delivery systems.

Cecil was the committee on committees mentor of every new young Democratic representative from California for several decades. From his position representing the Western States on the committee on committees, King helped shape the future of a generation of congressional representation.

Cecil King was a Congressman's Congressman, chairman of the largest delegation in the U.S. Congress, a diplomat, a representative of the United States to

the Common Market and many trade negotiations. He served the Congress and his country well, left his mark, a hero slightly sung, but who will long be remembered, sometimes perhaps innocuously and anonymously by the beneficiaries of his congressional industry.

To Cecil's wife, Gertrude, thanks from the people of the United States and the Fourth Congressional District of California.

BASEBALL 1974

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as an avid baseball fan, I followed with great interest the early season heroics that saw Hank Aaron hit the record-tying and record-breaking home runs.

WGN Continental Broadcasting Co. in Chicago, Ill., used the occasion of Aaron's historic record to comment generally on the popularity of baseball and some of the irritating public relations controversies that broke out in the early days of the 1975 baseball season:

BASEBALL 1974

In spite of the usual spring weather, the 1974 baseball season is underway.

Now that Hank Aaron has put the record-tying and record-breaking home runs behind him, we can make a few observations about the changing nature of the national pastime, if baseball still lays claim to that title.

To those of us who grew up before football was the focal point of every weekend from July through January, baseball was THE sport.

Part of the fascination was watching the record book. And, for the most part, baseball's owners treated the game as a sport.

Well, things are different today. There is still the fascination with the record book. But, everyone who follows the game knew the 1974 season would not be very old before Aaron replaced Babe Ruth as the all-time home-run king. It was, or so we might have thought, merely a matter of when and where. But, those who control baseball, those who have moved it from a sport to big business, felt otherwise.

We think Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn was wrong to insist that Aaron play at least two of the three opening games in Cincinnati. And, we think it would have been nice for the commissioner to go on to Atlanta where and when the record was likely to be broken, as indeed it was broken.

It's not just the way the Atlanta Braves' organization, the National League and the commissioner's office acted in the Aaron instance. The season has been made longer, but that often doesn't bring more people out to the ball parks, especially when opening day is delayed by snow. And, it's hardly sporting when the new owner of a ball club uses the public address system to criticize his players before 39-thousand fans. That might provide a little color, but not much.

Some may question whether baseball still enjoys the public popularity it once did. If baseball has lost public favor, some of the reasons were on display during the first week of the 1974 season.

We like baseball, but baseball has some problems. We don't know the answers, but we think organized baseball should be looking for them.

April 23, 1974

IMPRESSIONS FROM THE
AFTERMATH

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report entitled "Impressions From the Aftermath":

IMPRESSIONS FROM THE AFTERMATH

A tour of the communities devastated by the tornadoes that ripped and slashed through Indiana on April 3 left me with strangely mixed feelings of depression and pride. The depression was caused by the lives lost, the injuries sustained, and the property damaged. The pride was prompted by the uncounted acts of heroism during the storm and the efforts of thousands of people to bind up the wounds and rebuild.

Several counties in the Ninth Congressional District were among the hardest hit in the worst tornado disaster in half a century. Nearly 100 tornadoes in the storm crossed 11 states, killed more than 300 people, including 44 known dead in Indiana, left thousands injured or homeless, and caused property damage of \$1 billion. Thirty-eight Indiana counties were declared disaster areas as a result of more than \$100 million in property damage.

My tour of the tornado-struck communities left unforgettable impressions:

The bloodshot eyes of a rescue worker who had labored for 36 hours without rest;

The relieved young lady who found her parents after hours of desperate searching;

The elderly woman cleaning and arranging her kitchen counter in the midst of her ruined home;

The State Police helicopter pilot who told of several medical rescue flights;

School Board members planning to resume classes in a week or two as they walked about their destroyed schools;

Tangled steel outside a power plant that resembled spaghetti;

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The gratitude for life of people who had lost almost everything else;

The quick response of a man standing next door to his demolished home: "I'm going to start rebuilding tomorrow."

The farmer who commented: "All I got left is my family and my car, but I am lucky."

A family's delight when electric power was restored to their home;

A farmer, working alone, and beginning the enormous task of removing tons of debris from his fields.

Despite the desolation in the wake of the storm, I was encouraged by the resilient spirit and the indestructible sense of humor many of its victims displayed. (One man, who lost everything, said his theme song was "Gone With the Wind.") It will be generations before the tornadoes of '74 are forgotten by Hoosiers, especially in Ninth District communities such as Madison, Martinsburg, Hanover, and Hamburg.

The storm left countless scars: stately trees on a picture-book college campus destroyed; a pile of bricks that was once a church; a hardwood forest turned to splinters; a state park's scenic vistas destroyed; severe livestock losses; mobile homes strewn across valleys; schoolbuses hurled into the middle of fields; downed power lines; telephone poles arranged like in a game of pick-up-sticks; and hundreds of homes appearing as if they had been dynamited.

Most heartening of all was the help that the tornado victims received from a variety of sources. As one man said to me, it restored his faith in human nature. Police, National Guardsmen, and Civil Defense workers kept traffic moving, restored order, and prevented looting. Welfare officials helped with food stamps and clothing. Local businesses contributed whatever they could. State and county highway workers provided much of the muscle and equipment for the monumental cleanup job.

One of the worst natural disasters brought out the best in people. From all over Indiana volunteers came to the devastated communities to lend a hand with debris removal, food service, transportation, communications, and repair. Red Cross, Salvation Army, and other private relief groups distributed food and shelter. Water, electric, and telephone re-

pairmen worked without breaks to restore the basic services. Physicians and health care personnel gave medical assistance, checked water supplies, and vaccinated against disease. Trained insurance catastrophe teams were dispatched to adjust thousands of claims.

I am grateful for the cooperation my staff and I received from federal, state, and local officials who worked to make a wide range of assistance available to storm victims as soon as possible. Seven disaster assistance centers are now in operation in disaster areas across the state, including one in New Albany and one in Madison in the Ninth District. They will provide much-needed assistance in the form of temporary housing, mortgage or rental payments, food stamps, unemployment compensation, debris removal, loans for homeowners, farmers, and small businessmen, and grants to replace public schools and other facilities.

There may be no joy among Hoosiers as we survey the losses, but there are ample amounts of faith and courage and determination, as the events of this week surely proved.

JONES RELEASES FIRST DISTRICT SURVEY RESULTS

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks my office has been tabulating over 8,000 questionnaire responses which were returned to my office by citizens in Oklahoma's First Congressional District.

The results of our survey of voters' opinions is now complete, and I would like to share our findings with my colleagues here today. I include at this point in the RECORD my statement on the results of our survey, and the precise tabulated figures themselves:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided		More	Less	Same
1. The administration's authority to impose wage and price controls is due to expire April 30, should these controls be continued?	35.1	52.0	12.9	7. In the following program areas, do you feel that more, less, or about the same amount of money should be spent?	31.0	30.1	38.9
2. In establishing budget priorities, should the Government:				(a) Manpower training and development	25.2	41.2	33.6
(a) Maintain the present balance between human resources and military spending?	48.6	28.8	22.6	(c) Housing for senior citizens and low-income families	34.2	39.4	26.4
(b) Reduce spending on human resources?	42.0	42.1	15.9	(d) Defense	42.7	26.1	31.2
(c) Reduce military spending?	35.7	51.0	13.3	(e) Environmental protection	31.9	37.3	30.8
3. Should medicare-medicaid be replaced with a national health insurance system?	33.3	45.9	20.8	(f) Development of minority and small business enterprises	31.6	40.6	27.8
4. Should Congress pass a law providing for some form of public financing of Presidential elections?	39.3	52.4	8.3	(g) Energy research and development	77.5	13.2	9.3
5. Should the year-round daylight-savings time law be repealed?	53.9	38.0	8.1	(h) Foreign aid	3.7	84.6	11.7
6. Should Congress enact a "no-fault" auto insurance bill?	56.9	25.1	18.0	(i) Education	42.0	23.0	35.0
				(j) Health programs (hospital construction and health services)	44.8	19.8	35.8

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES R. JONES, FIRST DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

WASHINGTON.—Representative James R. Jones announced today the results of his most recent survey of voter opinions in Oklahoma's First Congressional District. Jones said that over 8000 individuals had responded to a questionnaire mailed from his office several weeks ago. The topics on which Jones asked voters' advice ranged from "no-fault" auto insurance, to what over-all spending priorities within the federal budget should be.

Jones reported that 52% of those responding are opposed to a renewal of wage and price control authority sought by the Ad-

ministration; 35.1% favored extension of that authority, and 12.9% were undecided.

Only 33.3% of those responding favored replacement of the present Medicare-Medicaid program with some form of National Health Insurance System; 45.9% were opposed to replacement, and 20.8% were undecided.

In answer to Jones' question as to whether they would support a public financing plan for Presidential elections, 52.4% First District voters replied "No"; 39.3% said "yes", and 8.3% were "undecided".

Fifty-four per cent of those polled supported repeal of Year Round Day-light Savings Time; 38% were opposed to repeal, and 8% were undecided. Jones earlier this year

introduced legislation to repeal the original Year Round Day-Light Savings Time Act.

On the question of whether Congress should enact some form of "no fault" auto insurance, 56.9% said "Yes"; 25.1% said "No"; and 18% were "undecided".

A combination of questions posed by Jones in his questionnaire asked citizens their views on how over-all federal spending priorities should be set. For instance, nearly half of those responding (48.6%) favor retaining the present spending balance between human resources and military programs; only 35.7% favored reducing military expenditures in favor of greater funds for human resources, while 51% were opposed to such reductions.

In a list of 10 specific areas of federal spending set forth by Jones in his questionnaire, respondents were asked whether they favored spending "more," "less," or approximately the "Same" amount of federal dollars in the future. One area that received overwhelming support for a greater future share of tax dollars was the field of energy development and research. 77.5% of the respondents indicated they felt financial assistance from the federal government for energy R & D should be increased, while only 13.2% favored a funding reduction. 9.3% indicated the present funding level was sufficient in their opinion.

A similar case of overwhelming opinion came on foreign-aid appropriations, except here, 84.6% favored a reduction in current funding levels. Only 3.7% favored an increase, and 11.7% advocated maintaining current spending levels.

According to the responses given Jones' questionnaire, First District voters also favor higher spending priorities in the fields of health programs (44% favor greater spending than present levels), and Education (42%), in addition to Energy R & D.

GALVA EAGLE SCOUTS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to become an Eagle Scout, and I would like to commend Scott Peterson, Dan Garrett, Andrew McNaught, and Jeff Olson for obtaining this position.

I include the following article which explains the dinner meeting of the Galva Lions Club, the sponsoring organization for Galva's Troop No. 144, at which these young men were honored:

MILLER, SAATKAMP JOIN LIONS CLUB

Two new members, Roy Saatkamp and Robert Miller, were inducted into the Galva Lions Club during the meeting March 27, in Epworth Hall, First United Methodist Church.

Joe Kendall conducted the induction ceremony.

The four Eagle Scouts belonging to Troop 144, the scout troop sponsored by the club, were honored along with their fathers. The four are Scott Peterson, son of Dave Peterson; Andrew Andre McNaught, son of Riley McNaught; Dan Garrett, son of Darrell Garrett; and Jeff Olson and his father, Roger Olson. Darrell Garrett was presented a pin from the club in appreciation of his work with the troop. The four scouts presented a certificate of appreciation to Robert Peck, president of the club, for sponsoring the troop.

The program was given by several instrumental groups from the middle school under the direction of Robert Baskovic, plus several selections from members of the girls chorus of the middle school, under the direction of Mrs. Wayne Nordstrom. The youngsters presented numbers they expected to use in the competition of bands and chorus at Henry last Saturday.

William Patterson and Harry Wallace were program co-chairmen.

The new officers for the coming year were elected during the meeting.

H. Ray Young was elected president; Frank Peterson Jr., first vice president; Tom Page, second vice president; John Goodale, third vice president; James White, secretary; Carl Palmer, treasurer; Dale Anderson, tall

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

twister; Gene Jennings, lion tamer; Willard Moore and Russell Alderman, directors for one year; Rev. Byron Robertson and Rev. James Hancock, directors for two years.

HISTORIC LA MOTT SITE OF ORGANIZATION OF FIRST FEDERAL COLORED TROOPS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a significant celebration planned for Sunday, May 5, 1974, to commemorate the organization of the first Federal colored troops at a site which is now the community of La Mott.

Located in Cheltenham Township in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District which I represent, La Mott will be honored in ceremonies by State, county, and local officials. Among those sponsoring the event are the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Cheltenham Township Historical Commission, the Township Board of Commissioners, prominent Negro leaders and local organizations.

In paying tribute to La Mott, I think it well that we reflect on the state of the Nation and its attitude toward blacks more than a century ago. What has been accomplished and what remains to be accomplished still stand in startling contrast to the crises and attitudes of a country then rent by civil strife.

The community of La Mott, formerly known as Camp Town, was a focal point in a great debate that raged at the time of the War Between the States. After President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, there was considerable controversy over whether or not to enlist black men into the Union Army.

Despite the furor, Secretary of War Stanton in 1863 issued an order allowing the State of Massachusetts to form the first colored regiment—the 54th Colored Regiment of the State of Massachusetts. At the same time, the War Department established a training center outside of Philadelphia where the first federally supported black soldiers were trained.

The site, now the community of La Mott, was in Chelten Hills and the training center was named Camp William Penn. Eleven regiments were trained at the camp.

Lt. Col. Louis Wagner, a veteran of the Battle of Bull Run, was the camp's commanding officer. Black regiments mustered at Camp William Penn were the 3d, 6th, 22d, 24th, 25th, 32d, 41st, 43d, 45th, and 127th. They were considered as part of the original forces of the U.S. Army. Mr. Frank H. Taylor, writing in his book, "Philadelphia in the Civil War: 1861-65," notes that the black regiments were not credited upon the quota of the city of Philadelphia for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In his detailed book, Mr. Taylor writes of the outstanding records compiled by

April 23, 1974

the enlisted men and officers. He said that 10,940 black soldiers and 400 white officers commanding them all shared in the records for bravery under fire and for efficiency in the many campaigns in which they participated. All of these men originally were assembled at Camp William Penn.

Mr. Taylor quoted the October 11, 1864, general order of Maj. Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, in which he referred to the charge of these troops at New Market:

Better men were never better led, better officers never led better men. A few more such charges and to command colored troops will be the post of honor in the American Army.

When the war ended, Camp William Penn became a home for blacks who settled at the site then referred to as Camp Town. Legend has it that they were helped to settle there by Lucretia Mott and her brother-in-law, Edward M. Davis. Both adamant abolitionists and operators of a way station along the underground railroad.

History records that blacks and immigrants of Irish descent lived side by side in harmony. La Mott grew and prospered. It remains today a friendly, stable, and harmonious community where blacks and whites live together in cooperation and brotherhood.

I think it altogether fitting and proper that we take note of the La Mott celebration, both for its historic beginnings and for its present exemplification of true brotherhood. The dreams of Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King live in the community of La Mott.

As Congressman for the citizens of La Mott, I add my own personal congratulations on the upcoming celebration. I hope the people of La Mott know how honored I am to represent them and how delighted I am to wish them well in the years to come.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XLIV

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the handgun epidemic continues to spread unchecked. The latest victims are youngsters in our Nation's schools. There is no excuse for Federal inaction which countenances 15-year-olds packing pistols with their lunches.

I include herewith an editorial from the April 14 edition of the New York Post:

GUNS IN THE SCHOOLS

City officials are reported contemplating a program to educate licensed firearms owners here about guns. Unfortunately, it develops at the same time that a number of public school students are teaching themselves on that subject—and some are learning the hard way.

According to data just provided the State Commission of Investigation by the Board of Education, gun "incidents" in or near schools have been increasing in recent years. In 1971, there were six, in 1972, nine, and last year, 24. If the current rate continues, there may be another record; there were 11 cases this January and February alone.

Both students and non-students have been involved in these crimes. Assault was the most frequent offense apart from weapons possession. The alarming point is that there seems to have been not only a discernible but a dramatic rise in school gun cases; the implications of that fact—and there may well be substantial "underreporting," as with crime generally—do not require elaboration.

There is nothing wrong with teaching safety to gun owners and tightening up on the regulations in general as they affect official permit-holders. But the gun plague, in this and other cities, demands far more comprehensive forms of official control.

DOES AMERICA WANT A VETO-PROOF CONGRESS?

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very thoughtful editorial which was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer on April 19, 1974. It was written by William J. Keating, a former distinguished Member of the House, who is now editor of the Enquirer. I recommend this editorial as a review of the basic structure of our Federal Government, and of our system of checks and balances. It contains an interesting commentary and some facts about the upcoming elections this fall.

Text of the editorial is as follows:

DOES AMERICA WANT A VETO-PROOF CONGRESS?

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves it he will sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become law. (Article I, Section 7, Constitution of the United States)

The furious effort exerted by organized labor in this year's congressional special elections—including the March 5 election in Ohio's First Congressional District and the more recent in Michigan's Eighth—is a clue that big labor is not speaking metaphorically when it declares its goal to be a "veto-proof Congress."

Indeed, Common Cause, which purports to monitor campaign spending, has reported that, as of February 28, the nation's unions had on hand \$5,032,584—as much as labor spent in the 1972 presidential campaign—for use between now and November to elect a Congress friendly to labor's legislative objectives.

There is, of course, nothing remarkable about any organization's seeking, as strenuously as it can, to elect members friendly to its point of view. But labor's goal of a veto-proof Congress—a goal proclaimed by George B. Meany, president of the AFL-CIO—goes far, far beyond the aspiration of most organizations to a friendly hearing in high places. A veto-proof Congress is, after all, a Congress that will not think twice, a Congress that will not ask questions, a Congress

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to whose members such standard legislative terms as "reconsideration" and "compromise" are unknown. What Mr. Meany and his cohorts are seeking, we fear, is a Congress that is willing to abdicate its historic mission to the executive officers of the AFL-CIO.

We question very much whether that is what the American people want.

The presidential veto has been portrayed in recent years, by some who have a stake in its nonuse, as a sordid device by which American Presidents have, on occasion, frustrated the will of the people as reflected in the legislative output of Congress.

In reality, the veto is one of those checks and balances built in the American system by the Constitution's framers for some specific and legitimate purposes. They wanted to make certain that no single branch dominated the entire federal government. They wanted to make certain that no Congress would, in a burst of passion, enact imprudent statutes without due consideration.

In consequence, they stipulated that every congressional enactment must be signed by the President to become law—provided he approves. If he does not approve, he must return the proposed law to the house in which it originated. It may then be repassed, over his veto, by two-thirds majorities and become law without his signature.

What the Constitution did not stipulate is what transpires between the time a President issues a veto message and the time Congress begins reconsidering the measure vetoed.

If the measure is one of genuine national significance, it immediately becomes a focal point of public interest. Rank-and-file Americans who may have paid only passing attention to the proposition when it emerged from Congress suddenly become more interested in its contents and its implications. Congress, mindful of this increased public interest, ordinarily takes a hard, second look at its earlier handiwork.

Sometimes a presidential veto is sustained, and the proposed law fails of enactment.

Sometimes a presidential veto is overridden, and the law becomes operative in spite of the President's opposition.

What harm is done in the process? Scarcely anyone with a legitimate purpose to serve suffers from reconsideration, from a second look, from renewed debate: from a few days' delay.

Most fair-minded Americans will agree, we believe, that the national interest is poorly served by a Congress so lopsidedly committed to any persuasion as to be tempted to act unthinkingly.

The Congresses of the early New Deal era were Congresses of such a stripe. They passed enactments at the behest of President Roosevelt—sometimes without reading them. Some of them turned out to be unconstitutional; many turned out to be imprudent. But there was no one to challenge, no one to ask for a reconsideration, no one to invite a second look.

Only when President Roosevelt sought to enlarge the Supreme Court to assure favorable consideration of measures in which the administration had a stake did Congress finally balk; only then did the checks and balances come once more into play.

The fact of the matter today is that the nation is ominously close to a Congress that Mr. Meany could certify as veto-proof. Nine more pro-labor votes in the Senate and 40-odd more votes in the House would suffice to give the AFL-CIO a virtual blank check to call the shots. It will be in the winning of those additional votes, presumably, that organized labor is prepared to invest its \$5 million to say nothing of millions of dollars of additional aid in the form of the labor of union functionaries, the propagandizing of union publications and the considerable expertise of union political advisers.

Lamentably, events in recent months have played into organized labor's hands to an extent scarcely anyone could have foreseen. The Watergate scandal and a succession of congressional and grand-jury inquiries has cast a considerable cloud over the Nixon administration and many of its policies.

Mr. Meany and his colleagues are astute enough to exploit these widespread discontents to seek objectives they could not otherwise hope to obtain.

They appear to subscribe to the strategy proposed some weeks ago by Prof. J. Kenneth Galbraith, who shares most of their political and economic objectives. "Our best chance of getting something done," Professor Galbraith wrote in *Newsweek* early this year, "is to have Mr. Nixon around a bit longer as the visible symbol of what is wrong. It will be said that it is cruel to use him—that a man should not be kept twisting slowly, slowly in the wind, even for so high a purpose as ousting reactionaries out of the Congress. But it is, almost certainly, the last thing he will be asked to do for his country."

Time will tell whether the strategy works. If it does, it will be regrettably too late for the American people to entertain second thoughts.

MY PLACE AS A NEW VOTER IN AMERICAN POLITICS

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to offer the following essay written by a young man who is a resident of my congressional district, Mr. Brian R. Miller of RFD 1, Jonestown, Pa. Mr. Miller's essay, entitled "My Place As a New Voter in American Politics," was the winning essay in an American Legion contest which covered three counties in Pennsylvania. Mr. Miller is an 11th grade student at Northern Lebanon High School in Fredericksburg, Pa., and I believe this essay speaks well for him and for the youth of America:

MY PLACE AS A NEW VOTER IN AMERICAN POLITICS

(By Brian Miller)

As a citizen of the United States it is my duty to defend the Constitution of this democracy and its treasured ideals of freedom of press, speech, religion, and assembly. As a new voter in American politics I feel that it is not only my privilege and right to vote, but a challenge and responsibility which I should uphold, selecting the best candidate, with an open mind.

Attributed to Amendment 26, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, which gave citizens of the United States who are eighteen years of age or older the right to vote, the number of persons eligible to vote increased by several million. However, only a small percentage of the eighteen to twenty-one age bracket registered to vote, and still fewer of those who registered, eventually voted.

In conjunction with Amendment 26, Section 1, there was a recent law passed which granted college students the right to vote in the area they resided while they were at college. I feel every student should take advantage of this, and if I further my education, I intend to register and vote while at college.

Frequently echoed excuses for neglecting to vote are, "My vote doesn't count anyway,"

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

or "I don't have time to vote." These are simply lame rhetoric for apathetic individuals. Then many times these individuals are dissatisfied with the government, when actually they have no right to complain. This is an irresponsible and ridiculous attitude to have, because if everyone held that same opinion, no one would vote and our democracy would crumble. Such an act on anyone's part displays not only a feeling of unconcern and disinterest, but disloyalty to the United States.

I hope as a new voter that I will be able to fulfill my right as a citizen and a voter and do my part and participate in every election. I also intend to encourage my peers and other persons to do their part and appear at the polls. I will not force my opinions, trying to convince other people that my views are best, for I realize that other people have different beliefs and I respect them for that. Albert Einstein said, "My political ideal is democracy. Everyone should be respected as an individual, but no one idolized."¹

Actual voting will necessitate an open mind, causing me to disregard all propaganda and unfounded opinions presented. My thoughts may be guided by other persons, but not totally persuaded by anyone. It will be my obligation to select who I think is most qualified for his or her office and who will be able to perform his responsibilities to the best of his capability, regardless of the political party he supports. Usually the best candidate will be elected; E. B. White stated, "Democracy is the recurrent suspicion that more than half of the people are right more than half of the time."²

After the election is completed and the ballots are tabulated, it is then my duty to support the newly elected and his policies and try to work for the betterment of society. Many times people oppose the elected official simply because he is of a different political party. This narrow-mindedness is a detrimental factor. In spite of what may have taken place in troubled Washington, D.C., I feel that the American people should support President Nixon until concrete proof of wrongdoing is a matter of public record. Not only did lack of support during the Watergate issue disgrace the President, but it disgraced the country as a whole.

Voting will not only be a new experience for me, but a chance to express my feelings in the outside world. This new responsibility will be a major contributor in my maturation from childhood to adulthood. Voting may mean the difference between asking one's parents for permission to do something or actually doing it myself. It will help me to establish self-confidence to face life's trials.

In short, it is every United States citizen's responsibility to register and continue voting, but this is especially true of all people eighteen years of age. Regardless of race, color, or creed, everyone should seriously think with an open mind about who he or she will vote for and then select the most capable candidate. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "Never in the history of the world has a nation lost its democracy by a successful struggle to defend its democracy."³ If we keep this in mind and remember Winston Churchill's definition of democracy, our democracy should remain for many years. He said, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, still remains the sovereign definition of democracy."⁴

FOOTNOTES

¹ The Great Quotations, Seldes, George (pg. 264).

² The World Book Encyclopedia Vol. D, Democracy, (pg. 104).

³ The World Book Encyclopedia Vol. D, Democracy, (pg. 104).

⁴ The World Book Encyclopedia Vol. D, Democracy, (pg. 104).

WHAT A PROFESSOR LEARNED WHEN HE BECAME A "COP"

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report carried one of the most informative and courageous articles that I have seen in a long time.

As an ex-police officer, I have been aware of a creditability gap between the working policeman and the university researchers. Neither camp really knew the other and neither really trusted the other.

Professor Kirkham bridged that gap and truly deserves the thanks of every police officer in this Nation and of every researcher in the field of criminology.

This brilliant professor had the courage to test his convictions on the field of battle. In so doing, theory was tied to practice and both sides of the law enforcement community learned a valuable lesson.

I think Members of Congress might also gain a very important insight to our national problems in law enforcement. I urge each Member to carefully read Dr. George L. Kirkham's brilliant article that I am herewith including in the RECORD:

WHAT A PROFESSOR LEARNED WHEN HE BECAME A "COP"

(By Dr. George L. Kirkham)

INTRODUCTION

(As assistant professor in Florida State University's school of criminology, Dr. George L. Kirkham wanted to study law enforcement at first hand. So he took a leave of absence, attended a police academy and became, temporarily, a patrolman in the 800-man police force of Jacksonville-Duval County, Fla. In this report, reprinted with permission from the "FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin" of March, 1974, Dr. Kirkham tells how his experiences as a patrolman altered some of his ideas about the police, criminals and the victims of crime.)

Persons such as myself, members of the academic community, have traditionally been quick to find fault with the police.

From isolated incidents reported in the various news media, we have fashioned for ourselves a stereotyped image of the police officer. . . . We see the brutal cop, the racist cop, the grafting cop, the discourteous cop. What we do not see, however, is the image of thousands of dedicated men and women struggling against almost impossible odds to preserve our society and everything in it which we cherish.

For some years, first as a student and later as a professor of criminology, I found myself troubled by the fact that most of us who write books and articles on the police have never been policemen ourselves. . . . I decided to take up this challenge: I would become a policeman myself. . . .

As I write this, I have completed over 100 tours of duty as a patrolman. Although still a rookie officer, so much has happened in the short space of six months that I will never again be either the same man or the same scientist who stood in front of the station on that first day. . . .

I had always personally been of the opinion that police officers greatly exaggerate the amount of verbal disrespect and physical abuse to which they are subjected in the line of duty. . . . As a college professor, I had grown accustomed to being treated with uniform respect and deference by those I encountered. I somehow naively assumed that this same quality of respect would carry over into my new role as a policeman. . . .

I quickly found that my badge and uniform, rather than serving to shield me from such things as disrespect and violence, only acted as a magnet which drew me toward many individuals who hated what I represented. . . .

Several hours into my first evening on the streets, my partner and I were dispatched to a bar in the downtown area to handle a disturbance complaint. Inside, we encountered a large and boisterous drunk who was arguing with the bartender and loudly refusing to leave.

As someone with considerable experience as a correctional counselor and mental-health worker, I hastened to take charge of the situation. "Excuse me, sir," I smiled pleasantly at the drunk, "but I wonder if I could ask you to step outside and talk with me for a minute?"

The man stared at me through bloodshot eyes in disbelief for a second, raising one hand to scratch the stubble of several days' growth of beard. Then suddenly, without warning, it happened: He swung at me, luckily missing my face and striking me on the right shoulder.

I couldn't believe it. What on earth had I done to provoke such a reaction? Before I could recover from my startled condition, he swung again—this time tearing my whistle chain from a shoulder epaulet. After a brief struggle, we had the still-shouting, cursing man locked in the back of our cruiser. I stood there, breathing heavily with my hair in my eyes as I surveyed the damage to my new uniform and looked in bewilderment at my partner, who only smiled and slapped me affectionately on my back.

"Something is very wrong," I remember thinking to myself in the front seat as we headed for the jail. I had used the same kind of gentle, rapport-building approach with countless offenders in prison and probation settings. It had always worked so well there.

What was so different about being a policeman? In the days and weeks which followed, I was to learn the answer to this question the hard way. As a university professor, I had always sought to convey to students the idea that it is a mistake to exercise authority, to make decisions for other people or rely upon orders and commands to accomplish something.

As a police officer myself, I was forced time and again to do just that. For the first time in my life, I encountered individuals who interpreted kindness as weakness, as an invitation to disrespect or violence. I encountered men, women and children who, in fear, desperation or excitement, looked to the person behind my blue uniform and shield for guidance, control and direction. As someone who had always condemned the exercise of authority, the acceptance of myself as an unavoidable symbol of authority came as a bitter lesson.

I found that there was a world of difference between encountering individuals, as I had, in mental-health or correctional settings and facing them as the patrolman must: when they are violent, hysterical, desperate. When I put the uniform of a police officer on, I lost the luxury of sitting in an air-conditioned office with my pipe and books, calmly dis-

cussing with a rapist or armed robber the past problems which had led him into trouble with the law.

Such offenders had seemed so innocent, so harmless in the sterile setting of prison. The often-terrible crimes which they had committed were long since past, reduced like their victims to so many printed words on a page.

Now, as a police officer, I began to encounter the offender for the first time as a very real menace to my personal safety and the security of our society. The felon was no longer a harmless figure sitting in blue denims across my prison desk, a "victim" of society to be treated with compassion and leniency. He became an armed robber fleeing from the scene of a crime, a crazed maniac threatening his family with a gun, someone who might become my killer crouched behind the wheel of a car on a dark street.

Like crime itself, fear quickly ceased to be an impersonal and abstract thing. It became something which I regularly experienced. It was a tightness in my stomach as I approached a warehouse where something had tripped a silent alarm. I could taste it as a dryness in my mouth as we raced with blue lights and siren toward the site of a "Signal Zero" (armed and dangerous) call. For the first time in my life, I came to know—as every policeman knows—the true meaning of fear . . .

I recall particularly a dramatic lesson in the meaning of fear which took place shortly after I joined the force. My partner and I were on routine patrol one Saturday evening in a deteriorated area of cheap bars and pool halls when we observed a young male double-parked in the middle of the street. I pulled alongside and asked him in a civil manner to either park or drive on, whereupon he began cursing us and shouting that we couldn't make him go anywhere.

An angry crowd began to gather as we got out of our patrol car and approached the man, who was by this time shouting that we were harassing him and calling to bystanders for assistance. As a criminology professor, some months earlier I would have urged that the police officer who was now myself simply leave the car double-parked and move on rather than risk an incident.

As a policeman, however, I had come to realize that an officer can never back down from his responsibility to enforce the law. Whatever the risk to himself, every police officer understands that his ability to back up the lawful authority which he represents is the only thing which stands between civilization and the jungle of lawlessness.

The man continued to curse us and adamantly refused to move his car. As we placed him under arrest and attempted to move him to our cruiser, an unidentified male and female rushed from the crowd which was steadily enlarging and sought to free him. In the ensuing struggle, a hysterical female unsnapped and tried to grab my service revolver, and the now-angry mob began to converge on us.

Suddenly, I was no longer an "Ivory-tower" scholar watching typical police "over-reaction" to a street incident—but I was part of it and fighting to remain alive and uninjured. I remember the sickening sensation of cold terror which filled my insides as I struggled to reach our car radio. I simultaneously put out a distress call and pressed the hidden electric release button on our shotgun rack as my partner sought to maintain his grip on the prisoner and hold the crowd at bay with his revolver.

How harshly I would have judged the officer who now grabbed the shotgun only a few months before. I rounded the rear of our cruiser with the weapon and shouted at the mob to move back. The memory flashed through my mind that I had always argued that policemen should not be allowed to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

carry shotguns because of their "offensive" character and the potential damage to community relations as a result of their display.

How readily as a criminology professor I would have condemned the officer who was now myself, trembling with fear and anxiety and menacing an "unarmed" assembly with an "offensive" weapon. But circumstances had dramatically changed my perspective, for now it was my life and safety that were in danger, my wife and child who might be mourned. Not "a policeman" or Patrolman Smith—but me, George Kirkham!

I felt accordingly bitter when I saw the individual who had provoked this near riot back on the streets the next night, laughing as though our charge of "resisting arrest with violence" was a big joke. Like my partner, I found myself feeling angry and frustrated shortly afterward when this same individual was allowed to plead guilty to a reduced charge of "breach of peace."

As someone who had always been greatly concerned about the rights of offenders, I now began to consider for the first time the rights of police officers. As a police officer, I felt that my efforts to protect society and maintain my personal safety were menaced by many of the very court decisions and lenient parole-board actions I had always been eager to defend.

An educated man, I could not answer the questions of my fellow officers as to why those who kill and maim policemen, men who are involved in no less honorable an activity than holding our society together, should so often be subjected to minor penalties. I grew weary of carefully following difficult legal restrictions while thugs and hoodlums consistently twisted the law to their own advantage.

I remember standing in the street one evening and reading a heroin pusher his rights, only to have him convulse with laughter halfway through and finish reciting them word for word, from memory. He had been given his "rights" under the law, but what about the rights of those who were the victims of people like himself? For the first time, questions such as these began to bother me.

As a corrections worker and someone raised in a comfortable middle-class home, I had always been insulated from the kind of human misery and tragedy which become part of the policeman's everyday life. Now, the often-terrible sights, sounds and smells of my job began to haunt me hours after I had taken the blue uniform and badge off.

In my new role as a police officer, I found that the victims of crime ceased to be impersonal statistics. As a corrections worker and criminology professor, I had never given much thought to those who are victimized by criminals in our society. Now the sight of so many lives ruthlessly damaged and destroyed by the perpetrators of crime left me preoccupied with the question of society's responsibility to protect the men, women and children who are victimized daily.

The same kinds of daily stresses which affected my fellow officers soon began to take their toll on me. I became sick and tired of being reviled and attacked by criminals who could usually find a most sympathetic audience in judges and jurors eager to understand their side of things and provide them with "another chance." I grew tired of living under the ax of news media and community pressure groups, eager to seize upon the slightest mistake made by myself or a fellow police officer.

As a criminology professor, I had always enjoyed the luxury of having great amounts of time in which to make difficult decisions. As a police officer, however, I found myself forced to make the most-critical choices in a time frame of seconds rather than days; to shoot or not to shoot, to arrest or not to arrest, to give chase or let go—always with

the nagging certainty that others, those with great amounts of time in which to analyze and think, stood ready to judge and condemn me for whatever action I might take or fail to take . . .

I found myself progressively awed by the complexity of tasks faced by men whose work I once thought was fairly simple and straightforward. Indeed, I would like to take the average clinical psychologist or psychiatrist and invite him to function for just a day in the world of the policeman, to confront people whose problems are both serious and in need of immediate solution. I would invite him to walk, as I have, into a smoke-filled pool room where five or six angry men are swinging cues at one another. I would like the prison counselor and parole officer to see their client, Jones—not calm and composed in an office setting but as the street cop sees him: beating his small child with a heavy belt buckle, or kicking his pregnant wife.

I wish that they, and every judge and juror in our country, could see the ravages of crime as the cop on the beat must: innocent people cut, shot, beaten, raped, robbed and murdered. It would, I feel certain, give them a different perspective on crime and criminals, just as it has me.

For all the human misery and suffering which police officers must witness in their work, I found myself amazed at the incredible humanity and compassion which seems to characterize most of them. My own stereotypes of the brutal, sadistic cop were time and again shattered by the sight of humanitarian kindness on the part of the thin blue line . . .

As a police officer, I found myself repeatedly surprised at the ability of my fellow patrolmen to withstand the often-enormous daily pressures of their work. Long hours, frustration, danger and anxiety—all seemed to be taken in stride as just part of the reality of being a cop. I went eventually through the humbling discovery that I, like the men in blue with whom I worked, was simply a human being with definite limits to the amount of stress I could endure in a given period of time.

I recall in particular one evening when this point was dramatized to me. It had been a long, hard shift—one which ended with a high-speed chase of a stolen car in which we narrowly escaped serious injury when another vehicle pulled in front of our patrol car.

As we checked off duty, I was vaguely aware of feeling tired and tense. My partner and I were headed for a restaurant and a bite of breakfast when we both heard the unmistakable sound of breaking glass coming from a church and spotted two long-haired teenage boys running from the area. We confronted them, and I asked one for identification, displaying my own police identification. He sneered at me, cursed and turned to walk away.

The next thing I knew I had grabbed the youth by his shirt and spun him around, shouting, "I'm talking to you, punk!" I had my partner's arm on my shoulder and heard his reassuring voice behind me, "Take it easy, Doc!" I released my grip on the adolescent and stood silently for several seconds, unable to accept the inescapable reality that I had "lost my cool."

My mind flashed back to a lecture during which I had told my students, "Any man who is not able to maintain absolute control of his emotions at all times has no business being a police officer." . . .

As a police officer myself, I found that society demands too much of its policemen: not only are they expected to enforce the law but to be curbside psychiatrists, marriage counselors, social workers and even ministers and doctors . . .

I have often asked myself the questions:

"Why does a man become a cop? What makes him stay with it?" . . . The only answer to this question I have been able to arrive at is one based on my own limited experience as a policeman. Night after night, I came home and took off the badge and blue uniform with a sense of satisfaction and contribution to society that I have never known in any other job. . . .

For too long now, we in America's colleges and universities have conveyed to young men and women the subtle message that there is somehow something wrong with "being a cop." It's time for that to stop.

MAIL, TELEPHONES, AND MONOPOLY

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in the past 3 years since the Post Office Department was transformed into the Postal Service, we have not been rewarded with the improvements which were promised when the Postal Reorganization Act was passed. Instead, we have been treated to deteriorating services and rate increases which leave the current inflation in the dust.

Even the Board of Governors of the Postal Service acknowledges that it cannot meet the postal needs of the Nation. In response to the congressional requirement that they study and reevaluate the restrictions on the private carriage of letters, the Board refused to recommend any changes in the private express statutes, but admitted that the public interest required that they be suspended in some cases "to make lawful a needed service, by private firms, which is not generally available from the Postal Service."

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1233, which would remove the Postal Service from this embarrassing position by repealing the private express statutes. A recent broadcast of the National Educational Television program, "The Advocates," presented arguments for and against such repeal. Our able colleague, Mr. CRANE, of Illinois, presented the arguments for repeal, while the defense of the postal monopoly fell to a member of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, Mr. UDALL. With all respect to the knowledge and ability of the gentleman from Arizona, I believe the audience vote will bear out my belief that Mr. CRANE had the sounder case to begin with and presented it most effectively. I hope that we may look forward to a repeat performance soon in this chamber.

A recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune commented on the television debate, and pointed out that there are many similarities between the postal monopoly and the Bell Telephone system, although many people have sharply different attitudes toward the two. The editorial concludes:

Neither mail users nor telephone users are likely to get the best possible service as long as bureaucrats and self-styled liberals insist that the post office and the telephone company should live by different rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I would like to commend this editorial of March 31, 1974, to the attention of my colleagues, and wish to congratulate Mr. CRANE for his very effective presentation of this important issue:

MAIL, TELEPHONES, AND MONOPOLY

Last Sunday's National Educational Television program, The Advocates, shown here on WTTW, was devoted to the question of whether to repeal the law giving the Postal Service a monopoly in the handling of first-class mail.

The pros and cons are familiar enough. Illinois' conservative Republican congressman, Philip Crane, argued in favor of repeal on the ground that free competition is the secret of America's success and that where the post office has faced competition [as in the carrying of parcels,] the privately run operation has often provided better and cheaper service than the post office.

Rep. Morris Udall, a liberal Democrat from Arizona, defended the government monopoly on the ground that private competitors would skim off the cream of the business and leave the post office to handle the unprofitable mail out in the boondocks, thus forcing rates to go up even faster in rural areas than they are going to anyway.

We agree with Mr. Crane, of course. A government monopoly is the surest guarantee of sluggish inefficiency, and this proved so true of the old Post Office Department that it was converted into a quasi-government monopoly called the Postal Service—without, so far, any conspicuous improvement.

This isn't to say that there isn't some validity to Mr. Udall's fears. Free competition inevitably means that prices will vary according to costs, and the cost of delivering a local letter in Chicago is obviously lower than carrying one from Pippa Passes, Ky., to Nunapitchuk, Alaska. But Mr. Udall's objections would be more persuasive if his fellow liberal Democrats—and he himself, for all we know—weren't so busy sniping at the Bell Telephone system precisely because it is a monopoly.

The argument for monopoly is at least as valid in the telephone business as it is in the mail business, and to its credit the Bell system has done a better job of improving service and holding down prices than the post office. Over the years, it has stubbornly resisted every effort to erode its monopoly position.

But today it is facing competition in the form of microwave relay services authorized by the Federal Communications Commission to handle private line business service between big cities such as Chicago and St. Louis. The Bell system has realistically resigned itself to the need to face competition. But what it faces at the moment is not free competition; it is competition manipulated

A federal court in Philadelphia has ordered Bell to allow these new, specialized competitors to connect with its existing lines, and an appeal from this order will be heard on April 2. Meanwhile the FCC has dillied and dallied over Bell's request to adjust its private-line prices so that they will more closely reflect cost. That would mean lowering them on heavily used routes, thus meeting the competition, and raising them on less used routes.

In short, the Bell system is being forced to meet and perhaps even to assist competition, yet prevented from doing precisely what its critics argue that the post office would have to do if it were to face competition; namely, adjust its rates to reflect actual unit costs. And the irony is that if competitors are allowed to siphon off the busy, profitable routes, and perhaps ultimately to branch into other types of service, the telephone rates on less used lines are going to have to go up anyway.

The consumer fares best when competition

April 23, 1974

is truly free, not under the sort of protective custody administered by government agencies in the name of competition but in practice more likely to protect some companies from the consumer. And neither mail users nor telephone users are likely to get the best possible service as long as bureaucrats and self-styled liberals insist that the post office and the telephone company should live by different rules.

SENATOR CLARK ADDRESSES COALITION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable DICK CLARK of the other body, who is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Rural Development, addressed a luncheon meeting of the Coalition for Rural Development. His comments are an excellent review of many of the matters that are of concern to those of us interested in comprehensive development in the countryside.

I offer the Senator from Iowa's remarks for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time and commend them to our colleagues for consideration:

SENATOR DICK CLARK'S REMARKS PREPARED FOR COALITION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT LUNCHEON, THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1974

Although I am an optimist by nature, it would be safe to say that when it comes to the subject of rural development, I am an unhappy and dissatisfied man.

I am not altogether naive—I was once a Congressional assistant—but I had a rather unusual thought: that when Congress passed a law, the Executive department made sure that it was carried out.

Despite what the civics books say, that has not been the case with the Rural Development Act of 1972, and you all know it better than most people.

All of us know that there are start-up problems with any new legislation. All of us know that the Rural Development Service has had staffing problems, that the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Forest Service have been hampered by staff and money cutbacks.

And all of us have been sympathetic with these problems. We have attempted to hold rural development oversight hearings in a non-partisan manner, and we told Assistant Secretary Irwin that we would delay the hearings for a while to permit his staff time to get the business and community-facility loan programs started.

I do want to say that I have found Secretary Irwin and his staff to be congenial and cooperative. And there is no question of their commitment to rural development. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the administration as a whole.

The Rural Development Subcommittee agreed to postpone oversight hearings, but we did not agree to abandon the commitment to rural development.

As of March 1st, the Department had requests for 1,540 business and industrial loans. As of April 5th, only 31 have been approved. As of March 1st, there were 235 requests for \$77.8 million in loans for essential community facilities, but as of April 5th, only seven loans had been made. There is a small appropriation of \$10 million for grants for industrialization support facilities in the

Act. So far, there have been 134 requests for this money, but, to date, only five grants have been made. And all of this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Under the law, every business and industrial loan and grant request must be sent to the Department of Labor for certification that a new project is not taking jobs from one place only to put them in another place. The Labor Department arranged with the Economic Development Administration to handle a part of this work, but it did not see fit to reimburse EDA for its expenses on the work—so the applications just sat there. No one worked on them.

When it comes to rural development, all we ever seem to hear is: "We can't do this, we can't do that. Because of this problem and that problem."

All of this shows that after almost two years, there has been virtually no significant benefit to the people of rural America under the Rural Development Act. I can understand the argument for easing into the build-up period—but not at this rate.

There's an agency in the Agriculture Department—with dedicated people—and there are programs on paper. But that's not the real test of legislation. The real test is the beneficial impact and effect of the legislation on people, on farms, on rural towns and communities. And by that standard, the Rural Development Act has not succeeded.

This government is the most powerful single institution in the world. Excuses will not work. Let me give you an example of what can be done, even by a reluctant administration: Several years ago, Senator George Aiken, a distinguished Republican, proposed the rural water and sewer program. He was vigorously opposed by the Democratic administration, then in the White House. But Senator Aiken won that battle, and he was invited to the White House for a bill-signing ceremony. The following day, the Senator was flown aboard Air Force One to Vermont, to preside over the ground-breaking of the first rural water and sewer plant.

The administration originally opposed the measure. No regulations were written. There was no appropriation. They just got the job done.

There is no need to mention, I suppose, the efforts of this administration to take steps toward the elimination of Senator Aiken's vital program.

The contrast between action and inaction, commitment and excuses is clear. And it is no wonder that the people of this country look at the government as some sort of inept giant . . . making promises which it does not fulfill.

On May 8 and 9, my subcommittee on rural development will resume its hearings to try to get the grants funded on rural development. Let me review some of the things we plan to look into:

First and foremost, we will want to consider the quality of implementation of the Rural Development Act, and the plans for implementation during fiscal 1975.

I have asked the General Accounting Office—the investigative arm of Congress—to do an evaluation of the regulations under Title One and Title Five of the Act. Senator Bellmon has asked GAO for a similar analysis on Section 603. So we're going to be ready to discuss these areas with the Department spokesmen when they come to testify.

We also will want to discuss with the Assistant Secretary the proposed budget for fiscal 1975, and the plans of Farmers Home to shift its emphasis to housing rehabilitation rather than housing construction.

As you all know by now, the President has sent the public works committees a new Economic Adjustment Act. Where this proposal would affect rural development we will

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

examine it during the hearings for its good points and its bad points. For my own part, I see little need at this time to abandon EDA, which is one of the best functioning programs in the government.

The Executive Committee of the National Governors Conference has offered its own development proposal. It calls for wall-to-wall regional agencies, modeled somewhat after the Appalachian program and backed up by multi-county planning and development agencies and multi-district agencies. We will take a close look at this plan.

I think all of us have been concerned in the back of our minds about what long-term effect the energy crisis will have on rural economic development. For example, you probably know that Mr. Guntharp has asked the Economic Research Service for a report on this. And I have sent 12 pages of questions on this subject to USDA and to the Federal Energy Office. When this material is returned, I plan to combine it with a report on the environment and rural development, being prepared by the Congressional Research Service, and a report on energy and rural development being put together by the National Area Development Institute. This should constitute an important committee print.

Incidentally, we now have three committee prints at GPO. There is one on rural industrialization—in addition to being a how-to manual, it also talks about problems and promises associated with rural industrial development. Secondly, there's a print pending on the use of the land and its relationship to rural development. This one is heavily oriented toward agriculture and the ability of land use planning to protect agricultural and forested acreage. Finally, we are complementing the two prints on the problems of moving things in rural areas with a print on moving people—print on rural transportation. The full committee also is reprinting the recent transportation report submitted to Congress by USDA. I hope that you have these reprints and use them.

But back to our hearing. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act authorizes the continuation and merger of many different manpower development and training programs. I want to ask the Department of Labor how they intend to provide manpower service to rural Americans, and how they intend to replace existing programs for public service employment for older rural workers under Title Nine of the Older Americans Act of 1973. What will happen to operation Green Thumb? What will happen to concerted in-service training and education?

The administration's actions under these programs is a source of great concern. As a matter of fact, when the manpower program was proposed for Lexington, Kentucky, and the surrounding rural areas, the state ruled that the money only could be spent in the metropolitan Lexington area. If this is the case nationwide, we've got a real problem, and we'll ask about this as well.

Naturally, we strongly urge the coalition and its members to testify on any subject which might have any relevance to the broad area of rural development.

In conclusion, let me tick off some issues all of us should be watching.

Rural health is one of the biggest. We haven't come close to solving the problem. But we have made a beginning—the new law setting up health maintenance organizations. 30 percent of these HMOs will be rural. But that's only a beginning. Like the weather, rural health care is something everybody discusses, but few can do anything about. It is an issue that has surfaced again this year, one in which all of us have a vital stake.

As the Senate and House of Representatives begin debate on proposals for a new or

drastically revised health care system, we have to ask ourselves one question: will the Congress recognize the special needs and problems of our rural populations?

As a nation, we have failed miserably to protect the health of people in rural areas. The health services that generally are available are not only inadequate in coverage, but deficient in quality. What we find in rural America in the area of health care is not what is needed or desired, but rather what has been left behind. One health expert put it best when he said: "Rural health conditions in this country today are the heritage of decades of indifference."

The problems of health care in rural areas are complex, serious, and above all persistent. The health care crisis experienced by the entire nation—in terms of poor access to services, shortages of manpower and high costs—are severely aggravated in rural America.

We know that:

Rural areas are isolated from centers of care;

Fewer and fewer doctors tend to locate in rural communities; and

The health needs of rural populations are greater than those in metropolitan areas.

As a nation, we must have the courage and the strength to make the commitment to make rural health care what it should be and what it can be in this country.

The economic and social conditions in rural America have had a profound impact on the health of its people. Poverty is a dominant theme in rural life. One of every six rural persons is poor, and, as we all know, if you're poor, access to health care is more difficult. It's harder to locate health care, harder to reach it, and harder to pay for it. And poverty also means greater susceptibility to ill health.

Even rural Americans who are not poor have great difficulty obtaining adequate health services. The more rural a county, the more inadequate its health services are likely to be. Sparse populations make it difficult for rural communities to compete with metropolitan areas. High and rapidly-spiraling costs of modern medical equipment and services only serve to increase the disadvantage.

The shortage of physicians is most severe in non-metropolitan communities. In Iowa, half the state's doctors are located in the six most populated counties. And in one-fourth of Iowa's counties, there is not one specialist. Nationwide, more than 87 percent of all physicians in medical specialties are located in metropolitan areas.

The distribution of dentists in rural areas tells the same story—rural America is not getting its fair share. While it may be safe to say that there is neither a shortage of hospitals nor hospital beds in rural areas, that doesn't tell the full story. The adequacy of hospital care cannot be measured solely in numbers. Rural hospitals are usually smaller, more often inadequately staffed, poorly equipped, and lacking out-patient and extended-care facilities. Add to these factors the special characteristics of rural populations, and you come out with a very grim picture.

In rural areas, infant mortality rates are higher. The incidence of chronic conditions and work-related injuries are greater than in urban areas. Heart disease, asthma and diabetes—conditions which cause the greatest drain on family finances—are clearly more prevalent in rural areas. Rural people have almost twice as many activity-limiting illnesses as urban population, and rural men employed in blue collar jobs have the highest rate of work-related injuries in the nation.

The health problems of rural America are readily apparent and terribly complex. In extremely isolated areas, there may be no ambulance, no hospital, no doctor, no help at all. The solutions to these problems will

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

not occur overnight. They will take years and years of the combined efforts of thousands of individuals, communities and institutions.

Within the next few years, possibly even this year, the nation can anticipate some form of national health insurance. Ten major plans have been proposed in the 93rd Congress so far, and they represent widely varying and divergent viewpoints. None, however, in my opinion, deal adequately with the unique health problems of rural America. Indeed, a number of them ignore the problem entirely.

As a group that represents the best interests of rural America, you can and should play a major role in shaping national health insurance legislation. Representative Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, will be holding hearings later this month and next month on this issue. He has invited a number of public witnesses, and I can think of no better forum for our voices to be heard. We need to express the interests of rural citizens to ensure that "the decade of indifference" end. That way, we'll make sure that this is a nation that lives up to its principles—and a nation that is stronger because of that conviction.

But rural health is only the beginning of the unfinished business that faces us. There has been a great deal of parochialism expressed about the energy crisis—will major rural development tend to gravitate to the energy-rich states? What effects are 75 and 85-cent-a-gallon gasoline prices going to have on the rural poor?

And what about agriculture? What will be the effects of inflation and shortages on the cost of production, a cost that rose 17 percent last year? The Farm Credit Administration predicts it will go up 15 or 20 percent more this year. We must insure that farmers get fair and reasonable prices for their labor, and we must see that the housewife is able to get abundant food at fair prices.

In that light, I am very concerned about the ability of the transportation system to move crops to market this year and in years to come, especially if railroads are allowed to abandon lines indiscriminately.

Following on the heels of the energy crisis, we can expect to see growing shortages of non-renewable raw materials. It will require some significant switch-overs in technology and the American way of living, now epitomized in many respects by the garbage disposal and trash masher. We will have to apply the ancient art of husbandry throughout our society. We will have to turn problems like animal and human wastes into assets such as fertilizer and methane gas.

If you hadn't noticed, the Environmental Protection Agency is making millions of dollars more in sewer grants in rural areas than the FHA, and EPA does not see sewer systems as tools for development. What effects will this have on rural development? I'm not sure.

Now, let me say a final word on housing. The House should adopt the rural provisions of the Senate-passed housing bill. Senator Hathaway did a fine job for rural people in this legislation, and I hope that this good work can be preserved on the House floor. This bill represents a major breakthrough for dealing with housing the rural poor. It must be enacted.

More importantly, it must be repeated in many other areas—in job training, in health care, in education. The farms and small towns of this country have made a very significant contribution to the success and prosperity of America. In return for that contribution, they have a right to expect more than the inadequate health care, the inadequate educational assistance, and the indifference of government that they have been receiving.

I think Congress can make a difference. I think you can make a difference. Whatever the outcome, the cause is well worth the effort.

JIM JONES OF SACRAMENTO—
IN LOVE WITH A RIVER

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to one of the microcosm component sparkplugs that makes things happen in the American conservation program. Because Sierra Club had a thing about redwoods, we have the Redwood National Park. The late Representative Clem Miller in large part produced the Point Reyes National Seashore. Every wilderness area in the country has a similar cause and effecting force.

In Sacramento, Calif., if future generations fall heir to 1,500 second feet of water for a thousand recreation purposes on the American River, they can thank Jim Jones, a Sacramento aerospace engineer in large part.

Jim's efforts for the river were catalogued by George Medovoy in the Sacramento Union last week as follows:

IN LOVE WITH A RIVER, HE EVEN FISHES
WITH VIGOR

(By George Medovoy)

"He jumped in with both feet," says a friend.

And that seems to be the only way James Jones would have had it when he joined the Save the American River Association (SARA) in 1969.

In a very real sense, it is Jones' style—determined, aggressive.

"He hates to sit around and talk," says James C. Mullaney, the founding president of SARA. "He meets the problem head on. There's no dilly-dallying. He gets to the point."

"He plans ahead, talks to people to find out the best avenues, and then he doggedly pursues. He's been good for the organization."

Jones, who has been president of SARA since 1971, agreed to meet me at Aerojet-General Corporation's facility just east of Rancho Cordova, where he is employed as an engineering specialist in structural and systems dynamics.

An aura of secrecy greets you at Aerojet's Gate 3. In a sense it seems ironic that someone who loves the out-of-doors as much as Jones does could be happy inside Aerojet's complex of buildings.

Jones walked into a reception office and suggested nearby Lake Natoma as a place to talk. Once at the lake, he grew more relaxed, sitting down under a tall tree near the water.

"This is one of my favorite spots," he says. "I like to come here whenever I can. It's a way I have of being by myself."

Nearby, two people were fishing—sedentary souls content to lounge in their deck chairs and wait for the fish to bite. As a fisherman himself, Jones doesn't consider that exactly his cup of tea.

In between his work at Aerojet and the time he puts in for SARA (the latter often amounting to 30 hours per week), Jones likes to fill his spare moments with what he calls a natural high—leisure activities providing exhilaration and an opportunity to test yourself.

"Steelhead fishing is something I love to do," he says. "Normally, the fishing for steelhead occurs in the worst time of year; you have to stand for long periods of time in cold water."

"But the hooking of the steelhead and the

April 23, 1974

fighting of the steelhead is one of these natural highs that has to be experienced to be believed. A lot of people don't like fishing because they get bored with it. . . . They picture the fisherman as the guy sitting in the chair and they want to be active.

"Well, I couldn't sit in a chair with a pole either for very long, unless that's my objective. If my primary objective is just to go and rest, I can do that just as well with a pole in my hand."

"But when I go fishing, my idea is to do what I can to catch a fish. And the act of hooking and playing a steelhead—a fresh-run steelhead—is one of the most exhilarating things I can think of."

Rafting down the south fork of the American River is also something Jones gets excited about.

"It's the kind of thing you can go a long way on the memories of," he says.

Another clear symbol of his leisure style is his practice of swimming across Lake Natoma in the summer.

And his objective in doing so, he explains, is to push himself to the limits of his endurance. Not in a masochistic way, but to do the best you can—a practice that probably dates back to his high school track days when he ran the mile.

So firm is Jones in this conviction that there are some things he won't do if he doesn't have enough time to do them. Like playing bridge, or bowling, or skiing.

"It's not the kind of thing I want to do on a casual basis," he says. "It's the kind of thing, if I do it, I want to do it right and I want to do it well. I used to play a lot of bridge, but I don't really play it much anymore because it drives me crazy to play bridge socially."

"Bridge is a thinking game. It's not a luck game, and when I'm with friends and I'm socializing, I want to be with friends and I want to socialize."

"So, I want to play a silly game like tripoli or hearts, or some game like that as opposed to bridge, because when I start playing bridge it becomes a different kind of thing. It becomes a challenge, you know, a mental challenge. . . ."

"It's that I don't like doing things poorly, and I know that I can't really be having a good time with my friends and playing a good game of bridge at the same time."

But Jones, of course, does manage to find time to swim across Lake Natoma. It's a distance of about a quarter of a mile, and anyone who is familiar with the lake will tell you it's cold even in the summer.

Jones admits it may be breaking all rules of safety, but it's the satisfying feeling he gets that counts.

"When I'm out in the middle," he says, "I sometimes stop and I feel, like man, nobody can get at you. This part of the river will never be popular because it's so cold."

Jones usually swims to a little island about halfway between two shores and rests there for about five minutes.

"There usually isn't anyone around," he says. "It's kind of pleasant. One of the nice things about the American River and Sacramento is that you can get the feeling you're all by yourself."

"To a certain extent, everybody needs that—to be totally by yourself sometimes. You need that aloneness to adjust to the 99 per cent of the time you're with people and all the frustration that entails."

Jones isn't prepared to call his swims across Lake Natoma a natural high, but he feels it sets you apart somewhat, and you're testing yourself.

"I'm not doing it to show other people how good I am," he says. "What I'm doing is to test myself. . . . It provides a bit of an exhilaration when I can for the last hundred yards straight be swimming as hard and strong (as that). . . ."

Towards the end of the summer, Jones can swim flat out for at least 100 yards. And

the resulting feeling, he relates, is like lifting yourself out of the water.

"Yeah," he says, "that's a good feeling—to be able to do that all the way in, and push yourself, to be right on the limits of (being) completely exhausted, but having been able to do it."

Jones also likes to hunt deer, although he doesn't get much time for the activity.

When he does, however, his idea is to put a pack on his back and hike into an area where he is likely to find deer.

Ironically, Jones considers the actual act of pulling the trigger as anticlimactic.

As he puts it, "I wish I could do what I do many times in fishing. Fight the fight, win the battle, and say, 'Good fight,' and release the fish."

"I wish there was a way, and the only consolation is that my family and I just love venison. With meat prices being as high as they are, the venison this year was especially appreciated by everybody in the family."

Jones feels a lot of people consider it strange that he hunts. Their reasoning, he suggests, is that he's identified with environmentalists and conservationists.

But the SARA president has an answer for them.

First, he expresses his resentment because he doesn't like being boxed or categorized.

And then he focuses his analytical mind on the ecological ramifications of hunting.

"I feel that hunting, for instance, has a very definite place in the scheme of things," he says. "Under the circumstances that we have established for wildlife—and I'm speaking primarily of the destruction of habitat and the elimination of suitable places for wildlife—there's really only a finite capacity to support wildlife now."

"And that's something I think people don't understand very well. The 1973 situation that we have for wildlife has to be a controlled situation."

Jones was born in Detroit, Mich., on June 18, 1941.

But he doesn't remember anything about Detroit because when he was very young his family moved away to McHenry, Ill., a farming community of 2,000 about 50 miles northwest of Chicago.

That move may have been fateful for Jones.

His emotional attachment to the American River may be related to his childhood experiences in McHenry. He was able to fish, and there were long hikes through Cooney's Woods with his boyhood friends. Jones calls the woods "that wonderful, beautiful place which is now a subdivision for adults only."

Jones' parents were divorced when he was three years old. He and his sister grew up without a father figure until his early teens, when his mother remarried.

His foster father was a railroad clerk and his mother, a clerk for an insurance company.

Jones remembers that before his mother remarried she had to take care of the family on just \$40 a week, plus a little more from his father.

"We lived in very modest surroundings," he remembers. "For a while we lived in a tiny town outside of McHenry. We had a rented house and it had a canal behind it, and I used to fish in it."

"I certainly don't remember that it was a small house or a shabby house or anything like that."

"I just remember that there was a neat little canal behind the place that I could go fishing in. That's what I remember."

In McHenry, the family lived downtown in an upstairs apartment. And Jones recalls that in growing up he never had his own bedroom and always slept in the living room. When the family purchased its first fold-out bed, he considered it a step up for himself.

"But I don't remember it as a sad time," Jones emphasizes. "As poor as we were, our

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

living environment was rich . . . One of the reasons I turned out reasonably straight is that I had elbow room, room to breathe."

Jones went to St. Mary's Catholic School and then to a public high school, both of them in McHenry. He had dreams of becoming a pilot, but settled for the next best thing, which was aeronautical engineering.

Uppermost in his mind after graduation from high school was getting into the University of Notre Dame. But that was too expensive. A scholarship allowed him to attend the University of Illinois.

While he was a junior at the university, Jones married his high school sweetheart, Hildie. They were among the few couples in their high school class who managed to stay together.

Jones and his wife honeymooned at the edge of the Boundary Water Wilderness area of Minnesota and then went back as a graduation present.

The couple came to California in 1963 because of the lure of the aerospace industry and first settled in Rancho Cordova.

Jones' impression on arriving in California has stuck vividly in his mind. He says he felt depressed by what he saw of the urban sprawl and its lack of community identity. It had been different in the more cohesive atmosphere of rural Illinois.

Jones and his family now live in a home in Citrus Heights. Their dream is to be closer to the river at some time in the future.

Jones' wife was born in Germany and came to America when she was 11. She is both a housewife and a teacher's aide in the Distar School Program. The couple has three children—Mike, 10, Anita, 6, and Leslie, 5.

The family likes to bike together, and Jones and his son Mike have been hiking together.

"Mike wants to know when we can climb into Rubicon Canyon," says Jones.

Understandably, Jones' involvement in SARA takes him away from what he refers to as his fantastic family.

"But Hildie is very forgiving and very tolerant," he says, "of the time and inconvenience caused by it."

Jones' interest in SARA began almost suddenly one day while he was fishing. He had heard of plans to divert most of the American River's water to the Folsom-South Canal and then south.

"Then something just clicked, and I changed from a non-involved person and got involved," he says. "I'm a firm believer that things like Watergate, the American River problem and our national policies with regard to energy and power have evolved because the majority of the public has a lack of involvement."

"It's astounding to see how few people are aware who their elected representatives are. And I admit that I didn't know until I got involved in the (American River) flow issue."

"I'm convinced that it's the people's own damn fault if they get screwed up government if they don't even know enough to know who their person (in Congress) is, and how to get a hold of him when they've got a problem."

The biggest problem now facing the American River is the proposal to divert water south and the need for adequate guarantees being provided by Congress for maintaining the water level at 1,500 cubic feet per second.

Under diversion proposals, waters would be sent south into southern Sacramento County, San Joaquin County and, as some people believe, ultimately as far south as Bakersfield.

Conservationists, state fish and game biologists and county officials have voiced concern that any diversion take into account the need to provide minimum flows for the American River.

Ed Horton, acting regional director for the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, has indicated that the bureau recognizes the need for minimum flows.

"I think that we . . . generally concur," he says, "that to maintain the recreational values as well as the fisheries that this (1,000 to 1,500 cubic feet per second), would be a desirable bracket or range of flows."

SARA's stand in this controversy is not to oppose diverting the water, but to first secure a guarantee that the minimum flows would be no less than 1,500 cfs.

It believes it will be necessary to integrate a properly sized Hood-Clay connector in the Folsom-South Canal.

In the meantime, SARA has been successful in getting a delay on any more construction of the Folsom-South Canal for the next two years. While the delay is in force, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation is studying ways to insure minimum flows.

What worries Jones is that at the end of the two-year period the bureau will come up with a declaration that minimum flows should be provided but nothing more will be done.

Jones wants to see no further construction on the Folsom-South Canal until Congress makes a commitment to provide the minimum flows sought by SARA.

Jones also notes that SARA's current opposition to construction on the Auburn-Folsom South unit is conditional and not fundamental.

"It is strictly tied to securing an adequate guaranteed flow in the lower American River," he says.

The importance of the minimum flows is emphasized over and over again by Jones.

"The Federal Bureau of Reclamation has finally admitted that lowered flows would destroy three-quarters of the salmon run," he says, "and that there would be equivalent losses in the steelhead and the shad and striped bass runs, although they don't know how bad the losses would be."

"And of course, the water-related recreational opportunities would be all but destroyed, like rafting, for instance."

"Now the American River is very popular for skin diving. But this would be almost impossible. You need enough water under your belly to dive or to float downstream."

"Water quality, of course, would be degraded because with the much reduced flow . . . there would be much less potential, much less ability for the water to keep itself clean."

In addition to all of this, Jones predicts there would be much greater aquatic growths as a result of reduced flows. In fact, he notes, the American River would become a slimy, algae-laden stream.

"And the whole basic purpose of the American River Parkway, the river itself, would have been lost," he says.

SARA's law suit to delay further construction on the Folsom-South Canal was the result of frustration with a number of congressmen and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation.

"We, (SARA)," Jones explains, "had been successful in getting an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation out here—and we're pretty sure it was cleared with the Justice Department back east—that would have allowed us to drop our law suit with the agreement that they would not proceed with any further construction of the canal until the American River flow problem had been solved."

Jones is convinced that this agreement was quashed by Representatives John McFall (D-Manteca) and Harold T. "Blizz" Johnson (D-Roseville). McFall, who is on the powerful House Appropriations Committee, represents part of Sacramento County.

McFall, according to SARA's president, places top priority on getting the canal com-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

pleted in order to serve his San Joaquin County constituents. And Johnson, he continues, wants the Auburn Dam built and will do nothing to anger McFall.

Jones not only has criticism for McFall and Johnson, but for Congressman John E. Moss (D-Sacramento), over the minimum flows issue.

"One of our greatest disappointments and frustrations over the years," he says, "has been the lack of commitment and support by our federal representatives, particularly John Moss, in seeking adequate guaranteed flows for the lower American River."

"They and the Bureau of Reclamation have continuously passed the buck back and forth over solving the problem while construction on the project has continued.

"It is this lack of working toward a solution that led us into the more aggressive position that we've taken recently. So long as they merely continue to study the problem and provide us only with reasons why a solution can't be found, we will maintain our opposition to continuation of construction."

Moss has told "People" that the proposed Hood-Clay connector is variously projected to running anywhere from \$60 to over \$100 million.

"So we're not talking about a minor project," he says. "We have to go after the money, which we're perfectly willing to do, but in order to convince the authorizing committee and the appropriation committee, we have to have the supportive data."

Moss places the blame for a lack of commitment on minimum flows on the doorstep of the Nixon Administration.

"If they (SARA) know any way of changing the President of the United States," he says, "and getting us an administration that is more concerned with people and the values of an environmental nature than the present one, why, I would be most interested.

"I did not vote to put him in the White House."

Moss adds that SARA fails to realize what he terms an interest in the problem predating the organization's by many years.

"I have nothing to gain in my congressional district," says Moss, "excepting the gratitude of the people in getting them precisely what they want."

Aside from the minimum flow issue, Jones is concerned about passage of measure A (clean water bonds) on the June ballot, and protecting the natural character of the American River Parkway.

"Although SARA feels very strongly that adequate access into the parkway and river must be provided," says Jones, "we feel just as strongly that vehicular movement within the parkway must be controlled much better than it has been."

"The uncontrolled use of recreational vehicles (jeeps, motorcycles and other recreational vehicles), actually threatens the whole parkway right now even though it is against the law to operate any motor vehicle on anything other than a designated roadway."

Jones emphasizes that SARA recognizes the rights of others to use of their recreational vehicles and worked to help provide McGill's mechanical park "as an alternative to tearing up the parkway with these vehicles."

Just as Jones is able to see the rights of other groups, so, too, does he look at his own aerospace industry with a healthy candor.

"I think it's tragic that so much emphasis was placed on space—then it was dropped," he says. "So many people lost their jobs."

"Hell, Aerojet has been very good to me, but I resent that as a national policy we (the U.S.) swing to extremes, we seem to react rather than plan."

Jones does believe the country needs a commitment to space programs, but "this up and down type of thing has literally destroyed people that have so much to offer."

Jones feels the pressing problems facing society, like the energy crisis, will require

people in government leadership positions who either have technical backgrounds themselves "or have the message, like a Tom McCall."

"If I have a hero," he says, "it's Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon."

"He is sold on the reality that we do have a finite amount of resources; that we had better right now be thinking in terms of just the kind of life-style we have."

Jones stresses that the energy crisis will not go away because Arab oil is flowing again.

"I'll tell you," he says, "I'll do what I have to to keep my son from fighting in a war 15 years from now that's generated because we're squabbling over Arab oil, that we've gotten ourselves in a position that we have to depend on Arab oil."

"And yet I'm afraid that what we are doing is that we are groveling in the dirt in creating a situation that is far more dangerous than Viet Nam by bending over backwards for Arab oil . . . to keep this gluttonous way of life that we've gotten into going."

As for his own personal future, Jones is committed to staying in the Sacramento area.

"As far as I'm concerned," he says, "this is my home. I love California. I love Northern California specifically, and I love Sacramento."

"I also love the outlying areas. I'd like to be here. I'd like to have some influence in guiding the way this area is going to grow."

Jones also would even like to have more responsibility in terms of decision making at work.

He admits: "When I talk about my dreams I have to be mindful of the realities of employment in the aerospace profession."

"What I really end up doing will be constrained somewhat by the external pressures associated with the basic instability of the industry and a drive that I have to achieve that has not been totally satisfied where I am."

Whatever Jones does, he knows that he will have to exert some sort of influence.

"It's a kind of thing that I need," he says, "and can offer."

VETERANS ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS UNEQUAL

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent of mine called my attention to an inequity in the law pertaining to veterans' educational benefits. Under existing law, those attending vocational or technical schools must provide the VA with a monthly certification of attendance signed by the veteran and a school official before payments can be continued. Veterans attending college-level institutions, in contrast, only have to submit a certification of attendance to the VA near the end of the semester or term. Moreover, while veterans attending vocational or technical schools are allowed only a minimal number of absences, veterans at standard colleges may have unlimited absences so long as they maintain a certain scholastic average.

Clearly the law discriminates against the veteran who wishes to attend a vocational or technical school, both in the matter of the monthly certification as a precondition for payment, and in the matter of the absences allowed.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill today to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to apply to veterans and other persons pursuing certain vocational and technical educational programs the same certification requirements with respect to enrollment, pursuit, and attendance as apply to veterans and persons pursuing programs leading to standard college degrees.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee will agree with me that the existing discrimination in the law serves no good purpose while unnecessarily imposing upon the veteran who wishes to pursue his education in a more technical field. Early action on my bill will help to alleviate this situation and provide all veterans with the same attendance and certification requirements for educational benefits.

SOLZHENITSYN: IN THE GREATEST TRADITIONS OF RUSSIAN LIBERALISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected ethnic newspapers in the country is the Armenian Weekly, a publication of Hairenik Association, Inc., in Boston, Mass.

James H. Tashjian, editor of that publication, is a distinguished observer of all developments within the Soviet Union. Therefore, the editorial in that publication's March 21 edition, discusses the views of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and their special significance.

The editorial follows:

SOLZHENITSYN: IN THE GREATEST TRADITIONS OF RUSSIAN LIBERALISM

It may be that Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn will be less honored for the astonishing courage he has shown in defying the Soviet authority than for having saved the life of Russian liberalism, on the reemergence of which rests the future of the Russians themselves, the fate of the Soviet empire and perhaps of the world. For if there is ever to be a final resolution of "the Russian question" which has, since the days of Peter the Great, cast its ursine shadow over the world, it is that that movement toward reform must have as leading participants Russians themselves.

And there can be no such readjustment without a powerful resurgence of liberal Russian thought, that grand tradition of free and humane thinking which has been stuffed into a bottle for over 50 years, leaving the scene to a frightening display of xenophobic reaction which has brought dishonor on all Russians, and servitude to millions of Russians and non-Russians alike.

The most striking thing about Solzhenitsyn, the genie who has finally escaped the vial, is that he is ethnically a Great Russian and an unabashed Russian nationalist who freely admits that not only is Russia "authoritarian", but that "it must remain so, and let us no longer try to change that."

But, adds he, "the authoritarian system must be based on genuine concern and love on the part of the rulers, not only for themselves and those around them, but also for their own (Russian) people, and all neighboring peoples, too." Which of course dra-

matically separates him from the Russian chauvinist.

Students of Russian intellectual history quickly acknowledge that Solzhenitsyn's ready admission of the "authoritarian" nature of the Russian psyche is not novel to him alone. Almost every great Russian thinker of the pre-revolutionary days warned that it would be "unnatural for Russia" to be ruled by anything but an authoritarian system. But all these great minds, with Solzhenitsyn as the latest advocate, have joined in pointing out that their apotheosis of Russian authoritarianism did not mean that they felt it to be "holy and messianic" and thus ought to be exported; or that it ought, internally or externally, to be anything but "benevolent."

This thesis revived by Solzhenitsyn holds the most promise for Russia, the enslaved nations of the USSR—and for the world. Solzhenitsyn simply says that Russia ought to get out of the business of communistic imperialism; it ought to look after its own Russian affairs, abandon its rule over the captive and satellite states, return to its traditional agrarian economy, which most of the great pre-Soviet Russian thinkers agreed to be the life-blood of Mother Russia, and instead of aspiring to rule the world, develop the immense expanses of Siberia.

What we have here in fact is the renaissance of Russian liberalism. Both through his defiance and his wisdom, Solzhenitsyn has emerged as the Villani of the contemporary Russian rebirth. The apostle of the great Dostoevski, whose Notes from the Underground was the 19th C. predecessor of Solzhenitsyn's The Gulag Archipelago, he has loudly reminded Russia that the trials blazed by his liberal forebears, Pushkin, Tolstoi, Chekhov, Gorki, Brussov, Lermontov, Karamzin, Turgenev, Lomonosov, and others, have become overrun by the toxic weeds of Russian chauvinism masked in "nationalistic" garb and that, for the good of Mother Russia and of mankind, Russians themselves must hoe up the awful mato grasso they have allowed to grow around them.

He says that even in Tsarist days Russia's politicians were being warned by Russian intellectuals against any trend toward industrial and military imperialism; and that now that the doctrine of "Communism" (which he regards as a foreign import) has violated the logos of Russian liberalism, the time has come for Russia to return to its agronomical legacy, to accede to the laws of its environmental atavism—to get down to realizing the fruits of the Revolution, the business of being the real, the free Russia, unimitative of foreign civilizations... benevolent to its own Russian people and, most importantly, benevolent toward other nations and peoples.

In his letter of September 5, 1973, to the Kremlin, Solzhenitsyn calls on Moscow to "drop its control over the Soviet Union's Russian states which he says have no business being a part of his 14 non-Russian republics" . . . and he lists Armenia as one of those.

Solzhenitsyn may right now be almost alone in his struggle to revive Russian liberalism. He may be a voice in the wilderness, but his words echo in the hearts of all thinking Russians. They give silent courage and solace to those who have been victimized by the brutal and disgraceful Soviet display of Russian chauvinism.

Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn has started something most feared of all things by Moscow. He has lit a backwoods kindling which will not be stamped out—which will soon flash into flame and run wildfire throughout the Soviet Union, burning down the wilderness planted by chauvinism, giving back the Russian people their self-respect and dignity—and returning to the beleaguered non-Russian states their sovereign heritage—and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the right for them to live side by side with an enlightened Russia in free and cherished neighborliness.

Truth, honesty, the call to liberty, these are things that cannot forever be suppressed Russia will stir for it. Solzhenitsyn has started something.

TREASURY REPORT ON DISC TAX LOOPHOLE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has just issued its 1972 annual report on the "Operation and Effect of the Domestic International Sales Corporation Legislation." If there was ever a report which "damned with faint praise," this is it. Major portions of the Department's report can be read as an outright indictment of the glaring tax loophole known as DISC.

On March 28, 1974, I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a General Accounting Office letter questioning the value and cost/benefit ratio of the DISC program. As the GAO investigators reported:

We learned that the program is not considered to have had much influence toward increasing U.S. exports to date. Neither has it resulted in exporters lowering their prices to meet competition.

Mr. Speaker, the GAO is providing me with a second report relating to wheat exports and the use of DISC's. This report should be available within the next few weeks. I anticipate that it will show that DISC's are highly inefficient and an unconscionable tax loophole.

The Treasury report attempts to hide these facts. But the report speaks for itself:

The DISC statute was thus passed at a time when the major trading nations were abandoning the fixed exchange rate system, and other powerful influences were brought to bear on the U.S. trade position. During this period, the U.S. balance of trade first worsened and then sharply improved. It is difficult to separate the causes of change in the balance of trade, and this report does not attempt to do so. Instead the report focuses on the revenue and exports effects associated with the DISC statute. It also examines how firms of different size have been influenced by the legislation.

The study concludes that the rate of return on export sales for DISC's was roughly 15 percent. This is about double the profit rate of non-DISC exports. The report explains that this is either due to the fact that export product lines are more profitable (in which case DISC would not be needed) or:

The devaluation of the dollar which occurred in 1971 presumably increased profit margins on export sales as distinguished from domestic sales. Exported goods sold in foreign markets may be sold at prices expressed in foreign currencies, and the decline in those prices after the devaluation, if it occurred at all, probably did so only after a time lag. Thus, profits expressed in terms of dollars may be substantially increased. For example, if before devaluation an article was sold in

a foreign country at a price equivalent to \$1.00 producing a profit of 8 cents, the same price after the 9 percent Smithsonian devaluation would produce a price equivalent to \$1.09 and a profit of 17 cents. Thus, the devaluation which occurred in 1971 could have accounted for the difference between the average 8 percent margin and the 15 percent margin on sales exported through DISCs, although insufficient data exist to prove that this in fact occurred.

From this quote, it would appear that the DISC's did not reduce prices and simply repealed a windfall profit from the recent devaluations. In this case too, DISC is simply an unnecessary tax loophole.

What exports may have been encouraged by DISC's? According to the report:

The leading five products account for about two-thirds of DISC activity. They are agricultural products and services (7.2 percent), chemical (8.1 percent) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the American people will be thrilled to know that the Treasury has been subsidizing the extra export of food goods and chemicals. It is even more shocking to learn that 42 DISC's reported the sale of \$168.4 million in refined petroleum products and \$41.3 million in rubber and plastic goods. Another 30 DISC's helped export \$240.7 million in paper products. It is incredible that we have been giving between 50- to 100-percent tax break for the export of critically scarce commodities and natural resources.

It might be argued that DISC is important if it helps small struggling companies make exports which they did not make before. Yet what kind of companies are helped by DISC?

Approximately 84 percent of gross foreign receipts of these 703 DISC's—which showed the majority shareholder—was accounted for by 107 DISC's owned by corporations with assets over \$100 million. Only 6.6 percent of the gross receipts were accounted for by corporations with assets under \$100 million.

How much does DISC cost the Treasury? Approximately \$250 million for the year ended March 1973. Yet, when the administration sold this gimmick to the Congress, the price tag was estimated at only about \$100 million. The report "explains" the difference:

The original estimates were based on the assumption that profit margins would be representative of industry averages, whereas the 1972 margins on these exports appear to have been about twice as great.

In other words, we are subsidizing some of the most profitable industries in the Nation.

Does DISC result in increased exports? Treasury thinks so—but its estimate is based on a sample of 166 DISC's out of 2,249. Between 1971 and 1972, the exports of the 166 firms grew 14.1 percent, while total U.S. exports grew only by 12.4 percent. For various reasons, Treasury thinks that the DISC figure may be low and that DISC exports may even have grown by as much as 29 percent. Yet, some major DISC's actually had declining exports while non-DISC's in the same industrial field increased exports.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that first, Treasury has no sound proof that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

DISC increased exports; second, if DISC did increase exports, it may have done so by an insignificant margin; third, DISC is a tax loophole, accruing to very large companies which are already in a very profitable trade and, fourth, DISC is particularly encouraging the export of supplies of commodities and products which are in short supply domestically. As C. Fred Bergsten, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, recently testified before the Senate Finance Committee:

The DISC legislation has apparently done little to spur exports and has significantly reduced government revenues. In addition, there is no need for such selective export subsidies in a world of flexible exchange rates. And, even had it worked as planned, it would have no place in the current inflationary environment.

The repeal of DISC must be a tax reform priority. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial from the New York Times of April 20, entitled, "Slipped DISC":

SLIPPED DISC

The tax bill passed by Congress in 1971 provided for a tax device known as the Domestic International Sales Corporation (or DISC) aimed at spurring exports. Any American company selling some of its products abroad could set up a DISC, export through it and defer indefinitely the taxes on half of its export-related profits.

Even before the DISC tax gimmick was enacted, critics warned that it would be expensive and wasteful. But reality has exceeded expectations, as a United States Treasury report disclosed this week. The Treasury had predicted in 1971 that the tax subsidies would result in a revenue loss of \$100 million, but the actual revenue loss in 1972 turned out to be \$250 million.

Losses to the Treasury for subsequent years will certainly prove to be a great deal more, as word of this tax gimmick has spread through the business community. There are more than twice as many DISC's now as there were in 1972.

It is impossible to say how much the DISC tax gimmick did to boost exports because of the complexities of separating its effect from that of such export stimulants as the devaluation of the United States dollar, the booming demand abroad for American farm products and other goods, the massively subsidized wheat deal with the Soviet Union and the greater profitability of exports. But what can be said firmly is that, whatever extra push to exports the DISC tax deferrals have been providing makes no sense in a world of flexible exchange rates and severe inflation. DISC worsens the inflationary pressures here at home by reducing supplies and draining off needed tax revenues.

Congress would be wise to repeal DISC and put an end to these wrongheaded export subsidies. Meanwhile, the Administration can suspend DISC, which the 1971 legislation empowers it to do.

SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the week of April 21 through 27 marks the 23d consecutive

annual Secretaries Week, sponsored by the National Secretaries Association (International). The theme this year is one with which we all agree, I am sure: "Better Secretaries Means Better Business", for secretaries are the conduits in an office through which all business flows. It is secretaries who create first impressions of an office to a visitor; who move the mails; who create organization from chaos.

The purpose of Secretaries Week is to recognize secretaries for their contributions in business, industry, education, and government. It also serves as a reminder to secretaries of their own responsibilities to their employers and to their profession.

A secretarial career, like most others, was once the exclusive domain of men because it was thought that a woman could not withstand the daily pressure that a secretary endures. It was one of the first professions that women cracked. They not only have withstood the pressure but have made the profession their own. There are over 4 million women employed as secretaries in this country alone; without them the Nation would come to a standstill. I congratulate them on their achievements.

ALDO LEOPOLD AWARD TO DR. LUCILLE F. STICKEL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Aldo Leopold Award, the highest honor the wildlife profession can bestow, has been presented to Dr. Lucille F. Stickel, director of the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service Patuxent Wildlife Research Center.

The award was presented by William Klimstra, president of the Wildlife Society, at the 39th annual banquet of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference meeting in Denver, April 2.

The award named after the pioneer wildlife scientist, Aldo Leopold, is given for "outstanding service and distinguished contributions in the field of wildlife research and in furthering the cause of sound conservation."

Dr. Stickel is a resident of my district and is the first woman to receive the award. She pioneered research to evaluate the effects of pesticides on wildlife species and has been directing the Fish and Wildlife Service's pesticides research since 1965. She has worked at the Patuxent Research Center in Laurel, Md., since 1956 as a research biologist, and in 1973 was named director of the center. The center's staff of over 100 focuses on environmental pollution, the conservation of endangered species, and prevention of crop damage by birds.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to Dr. Stickel for her dedication in the field of wildlife research and conservation and commend her for her efforts.

CHEMICAL WARFARE: GENEVA TALKS; HEARINGS ANNOUNCED

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 at Geneva, the 1974 session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament opened its first meeting. In the introductory statements, both the United States and the Soviet Union indicated that they are still committed to the concept of controlling chemical warfare weapons. This optimistic objective has been enunciated each session for the last 2 years with little or no progress being made because of the problem of reaching agreement on the issue of verification of compliance with any treaty which might be negotiated.

In the midst of the difficulties on the issue of verification to which the 25-nation representatives are already exposed in beginning these critical negotiations, the U.S. Army has announced its plans to begin a complete restructuring and modernization of the existing chemical warfare stockpiles currently in the arsenal of this country. Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff have indicated that current stocks in some seven storage sites throughout this country, as well as stockpiles in several overseas locations are adequate to meet the Nation's requirements to support a longstanding but questionable policy of retaliation if attacked, it is the judgment of the Army that these stocks should be modernized as soon as possible.

This obvious contradiction in the U.S. arms control policy of negotiating toward the elimination of chemical warfare weapons and the military objective of modernizing the current stockpiles has already produced concern in the community of nations involved in the Geneva negotiations. One internationally known chemical warfare analyst has already offered a critical analysis which suggests that the adoption of the new binary chemical system as proposed by the Army will lead to greater proliferation of these weapons.

The Director of the U.S. Arms Control Agency has indicated in an interview that he views the U.S. Army proposal as essentially negating any efforts toward arms control negotiations at Geneva. In a world already filled with suspicion, the U.S. contradictory posture on chemical weapons is bound to complicate any efforts at arms control. In the opening session of the Geneva conference, one of the indicators of concern was a call on the West to show "goodwill and readiness to find a solution" to the problems which have stalled negotiations thus far. Certainly, the Army disregard for the current problems at the negotiation table by choosing this time to begin production of the new binary chemical weapons system which offers no significant increase in tactical capability as compared with weapons already available does not enhance the political environment to begin these new negotiations.

In this atmosphere of concern, the U.S. House of Representatives will begin a review of U.S. chemical warfare policy. Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat of Wisconsin, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, announced the plans for the hearings on April 11, 1974. The hearings will be held on May 1, 2, 7, 9, and 14. The purpose of the hearings will be to examine the status of three specific and related issues as proposed in legislation which I introduced along with 45 cosponsors. The issues to be examined include:

First. The status of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the U.N. Convention on Biological Warfare, both of which remain pending before the Senate because of disagreements over the administration's exclusion of herbicides and riot control agents from the scope of the Protocol.

Second. The status of the current negotiations at Geneva on a comprehensive chemical weapons arms control prevention, particularly as those stale-mated talks relate to the technical problems of verification.

Third. A reevaluation of current U.S. chemical warfare policy and a determination of the need to retain a retaliatory chemical warfare capability, including the issue of the proposed new binary nerve gas weapons.

The hearings before this House subcommittee in 1969 undoubtedly contributed significantly to the President's decision to return the Geneva Protocol to the Senate and to discard biological weapons from the arsenal of this Nation's required weapons. It is hoped that the House hearings planned for this May will provide the needed public examination of U.S. chemical warfare issues so that rational decisions in the Nation's best interests may be similarly evaluated.

ACTIVISM IN ARCHITECTURE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Community Design Center—CDC—of Minnesota was formed 6 years ago to provide volunteer design services to those who could not afford them. The CDC has grown rapidly in the past 6 years; from a founding group of 8 to over 200 active volunteers, handling 200 projects per year.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article on the CDC, by Gene S. Peterson, which appeared in the January/February 1974 issue of Northwest Architect. A column by Elizabeth Robbins, the director of CDC, is also worth reading and it follows the Peterson article:

ACTIVISM IN ARCHITECTURE: THE COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER OF MINNESOTA
(By Gene S. Peterson)

The Community Design Center of Minnesota will be six years old this spring. It was 1968 when Allen Ambrose, Alfred French, Milo Thompson, Peter Seitz, Wei Ming Lu,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dick Peterson, Dick Morrill and George Klein joined together to provide design services to those who could not afford them. With the philosophy that the design professional has a general responsibility to upgrade the physical environment, this founding group undertook such initial projects as an Aquatennial float for the Way Educational Center and rehabilitation work for the Way, the People's Church and the People's Cooperative Union. A limited budget to cover out-of-pocket costs was provided in those early days by the Center Arts Council.

Soon the need for volunteer design services demanded provision of space, staff, and a working budget. The 1970 convention of the Minnesota Society of Architects gave CDC, which had now become a Minnesota non-profit corporation, substantial support by providing \$10,000. The Urban Education Center of the University of Minnesota and CDC found space at 118 E. 26th St. which fitted both their needs and cemented their cooperative relationship. Dr. Tom Walz and Lane deMoll became the core staff and CDC began to grow rapidly.

The Bush Foundation of St. Paul has provided a three-year grant on a matching fund basis. Individual and corporate cash contributors number more than 30. A number of building material suppliers, agencies, corporations, etc., provide various in-kind contributions.

Volunteer design services from professionals and students are, however, the essence of CDC and the cash and in-kind contributions make possible the circumstances and conditions within which the services can be rendered. Volunteers include engineers, planners and interior designers as well as architects; projects include public information and education, as well as designs for physical construction.

Currently CDC's projects and volunteers, as seen in the table here, number in the hundreds.

Professionals who have been actively engaged in CDC work find it to be a stimulating and valuable experience. A review of the list of volunteers reveals many repeat names year after year.

However, there is still opportunity to add new names to the list.

NUMBER OF NEW PROJECTS ACCEPTED

Low Income Dwelling Rehab
Non-Profit Agency Rehab
Neighborhood Advocacy
Public Information & Education
Graphics & Photography
Landscape Planning & Playlot
Engineer Consultation
Program Planning & Design

NUMBER OF ACTIVE VOLUNTEERS

Architects
Engineers
Planners
Graphic Designers
Interior Designers
Landscape Architects
Other
Students (estimate)

After more than two years of dedicated and effective service Dr. Walz and Ms. deMoll have gone, Tom to become dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Iowa, and Lane to join Criteria, architects, and now, off to Oregon.

Elizabeth Robbins is now director of CDC and Craig Hess assistant director. Liz brings the experience of a rich and varied background to the directorship. Her activities in reporting, writing, design and development of instructional systems, etc., will be helpful in meeting the challenge of CDC. Craig is not a newcomer; his experience as a VISTA architect and his continued dedication to CDC assure effective and innovative administration. Patricia Kundert has been a CDC'er for nearly two years and has gained a reputation for efficiency and equanimity.

Consider a professional office with three full-time persons, 31 part-time volunteer staff and more than 200 professional volunteers handling more than 200 projects per year of wide diversity. The tasks of coordination, meeting time schedules, observing budget limitations, etc., are formidable indeed. This is what has been accomplished—response from professionals has been highly gratifying but the need for CDC services is greater than ever before.

Projects undertaken by CDC are approved by a screening committee which passes upon the basic question of whether or not the prospective client can or can not afford to pay for design services. Occasionally CDC projects generate contracts for professional offices. Often the CDC client is itself a non-profit venture providing its services on a volunteer basis. An example of a CDC client is the *Family Tree*.

Since	Cumulative since
Sept. 1972	July 1971
12	24
69	134
15	22
16	31
52	85
14	23
7	10
17	37
Total 202	366
74	101
21	23
4	4
19	26
10	16
10	16
7	7
70	140
Total 215	335

Founded in mid-1971, the *Family Tree* provides free medical and educational assistance to individuals who could otherwise not obtain such services. Just as architects, engineers, planners, artists, etc., provide volunteer services to CDC, so also do doctors, nurses, technicians, etc., provide volunteer services to *Family Tree*.

Beginning with an unused basement space in an older store front building on Snelling and Selby, the CDC design team, working with the *Family Tree* advisory group, evolved a simple and functional plan. Restrained by low ceiling heights, various plumbing protrusions, uneven floors and inconvenient columns, the design was nevertheless consummated and the first clients received within six months. Success of the project is measured by a recent additional space acquisition and by the increase in the number of users, from 100/month to 400/month.

The entry is from a stairway which opens to sidewall level. Entering the reception and waiting room, one finds a colorful and informal environment with furniture groupings designed for two to four persons. Small rooms for counseling and for taking medical history are one side, examination rooms on the other. The laboratory runs across the back of the examination rooms and joins them together for efficient medical service. Offices and support facilities flank the stairway. A large space at the back has recently been added to provide group instruction, staff meeting space and audio-visual facilities.

One doctor and one nurse are paid to be in attendance during all clinic hours, approximately six other doctors and six other nurses volunteer time regularly to supplement the basic staff so that adequate service is always available. Equipment and supplies have come from St. Paul Ramsey Hospital, Minnesota Department of Health and other sources. A number of non-profit organiza-

tions provided construction funds and continue to provide operating funds.

DIRECTOR'S COLUMN

(By Elizabeth Robbins)

What is it like to be a non-architect and enter the preserve of architects? This is a reality I have been experiencing for the past five months as new director of the Community Design Center. The experience has been and is: complex, many-faced, agonizing, joyous, and amazing.

To my amazement, there is a tremendous load of work completed by the professional volunteers and students who work out of the center. Students are of upper division design under the Action program—Vista and University Year for Action Volunteers, and those from the Urban Education Center currently enrolled in the School of Architecture at the University of Minnesota who gain field experience by working on CDC projects.

The CDC has recently submitted a 10-month report of work completed by the UYA Volunteers. This entire magazine is scarcely large enough to record all the information about the projects these men and women have carried out.

Here is just a part of the list of accomplishments (the total impact can be realized only by coming in to CDC to read the report): completed the Basic Homes user study and market analysis for low-cost rural prototype housing; investigated, documented and reported complaints in "235" housing; designed two new buildings; completed six community planning designs, four community garden projects, three playlots, five site analyses and one grounds improvement; completed seven rehabilitations; recycled sixty pieces of furniture; completed thirty interior designs; conducted eighteen classes or clinics; developing eight comprehensive curricula; made fifteen new services available to the low-income community; provided eight new skills to the target population; were responsible for raising \$96,000 and a possible additional \$145,000 for the target population, involved over twenty different professions or skills to serve the target population.

These UYA students number less than one-fourth of the total number of students at CDC. And that doesn't include the heavy workload carried by more than 200 professional design volunteers.

What is our most significant project? That we are the means by which all this happens.

THE 1915 MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 of each year, people of Armenian descent all over the world commemorate the victims of the 1915 massacre of Armenians living in Turkey and the victims of other tragedies in the long history of the Armenian people. The United States has a strong tradition of opposing persecution of any minorities, and we join in the commemoration of this sacred day.

For thousands of years, the people of Armenia have been subjected to foreign rule. Except for brief periods of independence, they have been oppressed and often persecuted by foreign powers from the East and West. The last period of Armenian independence commenced in 1918 and lasted for only a few years. Before this brief period of independence, Armenians suffered through one of the worst periods in their history, when most

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the population either migrated or were slaughtered in their homeland.

Many Armenians migrated to the United States, where they have made significant contributions in the educational, artistic, political, and economic fields. As Armenians in this country and all over the world remember their fellow Armenians who have lost their lives at the hands of foreign powers, all Americans should recommit themselves to preventing the persecution of minorities.

**ORAL MILLER NAMED ONE OF 10
"OUTSTANDING HANDICAPPED
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF THE
YEAR"**

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTRY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. FAUNTRY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to commend Oral O. Miller, an attorney with the U.S. Small Business Administration and a resident of the District of Columbia, for winning the "Outstanding Handicapped Federal Employees of the Year" award which is given by the Civil Service Commission.

Oral Miller, who has been with SBA since 1960, is a trial attorney in the Office of Litigation of the General Counsel's Office. He is responsible for legal review of applications for SBA assistance as well as for preparing legal opinions in determining eligibility of applicants with consideration given to possible litigation concerning the agency's programs.

Born in Sophie, Ky., Oral Miller was blinded in an accident at the age of 8. At the age of 10, he entered the Kentucky School for the Blind. Thereafter, he attended the Louisville Male High School, under a cooperative program graduating as valedictorian of his high school class. He received an academic scholarship to Princeton University, where he was awarded a B.A. in history. He was then awarded the Kendall Law School and the Princeton National Law Scholarship to attend the University of Chicago Law School where he received his J.D. graduating in the top third of his class.

He is a member of both the Kentucky State bar and the District of Columbia bar and serves on the legal welfare committee of the bar association of the District of Columbia.

Miller's handicap has been a stimulus to him. He is president of the American Blind Bowling Association, Inc., and has placed first in national tournaments in 1970 (Detroit) and 1971 (Portland). He is also a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. For the past 2 years, he has been president of the D. C. Association of the Workers for the Blind.

He possesses a great zeal for life and has not allowed his handicap to keep him from enjoying life to its fullest. His hobbies and interests include bowling, swimming, boating, reading, fishing, miniature golfing, tandem cycling, and gardening. Not being one to shy away from new adventures, he has just learned to ski.

April 23, 1974

Asked on form 171, application for Federal Employment, whether he had a physical handicap, Miller answered:

Although I am almost totally blind, I have devised and I can devise additional methods and procedures to perform the duties of the position sought.

With that kind of outlook on life and on his own handicap, I believe that he truly deserves this award for both his efforts and the inspiration that he gives to all of us.

**THE SECURITY OF RESTRICTED
WHITE HOUSE AIR SPACE**

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of Sunday, February 17, 1974, a stolen military helicopter penetrated the restricted air space above the White House.

The fact that it was a military aircraft which had been commandeered by a U.S. soldier is not nearly as important as the fact that the aircraft was able to violate the security of the White House prohibited area.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, it became a matter of overriding importance when the security of the President of the United States, whoever he may be, is threatened in this bizarre fashion.

Because of the seriousness of this incident, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, I questioned Secret Service officials regarding this matter.

In addition, I called upon the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Mr. Alexander Butterfield, to provide me a report on the FAA investigation into this incident. I was particularly interested in whether or not there was a delay in advising the proper protection agencies and security officials that Zone P-56 had been penetrated by an unauthorized aircraft; if there was a delay, what caused it; and what is being done to prevent a reoccurrence of this kind of untenable situation.

Mr. Butterfield made the following report:

Let me say first of all that the bizarre flight of the stolen helicopter into the White House Prohibited Area, designated Area P-56, was and is a matter of great concern to us also; especially in view of the fact that the craft was operated at tree-top and near tree-top level en route to and from and back to P-56, and therefore undetected by airport radar equipment. The FAA's responsibility, incidentally, is to insure that no aircraft under our control penetrates Area P-56.

In this case, Washington National Airport Traffic Control Tower was called in rapid succession by the Washington, D.C. Police helicopter Squadron, the White House, and Baltimore-Washington International Airport Traffic Control Tower and informed that a chopper was in or around the Prohibited Area. Very shortly thereafter, a "target" was observed on the Washington National Airport radar scope, and radar was maintained by either Washington National Tower or Baltimore-Washington Tower throughout most of the remainder of the chopper's flight. The relaying of information to the Executive

Protective Service at the White House was continuous during this time.

It is frustrating at times, but true, that radar has its absolute limitations. And one of these is what is known as "altitude range." Aircraft at extremely low levels may or may not be detected by radar depending on the size of the aircraft and the area of its reflective surfaces. Then of course weather phenomena and various forms of ground clutter serve to further affect detection of low altitude targets in an adverse way. In an effort to preclude reoccurrence, representatives of the Federal Aviation Administration have had several meetings and discussions with U.S. Secret Service personnel. We have now provided for a protective area around P-56 in which intruder aircraft will be reported to the White House security personnel. This, in effect, establishes a buffer area to allow protective action to be taken if necessary.

Please be assured that we are continuing to work on this particular matter . . . and that we will do whatever we can, in close cooperation with other interested Federal agencies, to make such aerial intrusions impossible.

U.S. NAVY IN CRISIS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post, in its May 1974 issue, has performed a meritorious public service by making available to all Americans an account of the serious internal trouble which besets the U.S. Navy.

Author of this excellently written article is the distinguished military critic, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, himself a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, who points to the lowered standards, lax discipline, and eroded command authority that have seriously compromised what some are pleased to describe as the "New Navy."

Much of this trouble began when Adm. Elmo "Z-gram" Zumwalt became Chief of Naval Operations. It is the story, in part, of an admiral who evidently believed that the Navy could and should be made a laboratory for the testing of social change. No matter how well-intentioned, it is well that Admiral Zumwalt's tenure as Chief of Naval Operations will end in the near future. It is a sad chapter in the long and honorable history of the U.S. Navy and, had there been a national emergency, it could have been a tragic one.

But let the article in the Saturday Evening Post tell the story:

TRROUBLED WATERS IN THE NAVY (By Hanson Baldwin)

(NOTE.—This distinguished military critic, himself a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, points to problems of lowered standards, lax discipline and eroded command authority that are seriously compromising the "New Navy.")

Evening, the Gulf of Tonkin—the beginning of a long night for the United States Navy. After a full day launching air strikes, the great carrier USS *Kitty Hawk* rests in calm seas, a floating city of 4,483 men. It is 7 p.m. October 12, 1972, and for the next seven and one-half hours tension and terror will roll across the decks of the mighty warship. Bands of black sailors go in search of white crewmen. They wield chains, broomsticks, wrenches, fire extinguisher nozzles and metal pipes as they scream, "Kill the white

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trash." Sleeping crewmen are dragged from their bunks, beaten and left bleeding on the decks. Those able to stagger to the chaotic ship dispensary are threatened and harassed by another band of blacks as they await treatment. Forty whites and six blacks are wounded, three so seriously they must be airlifted from the carrier to shore hospitals. Not until the early hours of the morning is the riot quelled.

The *Kitty Hawk* violence was a frightening manifestation of the winds of change sweeping through the Navy's rigging today, symptoms of a sickness afloat, a widespread malaise never before experienced by the American fleet. The infection did not suddenly come to a head aboard the carrier. It had been festering for years as a social revolution convulsed the United States. Since 1971 there have been at least ten mutinous incidents of significant proportion in the Navy, one of them recently as last July aboard the carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* in the Caribbean.

Two of these confrontations—the one on the *Kitty Hawk* and a second racial blowup aboard the carrier *Constellation* a month later—caused the House Armed Services Committee to launch a full-scale investigation of "disciplinary problems in the U.S. Navy." More than 2,500 pages of testimony from fifty-six witnesses and an examination of the entire spectrum of naval orders and procedures led the special investigatory subcommittee, headed by Rep. Floyd V. Hicks (D-Wash.), to conclude:

"The United States Navy is now confronted with pressures, both from within and without, which, if not controlled, will surely destroy its enviable tradition of discipline."

Additionally, "an environment of leniency, appeasement and permissiveness" has led to lowered Navy morale and a deterioration in appearance and performance. Even more ominously, the committee found, this "easy" atmosphere enhanced chances for mutinous acts and brought about "an alarming frequency of successful acts of sabotage and apparent sabotage on a wide variety of ships and stations within the Navy." The report pointed to lowered Navy recruiting and training standards as being responsible for an influx of "agitators and troublemakers" into naval ranks, thus creating fertile ground for trouble.

The Hicks report has been ignored by many congressmen and brushed under the rug or criticized as overstated by some in the Navy. The two carriers, they note, had been at sea three months—twice the normal tour—and without relief and relaxation, frustrations had built up among crew members. Yet a recent visit to many ships and stations of the Navy's crack Sixth Fleet, sampling opinion from admiral to seaman, from executive officer to mess cook, bears out the report's findings.

And last November, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet sent a message to all ships and stations noting in his own command "the disregard of law, order and common decency . . . an atmosphere of lawlessness, intimidation and defiance of established authority . . . unprovoked assaults and robberies by marauding gangs of Navy personnel upon smaller groups . . ."

The Navy, like all our installations, has reaped the whirlwind of student dissidents, the anti-Vietnam trauma, the drug culture and black militancy and anti-military feeling. These outside pressures have weakened the fleet at the very time it must face the greatest challenge in its history from rapidly expanding Soviet sea power. But some of the Navy's problems are of its own making, and the "solutions" the Navy has tried have exacerbated the situation instead of resolving it.

This period of mutiny, disobedience and internal sabotage has coincided with the most profound internal changes in the Navy's history, begun four years ago under Admiral

Elmo R. Zumwalt, who ends his term this summer. The tenure of this personable, energetic, bright officer—youngest ever to hold the post of Chief of Naval Operations—has thus been one of great controversy. Taking over in an era of social transition, he firmly believed that the Navy must change along with the nation. But the speed and manner in which he proceeded to foster that change have split the Navy wide open.

Many young officers, enlisted men, and petty officers believe Zumwalt, in the words of one of them, is the "best thing that ever happened to the Navy." They applaud the more relaxed discipline and the emphasis on people that have marked Zumwalt's tenure. But numerous senior and middle-grade officers and chief petty officers (CPOs)—as well as a very large number of officers who retired before and since Zumwalt took over—are shocked by recent developments. They blame him for too much permissiveness, and a dangerous weakening of the Navy's chain of command.

One admiral, who served two years ashore in the first part of Zumwalt's tenure and then returned to sea in precisely the same area he had commanded before, noted a "tremendous degradation in discipline and readiness" in the interval.

The backbone of Zumwalt's controversial program has been his famous "Z-grams," general directives published throughout the Navy on matters ranging from shore leave to civilian clothes to wash facilities. In his first Z-gram, Zumwalt said he was committing himself "to improving the quality of Navy life in all respects and restoring the fun and zest of going to sea." Many Z-grams have been aimed at eliminating the "Mickey Mouse" irritations—unnecessary or obsolete regulations—and at improving the attractiveness of a service career. Laudably, some of them have dealt with the problem of racial friction and have established new means of communication on racial issues.

The collective intent of the Z-grams and of other Zumwalt programs—most in the Navy would agree—has been praiseworthy. But the effect has often been deplorable.

Many in the fleet attribute the confusion in standards and slackening discipline so evident in the Navy of today to the interpretation of the Z-grams rather than to their substance or purpose. The messages themselves have at times been so vague and imprecise that they have required a bewildering stream of follow-up clarification.

For example, Z-gram 57 issued in November 1970 stated that "In the case of haircuts, sideburns and contemporary clothing styles, my view is that we must learn to adapt to changing fashions." The message explicitly allowed any officer or enlisted man "to grow sideburns or neatly trimmed beards or mustaches." The same Z-gram also authorized wearing of dungarees to and from work in naval commissaries, exchanges and service areas. New rules already permitted such changes, but the Z-gram emphasized the point.

It produced the greatest variety of hairstyles seen in the Navy in its history, and at many naval stations men in dirty or frayed dungarees quickly became a common sight. In January 1971, another Z-gram stipulated that hair, beards and mustaches "will be neatly trimmed, well groomed" and "sideburns will not extend beyond the bottom of the earlobes." But Pandora's box had been opened. The following December still another Z-gram had to be issued:

"Z-57 has been erroneously interpreted. Instances are still observed of men in public with dirty or torn uniforms, haircuts and beards which are below standards . . ."

At a Mediterranean port, a chief petty officer orders several shaggy-haired crewmen to cut their hair before leaving ship. But an officer waves the men ashore and later joins them for drinks in a harbor bar. "How the hell can I enforce discipline with a situation

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

like that?" says the CPO wearily. Adds a chief in the Sixth Fleet: "It's nonsense the amount of time we have to spend on a simple thing like haircuts."

The net result of the Z-grams on grooming and personal appearance has been, most naval personnel agree, a marked deterioration in the look of the men, a "slovenly" appearance, as the Hicks subcommittee put it.

By far the most potentially detrimental of Zumwalt's revolutionary reforms have been those which, in fact though not in intent, have weakened the authority of the entire chain of command. For instance, each major command was ordered to establish a minority affairs officer who will have "direct access" to the commanding officer and who "will be consulted on all matters involving minority personnel." Specialized human relations councils were established; "gripe" or "rap" sessions and "hot lines" for complaints direct to commanding officers, bypassing immediate superiors, were instituted.

Again the intent—to establish a "viable two-way dialogue at all levels of command" was commendable, but the effect was that the chain of command was weakened and new limitations were placed on a CO's authority. Juniors were encouraged—by induction—to bypass superiors. As the Hicks report on the *Kitty Hawk* and *Constellation* incidents noted, middle-management officers were convinced "their authority (had) been diluted by the Chief of Naval Operations when he addressed all naval personnel in a series of Z-grams."

Especially rankling is the fact that many of the Z-grams—there had been 119 by last June—involve petty administrative details that have previously been exercised by commanding officers. This centralization of command and administrative power in Washington has been deleterious to all the links of authority from admiral to seaman.

Following the *Kitty Hawk* and *Constellation* incidents, Zumwalt further contributed to the problem with a public admonition—made even before the facts in these cases were fully known—of senior Navy officers and his staff for failing to solve racial problems within the Navy. The Hicks committee tersely rebuked him, pointing out that "again concern over racial problems seemed paramount to the question of good order and discipline," and regretting "that the tradition of not criticizing seniors in front of their subordinates was ignored."

Many of the reforms Zumwalt has achieved are to the good, and the Navy will certainly never return to its past. But there are three major problem areas—all dealing broadly with personnel—with which the Navy must deal if it is to survive as one of the bulwarks of our defense.

1. *The realities of racial bias have been blown out of proportion and needlessly exacerbated.* The Hicks report found no "instances of institutional discrimination on the part of the Navy toward any group of persons, majority or minority." Yet racial frictions in the past few years have been increased rather than decreased by the subtle establishment of what amounts to two standards in the fleet—one of them preferential for minority groups.

Time and again officers and petty officers said they were hesitant to record offenses—particularly against blacks. Yet, as the House subcommittee reported, the great majority of the dissidents in the *Kitty Hawk* and *Constellation* cases and in other incidents were black. These were the same types of men who either fell for or fostered an idea of black separatism that made any reprimand of a black sailor appear to be a racial rather than a naval matter. Thus, notes the Hicks report, many black sailors "find it difficult to accept punishment on an individual basis. Rather, they perceive that punishment to one is punishment to all." The report further emphasizes that "what many of these men view as

discrimination is more often than not a perception rather than a reality."

In ships with a small number of blacks there is usually little trouble, but in larger ships with several hundred black sailors, polarization inevitably occurs: "The Brothers" form a separate part of the crew with Black Power salutes and symbols. "This ship is sitting on a volcano," said one Sixth Fleet officer. "The whites aboard are scared, or mad, or both. Everybody's uptight. You constantly hear blacks saying, 'When we take over . . . when the revolution comes . . . !'

Much of the hesitation to enforce discipline against blacks represents a fear of political and promotion consequences. The appellation "racist" is easily applied but hard to outgrow in the service today; it can be the kiss of death to promotion. Blacks who are disciplined may use this semantic blackmail against their superiors, or they seek relief from just punishment by writing to their congressman, or organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union. The inevitable result is a "rocket" from Washington which requires answer, even if the disciplinarian is not reversed. The CO who tries to keep his justice evenhanded—black or white—may not be supported in his efforts. "A white man is really afraid to tell a black he has screwed up," a Sixth Fleet CPO said.

2. *Lowered recruiting and training standards, a "quota system" and a rapid turnover in personnel.* The all-volunteer service and a quota of black enlistments pressured the Navy into recruitment measures which have contributed materially to its recent state of woe. Despite the Nixon administration's avowed opposition to quotas as a discriminatory way of achieving equal opportunity, the Navy's recruitment goals for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, were established at 12 percent black, 6 percent other minorities.

With the draft scheduled to end on the same date, and with an equal-rights-for-women amendment to the Constitution pending, the Navy intensified its drive for black recruits. Enlistment standards had been lowered in the 1960's to permit recruitment of high-school dropouts and men with the equivalent of a sixth-grade education. Some of the advertising appeals and recruitment methods were dubious. They often made impossible promises, actual or implied.

Now emphasis shifted to numbers, not quality. During one six-month period, more than a quarter of the enlistees were from Mental Group IV, the least educated and scoring lowest in qualification tests. Many had only rudimentary knowledge of mathematics and English in a service where technical analysis and effective communication are essential for promotion. Recruitment of large numbers of Group IV personnel was doomed to failure. Experience in World War II, Korea, and since had shown that these men rarely pull their weight and account for a hugely disproportionate percentage of the Navy's disciplinary problems.

At this critical juncture the Navy's three "boot camps" or recruit training schools at Great Lakes, Illinois; San Diego, California; and Orlando, Florida, reduced recruit training time from the prior nine weeks (it used to be eleven) to seven weeks. Done to accommodate a new three-year enlistment program, it was, all agree, a failure.

The naval training stations reflect much of the same permissiveness as the rest of the Navy. They are rarely tough and hard. Many CPOs refer to them scornfully as "charm schools." Some of the recruits themselves have complained about the looseness of the boot camps. "The hardest thing I had to do at Great Lakes," one sailor said, "was to fold my skivvies."

Spurred by congressional and public criticism after the riots and mutinies of 1972 and 1973, the Navy is now remedying the enlistment mistakes of a year ago. Enlistment standards have been raised. The percentage of Group IV enlistees is dropping sharply.

April 23, 1974

Today those enlistees accepted come from the upper portion of the group, are high-school graduates, and most of them are qualified for some form of technical training. The Navy's boot camps have returned to a nine-week training cycle, with increased emphasis on military discipline, naval traditions and shipboard training.

But the Navy's manpower problems are not over. In the last six months of fiscal 1973—when there were no draft calls—the Navy was able to enlist only 83 percent of its needs. And despite the fact that its total strength is being sharply reduced, it ended the year more than 8,000 men short of authorized strength. With the hot breath of the draft no longer a factor, there is a real question whether the Navy can recruit enough men of high quality.

Equally important, the Navy is having a tough time keeping men aboard once they have served a single term. All sorts of inducements to persuade men to reenlist, to induce suitable junior officers to make a Navy career, are being tried. Congress has approved a re-enlistment or extended tour bonus—which for critical or highly important specialties can reach as much as \$15,000—are offered to each qualified officer or man who signs on for another term after his first term of duty expires. The retention rate of first-term enlistees—only 10.3 percent in 1970—has risen, as a result of all these measures, to a respectable 23 percent in fiscal 1973.

Yet retention rates do not adequately reflect the personnel situation in the Navy today. Many of those who chose to stay in the Navy were not nearly as qualified as many of those who got out. Many who leave the Navy are influenced in their decisions by the red tape and delay and the judicial leniency now prevalent in military disciplinary procedures. Many feel that legalisms tend to pervade the services' administration of justice—and, in turn, reflect the sense of permissiveness which permeates the fleet and the nation today. Theft, a crime corrosive to any structure of teamwork, is pervasive, and the use of marijuana and soft drugs is so frequent, even aboard ship, that in one Sixth Fleet ship a brig annex, three times the size of the original brig, has been created to house offenders. Psychological rewards—the sense of a job worth doing and a job well done—are too often missing in today's Navy. Many junior officers, long-term CPOs and first-class petty officers—many with years of service at stake—want "out" as soon as possible. Time and time again, man after man said: "I'm getting out just as soon as my twenty years are up."

3. *The erosion of military justice.* The Uniform Code of Military Justice, which governs the disciplinary procedures of all the services, replaced the far stricter "Articles for the Government of the Navy" in 1951. The reforms were needed, and unfortunately, the code introduced some of the same legal delays, red tape and paperwork that have tied up our civilian courts.

The Navy, however, could live with the Code of Military Justice, but many officers feel its provisions and, above all, its intent are being watered down, sometimes by congressional pressures, but most of all by what Colonel Robert D. Heinl, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps (retired), has described as a "wideranging though little-noticed series of legal challenges brought mainly by radical lawyers and consistently sustained by libertarian civilian courts."

In a comprehensive review of many court rulings of the past six years, Colonel Heinl, writing in the *Detroit News*, points out that—despite explicit constitutional authority for a separate and distinct system of military justice (Congress is charged with making "rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces")—continuous legal challenges and rulings have sought "to impose literal application of the libertarian and egalitarian provisions of the Constitution upon the Armed Forces which, in their

nature as institutions, cannot tolerate or coexist with libertarianism or egalitarianism."

Repeatedly, civilian courts have overturned military decisions and have forced honorable discharges—with veterans' benefits—for servicemen who had been convicted of criminal, subversive, or seditious acts. In 1969 the U.S. Supreme Court, in a shocking judgment which reversed 200 years of precedents, held that military courts-martial should not try uniformed personnel for "civilian" offenses. As a result, a convicted former Army officer serving thirty years in Leavenworth for multiple offenses of rape, sodomy and burglary was released, presented with a check for \$50,000 worth of back pay and, over the unavailing protests of the Army, put back in uniform.

The U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the highest court of the military legal ladder, composed entirely of civilian justices, has echoed some of the bizarre judgments of civilian courts. It has ruled, for instance, that an officer who drew bad checks to pay gambling debts committed no offense and that a convicted Vietnam private who lobbed a live grenade into a sergeant's hut should be freed because his counsel did not introduce character witnesses.

Theft, almost nonexistent in the old Navy when military law permitted the immediate bad-conduct discharge of a proven thief, is now a fairly general problem both afloat and ashore. Its effects are obviously corrosive to the development of teamwork so essential to any military society. As a chief in a Sixth Fleet ship put it, "the kids can't leave anything lying on their bunks."

Drugs, as well as theft, are another pervasive problem in all the Armed Services. Happily, in the Sixth Fleet, the use of hard drugs is rare, but marijuana, pep pills, hashish and amphetamines are an almost universal part of the naval scene. Intermittent spot checks, body and locker searches and special inspections—even aboard fighting ships—by dogs trained to sniff out narcotics, are some of the control measures tried, all of them handicapped by aberrant court decisions (one of which freed two confessed drug-running soldiers who had been detected by a dog). One ship in the Sixth Fleet has had to triple the size of its detention facilities for a "brig annex" to house sailors found guilty of possessing or using marijuana.

Another aspect of the watered-down code: the red tape and delay on most disciplinary procedures and light court-martial sentences, which often bear no relationship to the seriousness of the crime. Legalisms and judicial leniency have also influenced many COs to overlook offenses which might normally have been punished; the personal records of individuals often do not adequately reflect disciplinary infractions.

Thus, the Navy of today is in crisis. Too often, there is lacking that "conviction of excellence" the late Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King defined as the kernel of morale. Indeed, spirits were so low among embattled command rank officers in the Sixth Fleet that Vice Admiral Gerald E. Miller felt constrained to issue a special order early in 1973 reaffirming his faith in these men. But there are bright overtones in this somber picture.

First and most important, the majority of the Navy's personnel—white and black—are sound; the misfits, the militants, the malcontents and the oddballs are a minority. Properly screened and selected, the young recruit of today has assets his forefathers never had—a much better technical education and therefore a capacity for grasping the complex details of a highly technical profession. "I find it hard to keep up with them," a chief said. "These kids will get in a week what it takes me a month to master."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Second, there are some—though inconclusive—indications that the Navy's slump in morale and discipline *may* have "bottomed out." The shock of last year's mutinies and the determination of a few courageous commanders to cope with the growing chaos in the fleet let to somewhat sterner measures and perhaps a reversal of recent trends. The Navy's recruiting command has been reorganized, and more careful screening is being stressed. Basic training is more thorough than a year ago.

Not all ships are affected by the malaise of the fleet. A good captain can usually foster a "happy ship." Aviators and submarine crews—both very carefully selected, both with a sense of dedication to their jobs, both keyed to teamwork—are so far relatively immune to the deterioration around them.

But it is always harder, in the Navy's phrase, "to walk the cat back" when discipline has once been relaxed and morale has declined, especially since heavy pressures on the side of still more permissiveness are being exerted.

The first and fundamental requirement in the renaissance of the U.S. Navy is public support. We must understand the fundamental purpose of a navy—to deter war, to protect our vital interests and to win battles. Neither the Navy nor any of the other military services can be a social science laboratory and still retain combat effectiveness.

To win public support and to restore that sense of excellence which is the key to all morale, the Navy must clean its own house. It must restore the high-spirited, wise leadership it has usually had in the past, leadership dedicated to holding the line against unwise congressional and bureaucratic, political and sociological pressures; leadership that puts first things first: a disciplined, dependable and effective fleet.

This leadership must stress selectivity and quality of personnel—not quotas or quantity—it must rigorously eliminate the malcontents, the radical militants, the disgruntled time-servers and the misfits. It must stress one standard for white and black. As Rear Admiral Samuel L. Gravely, Jr., the first of the Navy's two black admirals, said some time ago, "Equal opportunity should mean just that and nothing else."

Above all, the Navy must stand firm against any further civilianization of the Code of Military Justice. Military justice must be *military*—a disciplinary prop. A clearcut ruling by the Supreme Court that would put up a "No Trespassing" sign around the military justice system would greatly aid in preventing the continuous erosion of the system by the encroachments of the judicial branch.

The Hicks report put the problem in a nutshell:

"Discipline is the keystone of the Armed Services of any nation. If discipline collapses, a military force becomes a leaderless, uniformed mob, capable only of accomplishing its own destruction."

There is not, there cannot be, there never will be a so-called "democratic army or navy." There can be a navy of a democracy, but it must be composed of proud, high-spirited young men who expect and welcome a structured life of discipline tempered with humanitarianism, and who recognize that wearing the uniform entails special obligations, duties, laws and restraints as well as privileges. A sense of excellence, pride of service and fidelity to authority must be once again emphasized in the "New Navy" of today and tomorrow.

The deterioration of our Navy has gone so far that a time of decision has been reached. The Navy quite possibly can survive the assaults upon its budget, its size, the reduction in its strength and even the petty and narrow economies that tend to hobble it. But it cannot survive the assaults upon its soul.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS FISHING INDUSTRY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that saturation fishing methods used by huge foreign fishing fleets threaten the destruction of an important national resource as well as continued employment for fishermen. On March 21, 1974, the Massachusetts House of Representatives adopted a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact the Studds-Magnuson bill (H.R. 8665) to help relieve this dangerous situation.

H.R. 8665 provides for the extension of the jurisdiction of the United States to 200 miles over certain ocean areas and fish, pending the Law of the Seas Conference and some international agreement to protect the fisheries of all nations. Open hearings on this bill are scheduled on May 2 in Portland, Maine, and on May 3 in New Bedford, Mass.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS FISHING INDUSTRY

Whereas, Valuable coastal and anadromous species of fish and marine life off the shores of the United States are in danger of being seriously depleted and, in some cases, of being extinct; and

Whereas, Stocks of coastal and anadromous species within the nine-mile contiguous zone and three-mile territorial sea of the United States are being seriously depleted by foreign fishing efforts beyond the existing twelve-mile fisheries zone near the coastline of the United States; and

Whereas, International negotiations have so far proved incapable of obtaining timely agreement on the protection and conservation of threatened species of fish and marine life; and

Whereas, There is further danger of irreversible depletion before efforts to achieve an international agreement on jurisdiction over coastal and anadromous fisheries result in an operative agreement; and

Whereas, It is therefore necessary for the United States to take interim action to protect and conserve overfished stocks and to protect our domestic fishing industry; and

Whereas, These findings adversely affect the future of the Massachusetts fishing industry and the health and welfare of its people; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation known as the Studds-Magnuson Bill (H.R. 8665), an act to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the

United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

THE INDEPENDENT GAS DEALER'S
ECONOMIC DEMISE

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, not too many Americans have noticed it amidst all the sound and fury, but the major oil companies have been able to attain virtually every goal they have sought. This includes higher prices for gasoline, fuel oil, and natural gas, which they possess near-monopoly control over, at least as far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned. One of their other goals, elimination of competition in the retail gasoline field, is being methodically pursued by the major oil corporations, with a significant degree of success.

Many of us will remember the cutrate gasoline station on the near corner, where with a minimum of frill and a maximum of economy, we could obtain excellent gasoline at reasonable prices. As a matter of fact, gas stations controlled by the major oil companies were losing the competitive struggle against their cost-cutting competitors. Between 1960 and 1972, independent and non-major-brand discount gasoline stations increased their share of the retail market from 10 to 25 percent.

Operators of outlets owned and controlled by the majors lead a precarious existence, if anyone thinks they enjoy any modicum of security. Economic vasalage is more the accurate term to utilize in their case. The majors will often build another station to compete with their own franchise holder a short distance away. Should the major oil company decide to adopt some merchandising gimmick, such as trading stamps, which are a totally parasitic enterprise, the retailer operating the company station must adopt the venture and pay its cost off the top. Often, this is inflicted upon the reluctant franchises through coercion, couched in terms of do it or lose your franchise because of this clause in the fine print allowing us to do just that.

As a result of all this, plus still other factors, the independent stations grew more and more competitive. In some States, such stations accounted for one-third to close to one-half of all gasoline sales until the recent gasoline shortages, which I believe were largely contrived by the major oil companies through their control of the distribution, refining, and shipping network.

How did these small stations, many of whose operators I have come to know, attain such success and serve the public so well? It was a simple and unadorned method, featuring a straightforward pitch to consumers conscious of costs. Automotive services were cut to a minimum. High volume gasoline operations were their norm, complete with 24-hour

service. Such independents were therefore able to sell gas for from 2 to 6 cents per gallon less than going prices at stations run by big oil.

Big oil responded by refusing to compete and offer consumers lower prices for gas. Instead, marketing firepower became the order of their day. New stations, heavy ad campaigns, credit cards, trading stamps, gifts and games, all costing operators of stations and consumers more, were their response. It did not work, because consumers wanted economy. They sensed what the peripheral services were costing them at the pumps. A hike of 1 cent per gallon means \$1 billion more for big oil in a year.

Then came the energy crunch, and major oil companies capitalized on the chief weakness of the independents—their place on the bottom of the gas distribution chain. Independents do not refine their own crude oil, instead buying it from independent refiners and smaller oil companies. These in turn depend upon the majors for supplies: Exxon, Gulf, Mobil, Texaco, Standard of California, Shell, BP, and ARCO, who control, according to the FTC, 70 percent of all our refineries. Turning off the spigot at the top by big oil resulted, starting last summer, in the closing of some 4,000 independent gas stations. At every point in the shortages, big oil took the opportunity to wipe out as many as possible of these enterprises. Simultaneously, curious to note, they continued their program of construction of cutrate stations from which to sell their own secondary or house gas brands.

As the independent operators are replaced by big oil-owned outlets, cutrate gas will become a thing of the past. The majors are aiming at what is for them the ideal situation—fewer but larger high volume stations owned by them, featuring gas at premium prices.

The Federal Trade Commission notes that the crunch has presented big oil with a chance to do what they have long wanted to accomplish: Eliminate price-cutting independents totally. According to the FTC—

The major integrated oil companies are . . . taking advantage of the present shortage to drive the only viable long-term source of competition, the independent marketer, out of market after market.

In the long run, there must be a major reduction in the majors' control of refining capacity. Senator HART's bill to construct seven oil refineries for sale to the public seems a viable alternative. The proposal to bring into being a national oil and gas corporation along the lines of TVA would seem to be the only way of guaranteeing a supply of crude to such refinery facilities. We know, for example, that the major oil companies have deliberately held back on building oil refineries in the United States because they have had so much to gain from building such facilities abroad. Our tax system has guaranteed them a financial break if they follow such a policy, and they have taken full advantage of this.

Congress can and should act to break this monopoly control. The measures are in committee and should be brought to the floor. If no action is taken, then the

oil majors will not only make more money and keep it, but they will also be able to build their existing monopoly structure into a stranglehold which will grievously harm every single American citizen.

A PAUSE THAT REFRESHES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on a beautiful spring day like this, it is appropriate to pause in the midst of the pressures of world problems and the demands of domestic crises to reflect on some of the joys around us.

News reports today indicate that since the fuel shortages eased, visitors to the Nation's capital have been increasing. As we know, they will find a lovely city, despite its faults, with a wealth of historical background and significance.

Recently, Peter C. Andrews, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Courier-Express, described the pleasures his family discovered at the Jefferson Memorial, and I would like to share his article with my colleagues:

JEFFERSON MEMORIAL BEAUTIFUL ON A MAGIC SPRING DAY

(By Peter C. Andrews)

It was one of those magic spring days that comes once every few years in Washington. The cherry blossoms were at their most luxuriant, delicate peak, with a gentle breeze wafting occasional petals down gently to the new spring grass coming up in renewed glory around the Jefferson Memorial. The sky was blue with just a few pleasant clouds to break the monotony. The sun reflected off the dappled surface of the Tidal Basin like so many little diamonds.

I was meeting my family and some friends for a picnic lunch under the blossoms. I was early and spent the time chatting with Robert Lipton, the National Park Service guard at the memorial. A former advertising man who left the hectic ulcer race for the more tranquil life of the Park Service, Lipton was a veritable treasury of facts about our third President and his monument.

Both the monument and Jefferson celebrate anniversaries next Saturday. The monument was dedicated 31 years ago, and Jefferson was born exactly two centuries before that. The 18-foot-high bronze statue of Jefferson was completed by sculptor Rudolph Evans on July 4, 1939, the anniversary of Jefferson's death in 1826.

"Jefferson really hung onto life," Lipton mused. "He started dying on July 1, but he was determined to live to see the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, and he made it. He was 83 years old. Our second President, John Adams, died on the same day, so both lived to see that historic occasion."

Like a lot of things these days, the Jefferson Memorial cost more to build than originally estimated. Congress appropriated \$500,000 for the memorial in 1934, but actual work on the structure did not begin until 1938. The intervening four years were spent in bickering about selection of contractors, who would design the building and who would be the sculptor of the statue. When the job was completed the total cost was about \$3 million.

Evans was a local Washington sculptor and won out in the selection process over 101

sculptors from all over the United States and abroad. He was not a total unknown, however, since he had already executed several statues in Statuary Hall in Congress, including the statues of Robert E. Lee and William Jennings Bryan and the bust of James Fenimore Cooper. Although he received only about \$17,000 for the work, he was delighted to receive the commission as a patriotic gesture.

The architect of the building, John Russell Pope, who also had designed the National Gallery of Art, came in for a lot of criticism, some of it from disappointed competitors whom he had beaten out on the job and some from politicians. The oratorical Sen. William Borah of Idaho, when he saw the design with its many columns, called it "the Temple of the Winds." Architect Frank Lloyd Wright called Pope "Old Domehead" because of his use of a dome similar to that on the National Gallery and—although Wright did not mention this—similar to the one Jefferson himself had designed for his home at Monticello. Wright also called the monument "the most classic men's room in the city."

No matter what Wright and others said about it at the time, the Jefferson Memorial is today one of the most beautiful and most photographed and beloved landmarks of the nation's capital.

The number of daily visitors is a fairly steady 4,000 to 6,000 year-round, Lipton said, although perfect days when the cherry blossoms are out and the sun is shining bring out crowds of up to 20,000 in a single day. After President Kennedy was assassinated, the crowds were bigger, averaging about 15,000 a day, but that had now dropped off.

Perhaps the best indicator of the affection and regard for the monument is that there have been only two minor cases of vandalism at the memorial in the last decade, and both of those were names written with felt-tipped pens on the columns and were easily cleaned off.

Anyway, it was a beautiful day and a beautiful setting. We had a beautiful picnic. I think I'll go back there for his birthday Saturday.

AGE IS IN THE MIND

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has initiated several studies relating to the elderly over the years and I think this editorial from the Emmitsburg Chronicle aptly points to the need for us to be flexible in determining the ideal retirement age.

EDITORIAL

The grim category of "middle age" used to officially catch up with people sometime in their 40's, but it might now be said that 40-year-olds seem to be getting younger and younger every day.

Middle age may not mean tired blood and spreading waistlines after all, and for those who think it does, a solution might be found in the old "mind over matter" philosophy.

A news report out of San Francisco tells of a gentleman who passed away at the age of 106. He took his last job as a waiter at the St. Francis Hotel at the age of 80 and worked there for 25 years until his retirement at the age of 105.

He liked to run seven miles every day, and three years ago polished off the 100-yard dash in 17.3 seconds.

Bored after retirement, he took a job as a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

goodwill ambassador for a temporary help employment agency.

Maybe there is hope for us in this early-retirement day and age. Flexibility of the retirement age of 65 may be the key to happiness for those who wish to continue working. Even if they don't run to work, there is a lot to be said for the spirit of sixty-somers.

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS, PARAMOUNT COUNCIL NO. 357 OF PARAMOUNT, CALIF.

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the forthcoming occasion of their annual scholarship award banquet to be held on May 4, 1974, I wish to salute the members of the League of United Latin American Citizens, Paramount Council No. 357 for their outstanding humanitarian work on behalf of their fellow men, women, and children.

Under the capable leadership of its president, Mr. Art Salazar, Paramount Council No. 357 has amassed a remarkable record of accomplishment in making the world a better one in which to live. Its main objective is education, for the members of LULAC feel that equal opportunity and excellent instruction are necessary if our children are to become responsible and concerned citizens.

The Paramount LULAC Council concentrates heavily on seeing that education is given and that scholarship will excel. In the past, their members have helped approximately 50 students attend the college of their choice, and at present 12 students attend various colleges in the Los Angeles area because LULAC has helped them financially. In recognition of its achievement, the council has received the Rick Telles Education Trophy upon three occasions at the LULAC National Convention; and, because of this outstanding record, is now permitted to keep the trophy permanently.

The Paramount LULAC's annual Christmas party for underprivileged children is widely supported by businessmen and women throughout the country. The event has been so well received and successful, that what started with 50 children grew to a record 500 last year. In the truest Christmas spirit, it is a program looked forward to enormously and enjoyed by all.

In addition, families who meet with hardship can look to this council for financial help when such need arises. Funds for the local church are raised every year. A foreign exchange student from Mexico is always in residence in the area, and the council is committed to raising funds to help cities in need in southern Mexico.

The council also focuses attention on social programs on the civic, State, and national levels and is involved with the city council, the board of education, the Paramount Involvement Corps, the

health clinic, and various schools in the district. Community affairs have the council's continual attention. In fact, the Paramount Health Force was formed by a member of the council, Mr. Le Roy Pearson, who has been chairman of the group for 2 years. It was through his unstinting efforts that the Paramount Health Clinic was acquired, a facility which is constantly growing in size and services to the people.

Delegates are always sent to district, State, and national LULAC conventions, and the council president, Art Salazar, serves as State Treasurer of LULAC.

One of the members, Paul Garcia, was selected National Man of the Year for his outstanding work in the community and involvement in the league at all levels. In 1970, President Art Salazar was selected California Man of the Year for his outstanding achievements in the league and throughout the country. Another member, Jess Vella, is a past national vice president while Margaret Pacheco is a past member of the National SER Board of Directors, a program federally funded for manpower training.

The LULAC motto is "All for one, one for all." They ask to be judged by what they do and not what they simply say they will do. The record is there for all to see.

I am personally proud to have such a committed and conscientious group within my district and feel a great sense of respect for each and every one of these fine citizens.

FORD FOUNDATION ENERGY PROJECT: SUGAR COATING INSTEAD OF STRAIGHT TALK

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this month, the Ford Foundation's energy policy project published a preliminary report, "Exploring Energy Choices."

The report, according to its introduction, uses as its major tool for analyzing energy policy options, three descriptions or scenarios of the future. These scenarios are called Historical Growth—3.4 percent; Technical Fix—1.7 percent; and Zero Energy Growth—achieves zero percent growth in mid-1980's.

It may, and probably will be necessary to try to fit the growing and sprawling American economy, into one of these modes for the future. But the problem with the Ford report is that it makes, or tries unsuccessfully to make, each of them look attractive and easy. To use the words of a dissenting advisory board member's remarks:

The clear implication of the report is that we should delay the development of additional energy supplies on the assumption that they will not be needed, because we can reduce our use of energy.

HISTORICAL GROWTH

The report notes that energy use in the United States has been increasing "at slightly more than 4 percent an-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nually." To get a lower use increase, Ford stretches its historical base back to 1952 and comes up with an average increase of 3.4 percent—at least 15 percent less than our recent history. Ford assumes no Government policies to change energy habits and states that domestic resources alone, aggressively developed, can meet this demand. I believe the demand assumption is seriously understated, and I have little confidence in the supply assumption. The Historical Growth Scenario seems to me to be not historical at all. Instead, it is a "fix" which would require heavy Government manipulation of both demand and supply.

TECHNICAL FIX

The technical fix—growth of 1.7 percent—"reflects a determined conscious national effort to reduce demand for energy." It surely will, but Ford has buttered up this scenario by telling us it provides a quality of life little different from the historical growth mode. "Little different" means one-third less energy in the year 2000. One-third less energy also means sharply reduced quality of life, unemployment, and a changed life style.

ZERO GROWTH

Zero growth is described as a "real break with our accustomed way of doing things". But the Ford pollyannas say it does not represent austerity. Maybe so, but it quacks like a duck and, without benefit of Ford's rosy glasses, it looks like austerity to me. It also looks like wholesale unemployment, and the dampening of aspirations for a better life for millions of our citizens.

It is not so bad that the report does its best to put down nuclear energy—on which we must rely for much of the growth of electrical generating capacity over the next 25 years. It is not so bad that the supply sources are overestimated and demand is underestimated. What is really bad about the report is that it says we are going to enjoy going without the energy we want. It is a little bit like telling people that depressions are really fun, because they build character.

The Ford energy project is off to a bad start, because we desperately need straight talk on energy. We have not had much of that yet from politicians and oil companies. It is a shame we can not get it from the Ford Foundation either. Sad commentaries on the preliminary report is that it looks as though it were written by politicians, and that some of its best stuff is in the nonconcurring statements of advisory board members.

The report is soft soap with a sugar coating, but it still tastes like soap.

YOUR STATE FLAG

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as the celebration of the American Bicentennial draws near, all of us should be-

come more aware of the tradition and heritage of our 50 States. Each is a part of the Union, yet each is unique in its history and in its contribution to our heritage.

John Robert Gebhart, of Cherry Hill, N.J., has compiled a book which preserves the history and background of the States by providing the history and symbolism of each of the 50 State flags. "Your State Flag," published by Franklin Publishing Co., Philadelphia, is organized chronologically by date of statehood. Each entry includes a full-page color photograph of the flag's design, one or two paragraphs of historical information, and a list of the State bird, flower, tree, colors, song, name, and origin. There is also an appended list of those who designed each flag and a brief bibliography.

I would highly recommend "Your State Flag" as an excellent reference book and a valuable addition to any library.

SLOW MOTION IN WASHINGTON

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, with the House Judiciary Committee investigating all the charges pending against the President and everyone so concerned over the serious matter of impeachment, I wish to insert this article from the Chicago Tribune for the benefit of my colleagues:

SLOW MOTION IN WASHINGTON

The House Judiciary Committee's deadline for receiving additional tapes and documents sought in connection with its impeachment investigation has come and gone, and nothing has been delivered. Instead, President Nixon's special counsel, James St. Clair, said he had been "directed" by the President to say that a review of the material is under way, that it will be completed "by the end of the Easter recess" (April 22), and that "the material furnished at that time will permit the committee to complete its inquiry promptly."

This elusive response aroused members of the committee to predictable anger. Several Republicans who have hitherto been cool to subpoenas and impeachment are wavering. It is hard to believe that in more than a year of screaming controversy over Watergate and related matters the White House has not gotten around to reviewing just about everything in its possession which might be relevant.

Once again, there is a vague promise to produce something—we're not told just what—at some time in the future; and once again there is the familiar suggestion that this something is all that is needed to satisfy the committee and enable it to finish up its work "promptly" and presumably forget about impeachment.

Every effort thus made by the White House in the past to brush aside the scandal has instead raised new questions and intensified the zeal of the President's critics. Mr. St. Clair's latest message seems almost calculated to taunt the committee.

Surely all of this must be perfectly clear to Mr. St. Clair, a skilled and experienced lawyer. And altho Mr. Nixon has been isolated from reality and fed bum advice by his

April 23, 1974

staff in the past, he, too, must realize now that the course of events is being determined not just by the Judiciary Committee, but by an increasingly exasperated public opinion.

What, then, can be their motive in deliberately provoking the committee's wrath? Is there still a hope that the captain's bridge can ride out the storm while the rest of the ship founders beneath it? If so, something will have to happen pretty soon to satisfy the country or divert its attention.

Is the purpose to provoke the committee itself into behavior so rash as to discredit it in the eyes of the public? If so, at least one Democratic committee member, California's Jerome Waldie, seems to be stumbling into the trap with his belligerent talk of impeachment and his demand that the committee "no longer tolerate" the President's "contemptuous attitude." Mr. Waldie's halo was already badly dented the other day when one of his assistants showed up in Federal Court asking for copies of an indictment which, it turned out, had not yet been returned. Evidently Mr. Waldie or his assistants had been illegally siphoning information out of the special prosecutor's office.

Fortunately most of the committee members and staff have behaved well. To their credit, the Democrats on the committee agreed—before receiving Mr. St. Clair's message—to let him sit in on the impeachment inquiry. This is a right that a prospective defendant does not enjoy in ordinary indictment proceedings but which, in the present instance, seems quite justified in order to protect Mr. Nixon's interests and prevent the slightest hint of a lynching party.

The longer the committee maintains its dignity and composure, the more certainly the White House will have to recognize that the tactics of delay and evasion will not work and that more sincere evidence of the promised cooperation is necessary.

AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO EXPO '74

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, a new World's Fair, Expo '74, will open in California's fellow State on the west coast, the State of Washington, and in the beautiful city of Spokane. The theme is the environment, a vital one to all of us.

It is fitting that the Federal Government has underwritten a motion picture concerned with our national environment today, to be premiered on one of the three largest screens existing in the world, erected in the fabulous U.S. Pavilion constructed on the site of Expo '74.

This IMAX film, appropriately titled "Man Belongs to the Earth," is being presented by the Department of Commerce. It certainly is one of the most impressive and important motion pictures ever supported by the Government.

Paramount Pictures, a major motion picture producer from the era of silent films to the present day, produced "Man Belongs to the Earth," through its Paramount Communications Division, which in its own field has won more than 50 international awards.

This organization previously has produced noteworthy subjects for the U.S.

Treasury Department, the American Cancer Society, the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, the State of California, and for a number of leading U.S. cities.

To film "Man Belongs to the Earth," a Paramount crew labored for more than a year and traveled to States throughout the country, including Hawaii and Alaska. They went into cities large and small, onto the desert and the ocean, over streams and into the mountains.

What finally has been put onto film, to be viewed at Expo '74 on a screen 60 feet high by 90 feet wide, is an exciting, spectacular, and thoughtful visual representation of our environment. It speaks out about the problems that confront us, and about some solutions.

From its opening scenes over the Grand Canyon to a closing sequence in Monument Valley, the IMAX camera, a technical marvel, presents a breathtaking panorama of scenic wonders throughout the United States. It ranges over the rolling hills of Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota, across cities like Denver and Los Angeles, and follows the bald eagle, our national symbol threatened with extinction, to Alaska, the alligator to the Okefenokee Swamp of Georgia, the whooping crane to the Arkansas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas, the sea otter to the Monterey coast of California.

It takes viewers on a thrilling raft ride down the rapids of the Colorado River, and puts them in ringside seats to observe the frightening battle to extinguish an oil well fire in Casper, Wyo.

There is beauty, and there is also the devastation wrought by smog, by pollution and by man.

As James Whitmore, the fine actor who narrates the film, says at one point:

We're the problem—but if we put our minds to it, we can be the solution. We've just got to decide the kind of world we really want.

Chief Dan George, another notable personality and performer, appears in "Man Belongs to the Earth" and sums it up perfectly while standing in the lush Quinault Rain Forest of Washington's Olympic National Park. He says:

Everything that lives on Mother Earth is precious. Even the grass that grows we shouldn't destroy. The trees, we shouldn't destroy. They've got life. They've got life from the breath of the Great Spirit. That's what I want my children to see, the way Mother Earth was given to us. That's the way it should be.

Chief Dan George and James Whitmore are to be commended for their part in this fine endeavor. So, too, are those responsible for the production, including Frank Yablans, president of Paramount Pictures; Robert C. Peters, vice-president of Paramount Communications Division and the film's executive producer; Roman Kroitor, producer, and Graeme Ferguson, producer, director and photographer.

They can be proud, as can the Department of Commerce, of a most worthwhile as well as entertaining contributions to the success of Expo '74.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE FINANCIAL STATUS OF REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe deeply that elected officials must observe the highest standards of honesty.

One of the best ways of insuring integrity in government is to provide the voters with the facts regarding each Representative's financial dealings—so that the voters can prevent dishonesty and conflict of interest when they go to the polls.

For this reason, I am making the following financial disclosure which I believe will enable the voters of my district to judge how I have discharged my public trust. I am pleased that my disclosure follows the guidelines suggested by the New York State Congressional Delegation.

I also wish to add that I resigned from my law practice before I took my seat in Congress and will not resume law practice while I am a Representative.

FINANCIAL STATUS

NON-CONGRESSIONAL INCOME

In 1973, my income from non-Congressional sources is as follows:

Lecture and Writing Fees, \$3,250.00.
New York Times, "Op Ed" Page.
Brooklyn Law School.
Washington D.C. Chapter, Federally Employed Women.
North Virginia Chapter, Federally Employed Women.
Queens College Student Activities Fund.
Richmond College Student Activities Fund.
National Organization for Women (NOW) Chicago.
The Brookings Institution.
North Shore Unitarian Womens Federation.
American University.
Barnard College.
Georgetown University.
92nd Street YMHA, New York City.
National Broadcasting Company, "Not for Women Only".

UNSECURED LOANS

I had only one unsecured debt in 1973 which was a personal loan from the Atlantic Bank of New York. The loan was paid in full in 1973.

NON-CONGRESSIONAL REIMBURSEMENTS

Reimbursements to me for expenditures other than from the U.S. Government in 1973 totalled \$390.70. These reimbursements were all in connection with speaking engagements. The sources for these reimbursements are:

National Organization for Women (NOW), Chicago.
1973 New York State Legislative Conference of Business and Professional Women.
2 Miscellaneous Reimbursements for travel, each under \$100.00.

SECURITIES

I own no stocks and bonds with a total value of more than \$25.

TAXES

The personal income taxes I paid for 1973 (contained in my tax returns as filed on April 15, 1974) totalled \$6,456.00 and are as follows: U.S. Government, \$4,656.00; New York State, \$1,421.00; New York City, \$379.00.

BUSINESS AFFILIATIONS

I do not serve as a director, officer, or partner (or advisor or manager) of any business entity, foundation or professional organization (of a non-eleemosynary nature).

KENNEDY GIVES SOVIETS A LESSON IN DEMOCRACY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a speech before an audience at Moscow State University yesterday, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY asked for a show of hands on whether Soviet military spending should be increased, decreased, or held the same. Such straw-polling of audiences is a standard procedure here in the United States; I myself have done it many times.

But the Soviet audience sat in stunned silence, followed by nervous laughter. Apparently in the Soviet Socialist Republics the common people are unaccustomed to being consulted on any matters of national policy. After the question was repeated several times, about half a dozen indicated a desire for less military spending, one indicated a desire for more, and everybody else claimed to feel the present level is exactly correct.

The officials then forced Senator KENNEDY to leave, telling the audience, despite his denials, that he was not feeling well. Evidently in the Soviet Union consulting the opinion of the people is considered proof that one is ill.

The affair had certain aspects of low comedy, but I believe that in the perspective of history it will be seen as high drama. In my view, Senator KENNEDY performed an enormous service for the Soviet citizens in the audience by giving them a taste of the way things operate in a real democracy, where the people tell the leaders what to do rather than the reverse. They will not forget it, and I expect the story will spread rapidly and widely by word of mouth.

Since there are substantial differences between the New York Times and the Associated Press news accounts, I include them both in the RECORD at this point:

KENNEDY'S OPINION POLLING BAFFLES MOSCOW AUDIENCE

(By Hedrick Smith)

MOSCOW, April 21.—Senator Edward M. Kennedy tried out American-style public opinion polling on an audience at Moscow State University today and drew some hostility from a generally silent audience when he asked for a show of hands on whether the Soviet Union should be spending more or less on defense.

"That's a provocative question," a white-haired gentleman in the third row shouted in Russian, raising his hand as if to stop the proceedings.

"That depends on the international situation," objected a middle-aged woman, speaking English.

AN AWKWARD SILENCE

But the bulk of the audience of nearly 800, totally unaccustomed to being publicly polled without advance warning on such a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sensitive issue, sat silently on their hands in awkward confusion and embarrassment.

All but a few declined to be coaxed into voting until the Massachusetts Democrat and a Russian translator had rephrased the question. Then the audience in the hall almost unanimously raised their hands in favor of the present level of spending. Only one man voted for an increase.

The option of voting for a cutback was dropped entirely this time, though on the first abortive attempt to ask that question a dozen or so hands had gone up. One woman enthusiastically raised both arms.

Mr. Kennedy's surprising attempt to sample Soviet opinion on several issues came at the conclusion of a speech in which he appealed for the Soviet leadership to take "magnanimous action" on Jewish emigration to break the deadlock over development of trade.

The Senator arrived Thursday for a week's visit to the Soviet Union, including a scheduled meeting tomorrow with the Communist party leader, Leonid I. Brezhnev.

This afternoon, he met for two hours with Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, touching on strategic arms control, European security and force reduction, the Middle East, China, Indian Ocean problems, trade and emigration for Soviet Jews.

RAISED EMIGRATION ISSUE

In his university speech, the first ever given on the Moscow campus by a major American politician, the Senator gently raised the question of "the free emigration of peoples" without specifically mentioning Soviet Jews.

He acknowledged the Soviet argument that it was wrong for the American Congress to block lower tariffs and larger credits for Moscow with demands for free emigration, and he took note of "the general increase in emigration that has taken place during recent years."

"I am confident that magnanimous action on the part of your Government would lead the American people to respond as well," he said, offering a vague indication of Congressional action that would satisfy Moscow.

He also advised the Soviet audience that it would not be to their advantage to hope for or encourage a split between the United States and Western Europe because, he implied, it might raise mistrust that "would definitely not promote those conditions needed for our own progress in controlling nuclear arms."

CANDOR A THEME

But a more general theme in his talk was for greater openness, candor and exchange between the Soviet Union and the United States.

When he declared that it was time for both sides "to modify the restrictions on travel within each country by anyone from the other," the simultaneous Soviet translation dropped this passage entirely. When he urged larger student exchanges, the translator rendered this as "when larger exchanges are taking place."

Senator Kennedy had requested the appearance at the university. His coming had not been announced to the 27,000 students. Roughly half the members of selected audience were older than student age, apparently faculty and staff. Lenin lapel pins and Komsomol, or Young Communist League, badges were prominent among the younger people. Some students trying to enter the building were barred though the auditorium had a few empty seats.

The lecture took place at the humanities school, about half a mile from the main university building, where almost all major functions take place and where Angela Davis spoke. When the Senator toured the main building briefly, the section he visited was closed off from the residential wings, stu-

dents said. Only a few hundred students saw him.

AUDIENCE STARTLED

Although a question-and-answer session was on the schedule, Senator Kennedy startled his listeners when he said he wanted to ask some questions, as he did on American campuses.

He first asked the audience to rate the importance of four major Soviet events—the first manned space flight, victory in World War II, Soviet economic achievements and the victory at the 1972 Olympic games.

The university rector interceded to explain the procedure to the confused audience, listing the choices in a different order—the war, the economy, space and the Olympics. When the polling took place, the war and economy were far ahead.

When the audience got its chance, the white-haired man who had first rebuked the Senator, jumped up to ask "What country in the world is second after the Soviet Union in education, health, housing and so on?" The audience laughed and applauded.

"In many areas," said Mr. Kennedy, "we are spending more and getting less."

KENNEDY IRKS SOVIET HOSTS

Moscow, April 21—Sen. Edward Kennedy was met with silence, laughter and open hostility at Moscow State University today, and then was hustled out of the auditorium by his hosts on the pretext that he wasn't feeling well.

Kennedy had asked the audience of Soviet university students and other spectators whether they thought Soviet military spending should be increased or decreased. His question was greeted first with silence, then with an explosion of laughter.

There is no public discussion in the Soviet Union of defense expenditures, and it apparently struck the audience as bizarre and amusing that Kennedy would ask their opinion.

An elderly man in the audience shook his fist at Kennedy and shouted. "That question is a provocation." Those near him murmured agreement.

The man then stood up and told the Massachusetts Democrat: "We spend as much on defense as our country requires."

Kennedy, who often asks questions of his American student audiences, then asked the audience to vote by raised hands on which Soviet achievements they considered most important.

Obviously confused, the audience failed to respond.

Finally, after several translations of the question, including one by the rector of the university, a few hesitant hands went up when the senator mentioned the first man in space.

More hands were raised when he mentioned the Soviets' victory in World War II and economic progress.

After conferring with officials on the dais, an interpreter came over to the podium and announced that the senator had to leave because he was not feeling well. "No, no, I'm perfectly all right," Kennedy retorted, but he was hustled out of the auditorium shortly thereafter and taken to a meeting with Foreign Minister Gromyko.

Details of that meeting were not disclosed.

The 600-seat auditorium in the Humanities Building was filled, but many of the spectators were middle-aged or older. The building is off limits unless one has a special pass or permission.

A British professor who teaches at the university said a notice had been posted on the bulletin board last week that the speech was open to students and faculty. But he was not allowed in when he showed his university pass.

In his speech, Kennedy appealed to the Soviet Union to allow Americans to travel

April 23, 1974

more freely within Russia. He said the United States would do the same for Soviet travelers.

Kennedy said Russia should not get upset when its domestic policies are criticized by Americans, an apparent reference to U.S. criticism of the Soviet government's policies on emigration. That policy led Congress to block the granting of tariff concessions and bank credits to the Kremlin.

"In general, I do not believe that one nation should interfere directly in the internal affairs of another," Kennedy said. "But I also do not believe in silence—whether on your part, or on ours."

"I also believe that it does not threaten the integrity of the Soviet state for Americans—or for other peoples—to express their views individually on the evolution of Soviet society."

Kennedy was the first major American politician to be allowed to speak on the university campus, Reuters reported. He was invited to address the meeting after American exchange students there had suggested he visit them in their dormitories.

[But when he made a brief tour of the skyscraper building's central complex before his speech, access from the dormitory area was blocked off and few Soviet students appeared to be aware that he was visiting the university.]

A PLACE TO DIE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an exceptionally well written article by Mr. Charles Seabrook which appeared in the Sunday, April 21, 1974, edition of the Atlanta Journal and Constitution.

Mr. Seabrook's poignant account of the plights of many terminally ill cancer patients is touching—and, moreover, tragic. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to take the time to read this article, for it reflects a side of this dread disease which does not show up in any statistics.

Mr. Seabrook's article reads:

A PLACE TO DIE—THE TERMINALLY ILL CANCER PATIENT, HIS MONEY GONE, HAS DIFFICULTY FINDING A PLACE TO STAY IN ATLANTA

(By Charles Seabrook)

Among the most unwanted people in Atlanta are dying cancer patients who have been ruined financially by the disease. Hospitals don't want them, and nursing home operators are increasingly reluctant to take them.

As a result, Atlanta's only free home for destitute cancer victims, Our Lady of Perpetual Help operated by the Catholic church, is being deluged with calls from families who are at the end of their financial rope but still want some decent place for their loved ones to die.

"I wake up in the middle of the night trying to decide who to take next," said Our Lady's director, Sister Mary Eucharist.

"We get frantic phone calls every day from families whose financial resources have been wiped out by cancer, and who have exhausted their chances for any possible government medical aid," she said.

Ironically, said Sister Eucharist, Our Lady is being filled more and more with incurable cancer victims in their mid 30s or early 40s—people who are ineligible for government medical assistance.

"It seems a shame, because the young or middle age persons who pay the most taxes reap the least benefit from government medical programs," she said.

"If you're very poor or very rich and have cancer, you will be taken care of . . . but if you're a young, middle-income person, cancer can financially destroy you and your family," she added.

Medicare and Medicaid (government medical assistance for the poor and aged) officials insist that they can help many of the victims, but the regulations governing the programs are so surrounded by bureaucratic red tape that even the officials themselves appear unsure who can benefit, social workers say.

"Many of these people are not helped at all, despite all the talk by the government people," said a worker in Grady Memorial Hospital's social services department.

Grady, which cares for most of the indigent population in Atlanta, has found it increasingly difficult to find places to move cancer patients who can no longer benefit from conventional cancer therapy.

Recently a Grady social worker phoned several Atlanta nursing homes before she found one that would even talk to her about accepting a destitute and dying cancer victim.

"Only about half of the nursing homes in metro Atlanta will accept the terminally ill, indigent cancer patient," she said. "And those that will accept such patients are continually filled . . . because nursing home beds in Atlanta are already at a critical shortage."

Nursing home owners give a variety of reasons why they don't want the dying cancer victim in their facilities.

One administrator said such patients are too depressing for other patients.

Other nursing home administrators say the patients require a demanding type of nursing care that they can't provide.

But most of the administrators cite dissatisfaction with Medicaid and Medicare regulations. They say Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements for taking care of the patients are not enough in line with soaring food and labor costs.

The state reimburses a nursing home a maximum of \$450 per month to care for a Medicaid patient. But many homes say it takes more than that to provide nursing care, food, linen, custodial services and other necessary care.

Last week Grady had four patients who were lingering in the hospital, awaiting transfer to a nursing home.

"The hospital has done all it can for the patients, but now it can do no more," said a Grady official. "It costs the hospital almost a hundred dollars a day to keep the patients, not to mention the tying up of a needed bed."

"But as long as they are in the hospital, they will get the best care possible," he added.

At one time a few months ago there were 12 incurably ill patients at Grady, but no nursing homes could be found for them.

"But if we even have one patient that we can't find a nursing home for . . . that's one patient too many," said a Grady social worker.

A major problem at Grady is that if the patients stay more than 30 days in the hospital, present Medicaid regulations make it necessary for the patients to first be discharged, and then apply for Medicaid.

If the person is then accepted for Medicaid benefits, he or she is moved to a nursing home.

"But the problem is that it takes weeks to go through the process of applying, and during that time the patient is hurting, and may die," said the social worker.

However, Jim Demer, head of the Medicaid section of the regional Social Security Ad-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ministration office, met with Grady workers last week, and both sides are confident that a solution to the problem can be worked out.

Troy Athon, executive director of the Georgia Nursing Home Association, says construction in Metro Atlanta during the next year or so should alleviate somewhat the nursing home bed shortage in the area.

"But even with more nursing home beds, the owners may not want a dying cancer patient, especially those who have no money left," said the Grady worker.

But cancer volunteers in Atlanta say the problem is getting worse, and they see no early end to the situation.

"I wish I could say yes to all the frantic and desperate families who phone here everyday," said Sister Eucharia of Our Lady. "But it is impossible to admit everyone right away . . . our waiting list is three weeks long already."

DR. DAVID W. MULLINS, DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT RESIGNS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last month one of the great educators of the South and, indeed, the Nation retired after 14 years of service as president of the University of Arkansas. He leaves a vacancy that will be hard to fill and a long trail of accomplishments and contributions which has brought the University of Arkansas through a period of high achievements. Under President David W. Mullins, the University of Arkansas grew to be more than a football team.

Dr. Mullins served the University of Arkansas through a vast growing period. Not only did the Fayetteville campus population triple in size, but the University system, which already included a Graduate Institute of Technology, a medical school and several other facilities in Little Rock, was expanded to include Little Rock University, Arkansas A.M. & N. at Pine Bluff and Arkansas A. & M. at Monticello. It was his responsibility to mold an integrated University system out of four previously separate and diverse institutions.

Dr. Mullins served the University during the period of nationwide student revolts. That this dissent never reached the riotous stages so publicized at other universities is a tribute to the able reactions of Dr. Mullins and the men and women whom he was responsible for drawing to the campus to work with him.

During his administration, the discriminations against black and women students, which had existed since the founding of the University 100 years ago, began to be aired and come to an end. University housing ended racially discriminatory policies and blacks were integrated into many phases of university life, including athletics, previously closed to them. A black studies program was instituted. Women students worked to abolish the countless rules and regulations which separated them from men students and kept them from taking on the responsibility of governing their own

lives. Students were included in the decisionmaking structures of the university.

Dr. Mullins recognized the need for respecting individual rights and under him the UOFA abandoned the "in loco parentis" philosophy and allowed students the responsibility of exercising their own individual freedoms. The university concerned itself with education of the total human being.

Under Dr. Mullins, the main campus at Fayetteville also saw a tremendous physical growth: 20 buildings in all, including 7 high rise dormitories, 4 buildings to be used for science and engineering, an administration building, library communications building and student union. In February, the chairman of the board of trustees, Fred Pickens of Newport, announced the board's decision to name the new library the David W. Mullins Library.

Dr. Mullins' national reputation as an educator is well-earned. He has appeared as a representative of American higher education institutions in several instances and has served as president of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Although Dr. Mullins has retired as president of the university, he remains on campus to teach higher educational administration and finance to graduate students. These students will benefit greatly from his knowledge and experience.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a characterization of Dr. Mullins written by Bill Hughes, director of information for the University of Arkansas who has worked with Dr. Mullins through his 14 years as president:

[Arkansas Alumnus Magazine, February 1974]

DAVID MULLINS, AS I KNEW HIM

(By Bill Hughes)

He showed no elation as his strenuous period of service drew to a close, nor did one detect disappointment or a sigh of relief. Simply a quiet sense of satisfaction with a job well done. Additionally, there was a relaxed demeanor and a desire to conduct more informal conversations with those who had served in close association with him through the years. However, as always, he was "minding the store" in his highly efficient way of keeping the administrative processes running smoothly.

There also was a very impressive attitude not always seen at the termination of a presidential career. While David Mullins, like all men at such a time, delighted in reminiscing about his tenure, he was obviously more interested in the future than in the past. He accepted invitations to make a half-dozen speeches in the last month of his presidency and in each of them, he stressed the University's potential for the future.

What does one remember about the man and his service?

First, there was his strength of character. This was often manifested in his determination not to be ruffled in times of crisis—which occurred somewhat frequently during the tumultuous days when the issues of academic freedom and the demands of the student protest movements were constantly arising. He never dodged meetings with protest groups. Nor would he ever lose his composure when the hecklers harassed him, but rather, he made a point of giving calm and considered responses to loud and vehement

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

criticisms. Down memory lane one recalls the time when, during the visit of a dozen protesters to his office, the group leader sat on the presidential desk, dangling his legs and exercising his vocal chords. But not a presidential eyebrow twitched in response, and the protestor quickly and voluntarily regained his standing position.

It was not that he didn't become tense at times, and place heavy demands on those who worked for him. Such traits are an integral part of conscientious leadership and, in Dr. Mullins' case, they could show through on such chaotic occasions as the campus visits of celebrities like Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon. However, even as the Secret Service and the "advance men" created confusion and extremely heavy demands on the University, and as Mullins' anxiety increased about the eventual result, he thoughtfully and carefully kept the organizational wheels well-greased until some highly complicated situations were resolved.

There were also the more smoothly-running glamour moments: his appearances before Congressional Committees in behalf of constructive legislation for all of American higher education, and his address to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in his capacity as the association president.

He approached every administrative problem with care, to the extent that, as one political leader recently said of another, "He could see seven sides to every four-sided question." Yet, in retrospect, one feels that here was a welcomed characteristic of this university president during a period of years when controversy, at times, could be the rule rather than the exception. There were frequent occasions when a rash decision, reached too quickly without thoughtful evaluation of a number of diverse factors, could have damaged the University. Like the most capable physician, David Mullins felt the prevention of trouble was always better than attempting the cure. And who, in retrospect, can say he wasn't right?

He had an almost unique knack for dividing his life into two separate compartments—his no-nonsense working hours an off-duty periods when his likeable personality and keen sense of humor would shine through. The David Mullins who wanted an administrative memorandum on his desk by 10:30 a.m. with no excuses was in sharp contrast with the "Dave" Mullins who, in the social company of other university presidents, was the favorite raconteur and the life of the gathering. Following the admonition in Ecclesiastes, Mullins has found that "for everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heavens." Put another way, he has been "an all-together" kind of man whose life style has well-suited him and brought him a large measure of self-contentment.

He also has been able to place his interests in separate compartments and yet give full play to all of them. Illustrative of this has been his dedication to the academic progress of the University matched by his equally intense devotion to the success of the Razorbacks. His cheers and laments for the changing Razorback fortunes are equalled only by the volatile expressions of his delightful wife, Eula. David Mullins' interest in his children has been manifested in a number of ways and was perhaps most sharply dramatized by his pride in son Gary's progress with the French horn in the Razorback band.

He appropriately has given a great deal of dignity to the presidency. However, he is a man who takes a practical joke. In 1971, he was a member of a blue-ribboned group of American educational leaders who were taken on a tour of Russia. Before his departure from the campus, members of his staff decided he should have the proper sendoff and presented him with some long-handled underwear on which were embroidered the

words "Siberia or bust." He still recalls the incident with spontaneous laughter.

He looks back upon his achievements with the recognition that he will be remembered as "the building president." True enough, he has achieved far more than any of his predecessors in the construction of new facilities. However, he also placed an early stress on the people and programs of the University, and it is this emphasis for which he wishes most to be remembered. In his first year at the University, he started a long hard fight to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive levels. Moreover, he has never lost an opportunity to bear down on the need to revise and update the curriculum to meet today's needs for career preparation of students. His insistence upon more relevance is perhaps the least publicized fact of his tenure.

Dr. Mullins also has not been sufficiently recognized for his relationships with students, many critics believing these relationships were not adequate. Actually, he consistently maintained an "open door" policy with students. He never rejected an invitation to attend or speak to a student meeting, and no student or student group has ever denied an audience with him in his office. On two occasions, when groups were too large, he simply invited them to meet with him in a nearby conference room.

The University is fortunate that this man will remain on campus for several more years to teach higher educational administration and finance to graduate students.

About ten years ago, Dr. Mullins included in one of his speeches the following statement about higher education that exemplifies everything he has tried to do for the University.

Effective higher education today has four essential ingredients: It must have excellence; it must be well-balanced in terms of the needs of the day; it must have integrity in its intellectual influence and forcefulness, and it must have the ability to grow in its capacity to serve present and future generations.

SUMMARY OF MY 1973 FEDERAL TAX RETURN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in response to requests received from the news media, the members of the New York State delegation are today submitting statements of our financial position as reported in our Federal income tax returns for 1973. I am therefore reporting to you, my colleagues in the House, and to the general public on the information contained in my 1973 Federal income tax return.

I filed a joint return with my wife Alma, who was not employed during 1973. Total income received from wages and salaries during 1973 was \$42,500. This was augmented by \$4,367.65 received from honoraria, reimbursed travel expenses, and interest income to make a total income of \$46,867.65 during 1973.

My congressional expenses exceeded the amount I was reimbursed by \$4,985.77. In addition, I had a total of \$7,361.38 in congressional expenses which I claimed as a deduction as expenses incurred in connection with congressional duties on schedule A.

Adjusting my total income by my excess congressional expenses made my ad-

justed gross income \$41,881.88. There were \$17,192.28 in itemized deductions and \$3,000 in exemptions—I have two dependent children, aged 3 and 5—which made my taxable income \$21,689.60. My tax on this amount was \$4,929.67.

Total Federal income tax withheld from my salary during 1973 was \$11,060.40.

I have no stocks, bonds, or other investments. I am a full time Member of Congress with no outside income from my profession, the practice of law, or from any other source.

DAY WITH GILLIS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the article which follows describes some of the fine qualities and abilities of our outstanding colleague from Louisiana, GILLIS LONG. His great energy, quick intelligence, and complete dedication to public service represent a real addition to the Committee on Rules and to the House of Representatives:

DAY WITH GILLIS A BUSY ONE
(By Jo Tubb)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Miss Tubb accompanied a group of Central Louisiana guidance counselors on a visit to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., earlier this month. While in the area, she dropped in on Rep. Gillis Long at his Washington office. This is her account of that visit.)

WASHINGTON.—The crew cut which was his trademark for so many years is gone now, and he has abandoned his white-shirt-black-tie wardrobe for more colorful combinations. But one thing remains unchanged about Rep. Gillis W. Long (D-La.)—he is still a man of intense energy.

Often arriving at his Cannon Building office before any of six aides, Long generally begins his days with telephone in hand, catching his callees before they leave for work.

Today is no different.

He's leaning back in his high, black chair when I peek into the room, a felt-tipped pen lodged between two fingers of his right hand (it seems always there), his left hand clutching the gray receiver.

In a voice loud and gravelly and apparently accustomed to speech-making, the congressman talks of cows and levees and improper drainage.

Impressions left by cattle hooves, it seems, are causing drainage problems in the Eighth District of Louisiana.

"I hadn't thought of that," goes this end of the conversation. Then, there's, "Good point" and "We'll see what we can do" before Long finally hangs up and rises to greet me.

We have scarcely shaken hands when one of the 10 lights on the phone flickers again. This time it is an independent gasoline dealer complaining of being "squeezed out" by major oil companies.

Long listens sympathetically, nods into the phone and assures the small businessman he understands the problem.

"He's not even from my district," the congressman says after the phone call. "But he's a friend of mine, and he's having problems. I sympathize with him; I just wish I could do something about it."

THE DAY'S AGENDA

By this time, Leah Schroeder, a top aide who followed Long from Alexandria, has produced a sheet of yellow paper on which is typed the day's agenda. It won't be a heavy day, she tells the congressman.

She notes there's an interview at 9:30, a briefing at 10, house session at noon and another briefing shortly after 4 p.m.

The House Rules Committee, the powerful 15-man body of which Long is a member, does not meet today, having finished its week's business the day before.

"I wish you could see the committee in action," Long says to me. "You'd find it interesting, I believe."

Meanwhile, another aide, Ginny, has brought in a towering stack of letters for the congressman to sign. She pushes aside large silver colored initials "G" and "L" (paper-weights, I tell myself) and scoots the stack in front of him.

He puts on wire-rimmed glasses now, flips through the letters one by one, signing them with the pen he is wielding.

Long's office receives as many as 250 letters a day in five separate deliveries, and every piece—except "junk" mail—has to be answered. The congressman reads each response before it leaves his desk.

Some of the letters concern personal matters among constituents, some are legislative inquiries about House bills, others are requests for materials, some concern project work or job assistance, and still others are schedules and invitations.

FAMILIAR WITH LETTERS

An aide is assigned to handle the letters in each category, but Long himself has at least conversational knowledge of all of them.

"Did you notice Mr. So and So's comments about family planning?" he might ask an assistant, ready to discuss Mr. So and So's letter or any other in the stack.

The congressman is so intent on his letter reading and signing, I dare not bother him for a while. Instead, I gaze around his office with its high ceiling and heavy turquoise drapes, looking for things Longish.

There are framed photos on one wall of the room—of Hubert Humphrey, of Long with Sargent Shriver and Lyndon Johnson. Another wall is hung with paintings, attesting to the congressman's interest in art.

There is a mirror above the black couch, some plants and family photos on the window sill. Near a corner is a Dali print of Don Quixote, and on the wide desk, near the "G" and "L", a bust of Thomas Jefferson sits staring.

"I'm quite a Don Quixote fan," Long says, noting there's a statue of the windmill knight in the outer office as well. "I sort of identify with the character, with his idealism. I've seen the play four times."

He also identifies with Thomas Jefferson, he adds, hence the bust.

"I agree with what President Kennedy said when he feted all the Nobel Prize winners at the White House," Long offers. "He said, 'We haven't had as much intelligence in this room since Jefferson dined alone.' I imagine that's true; Jefferson was a great man."

Long is still signing letters when a young man from the "Congressional Quarterly" arrives for an interview about the Rules Committee. The writer, carrying a cup of Louisiana coffee, praises the black stuff as he enters the room, saying it's the best coffee in the building.

"We brew a pot for Yankees and a pot for Louisianians," Long answers, smiling. He orders a cup for himself and adds a liquid sweetener to it when it arrives.

MUTUAL RESPECT

The interview goes smoothly; there is mutual respect. Long doesn't hesitate to challenge a premise when he thinks it invalid.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The writer concedes a point if he finds he has made an unfair assumption. Long appreciates the young man's knowledge of committee affairs and says so. A half hour somehow disappears.

As the young writer leaves, a representative of the Army Corps of Engineers enters the office. The congressman calls in aides Tom Ledet and George Foote, both of Alexandria, who are to sit in on the briefing about Bayou Rapides.

It turns out to be a fairly lengthy four-way discussion which ends on a high note. A study to define the need for larger pumps on the bayou must be made, it is agreed. And while the congressman is willing to ask for appropriations for the study, it now appears the authorization is already there, and there will be no need to get an appropriation. All four are notably pleased by the revelation.

"It looks real good," Long says as the engineer rises to leave. The congressman suggests subsequent contacts with other officials to get the ball rolling, and the room gradually clears.

Long is back at his desk now, back to his paperwork. There are more phone calls—perhaps six or seven—some coming into the office, others going out.

The congressman intermittently lifts the receiver to ring one side or another, asking endless questions, expecting quick answers and getting them. Everything clicks. The office is a study in efficiency.

At 11:45 a loud buzzer sounds three times, and three lights on the face of a wall clock flicker on. That means, Long explains, the House will be in session at noon today. He straightens his tie, smooths out his gray striped suit coat and leaves his office for the half-mile walk to the House floor.

Long walks briskly, his left hand tucked into a pocket, his right arm pumping. For an Arkansan-turned-Louisianian, the pace is exhausting; for Long it is a matter of course. He appears inexhaustable.

I enjoy lunch in a House cafeteria while Long attends the noon session. (The congressman sometimes eats soup and sandwich in his office; at other times he lunches in the cafeteria or eats downtown. To my knowledge, he skipped lunch altogether today.)

The vote on the House floor concerns amendments to the Freedom of Information Act. Non-controversial, it passes by an overwhelming margin.

Long doesn't return to his office immediately after the vote, instead staying on the floor to speak with fellow congressmen about various issues. He approaches each subject with intense interest, as if each were the only one on his mind. His concentration, his knowledge on such a wide range of topics is remarkable.

READS A LOT

Much of that knowledge comes from reading. Long devours a great deal of printed matter during the course of a day, often reading far into the night at home.

"This is a 24-hour job," he says. "I spend a lot of time on the telephone after I get home, and there is always something to read. This is not a job that can be turned off at the end of a day."

When the congressman returns to his office at mid-afternoon, there are messages for him. Schedules have been re-scheduled. Appointments have been verified. Another dispatch of mail has been opened, examined and left on his desk.

Shortly before his 4:10 meeting with an Army representative, a friend from the Eighth District drops by the office, and Long talks with him, even if it means making the officer wait a few minutes. Priorities are clear.

Halfway through the Army briefing—this one about the "new posture" of the

Army—I make my apologies for having to leave early to catch a plane.

(The Army representative seems to welcome the break—Long is drilling him, and the officer, with his prepared spiel, hasn't anticipated all of the congressman's questions.)

Once again, Long rises for a handshake, still firm after nine hours on the job and three more to go.

"Come back," he says, "when I have a busier schedule."

WAYS AND MEANS TO BEGIN HEALTH HEARINGS—REPAIR OF MEDICARE A LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this week, on April 24, the House Ways and Means Committee will begin a new series of hearings on health care and health insurance legislation.

There is a great deal which needs to be done to provide all Americans with better health insurance protection. But the first priority must be the repair of medicare. For several years now, every Member of Congress has been deluged with letters and complaints from constituents regarding the "breakdown" of medicare. The medicare promise of 1965 has become the medicare delusion of 1974. Delays in reimbursement, disallowance of claims, lack of complete coverage, failure to provide adequate nursing home care have all become increasingly serious.

It will make little sense to build an expanded facility onto medicare when medicare is becoming a national disaster. We must provide for the immediate improvement of the medicare system as a base on which to provide better health care for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Cleveland Press of February 7, 1974, by Don Kirkman entitled "Elderly Are Finding Medicare a Costly Delusion." The article is an excellent description of the problems which have come to plague medicare. Originally, medicare recipients had to pay \$36 a year for the part B physicians' coverage insurance. Now the premium is \$80.40. The full text of the article follows:

ELDERLY ARE FINDING MEDICARE A COSTLY DELUSION

(By Don Kirkman)

WASHINGTON.—Last summer an elderly lady in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., had a cataract removed from her right eye. Her doctor's bill was \$1135 and the special eyeglasses she needed were \$147.

She was shocked to find her medicare reimbursement was only \$560 and that she had to pay the remaining \$722 out of her meager resources.

Like millions of other elderly Americans, she found herself a victim of some of the shortcomings of the eight-year-old federal health insurance plan for the 23 million Americans 65 or older. Critics contend that medicare:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FAILS to pay enough of the health bills of the elderly.

FAILS to pay for many necessary health services like dentistry, routine eyeglasses or prescription drugs outside of hospitals.

Is so snarled in red tape that most of the elderly cannot cope with the government paperwork required to file claims with the Social Security Administration, which administers the program.

Is open to abuses by doctors to maximize their incomes.

Although the Nixon Administration wants to include Medicare as a part of its proposed national health insurance (NHI) plan, many experts doubt Congress will enact the plan or that it would correct Medicare's shortcomings.

Much of the criticism is directed at the way Medicare pays for services outside hospitals and the way it pays doctor bills.

The Medicare law took effect in 1966 and provided a basic insurance plan for virtually every American 65 or over designed to pay most of his hospital bills. This is the basic Medicare plan paid for by Social Security funds. But it does not cover doctor bills or the cost of full-time nursing while in the hospital.

Congress also provided a Medicare supplementary medical insurance program, available to Medicare recipients at a cost, designed to help them pay for their health care outside of hospitals and to help them pay their doctor bills. But this insurance plan is complex and so snarled in red tape that most Americans simply cannot cope with the necessary paperwork.

Originally, Medicare recipients had to pay \$36 a year for the supplemental Medicare medical insurance. They now must pay \$80.40. Originally, each Medicare recipient had to pay the first \$50 of his annual claim against the supplementary Medicare insurance, including doctors' bills. Now he must pay the first \$60. Originally he was to pay 20% of all medical bills beyond that first \$50. Now he must pay 20% beyond the first \$60.

Congress, reacting to objections by many doctors that Medicare would "infringe on the physician-patient relationship," permitted physicians to collect from Medicare in either of two ways:

By assignment in which the doctor agrees to accept the Medicare-approved fee schedule as payment in full for his services and in which the doctor does all the paperwork. This way, if the Medicare-approved fee for a certain procedure were \$50, Medicare would pay \$40 and the patient \$10. The doctor cannot charge more than the \$50 Medicare-approved fee for that particular professional service.

By direct billing in which the doctor charges whatever he wants while the patient does the paperwork and pays the difference between the Medicare-approved fee and the doctor's charge.

Former Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball told Scripps-Howard Newspapers in his interview that while Medicare does a good job paying hospital bills, "protection against the cost of physicians' service wasn't very good when the program started and isn't very good now. I think it's time Congress gave the program a major overhaul."

William R. Hutton, executive director of the National Council of Senior Citizens, said his office receives more complaints about direct billing than any other Medicare problem.

"A doctor doesn't have a sign in his office or a tattoo on his forehead," Hutton said, "telling his patients whether he's a direct-billing doctor or an assignment doctor. So a Medicare recipient gets treated by a direct biller who charges far more than Medicare pays and gets shocked when he sees the size of the doctor's bill."

"When these people get a doctor's bill that

runs into hundreds of dollars, they say to themselves: 'How can I possibly pay this?' And they sit down and cry. Direct billing is a cruel, cruel thing to do to old people."

"I think," Ball said, "that very quickly Medicare recipients would pass the word around about who's a direct-billing doctor and who isn't, and the direct billers would suffer. I think if you hit them in the pocketbook by depriving them of Medicare patients, they'll quickly fall into line."

Ball and other Medicare critics want Congress to abolish the red tape. He also wants Congress to abolish the \$80.40 annual premium for Medicare supplementary medical insurance because he thinks it runs counter to the basic idea behind Social Security.

"I think a person should pay for his retirement benefits while he's young and working and not when he's retired," Ball said.

And he would abolish the requirement that the elderly pay the first \$60 of their medical bills each year. In place of requiring the \$80.40 and \$60 payments, he would require Medicare recipients to pay 20% of each bill up to about \$250 or \$500 and then a lesser percentage of bills beyond that.

"It would be beautifully simple," he said. The patients would not have to keep track of every bill and the doctors and hospitals would handle the paper work with the government.

The first improvement they expect will be coverage of prescription drugs outside hospitals. The Senate voted that change last year, and house passage this year is likely.

UNTIMELY FLIGHT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I lament the fact that this Congress will apparently do nothing to stop the unbelievable inflation in our economy by extending authorization for some form of price control.

I attach herewith a perceptive article by Dr. Walter W. Heller, the president of the American Economic Association. Dr. Heller is the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Dr. Heller concludes his very balanced plea for some form of controls by stating:

The Congress and the country may well rue the day when, largely at the behest of big business and organized labor, the government presence in their price and wage decisions was mindlessly liquidated, leaving the consumer to fend for himself.

Dr. Heller's article is taken from the *Wall Street Journal* of April 15, 1974:

THE UNTIMELY FLIGHT FROM CONTROLS

(By Walter W. Heller)

Congress is about to outdo the White House in running away from the inflation problem:

—While correctly observing that business and labor are bitterly opposed to wage-price controls—and that consumer views range from skeptical to cynical—Congress is mistakenly sending such controls to the gas chamber rather than putting them in cold storage.

—While correctly concluding that broad-scale mandatory controls had outlived their usefulness in an excess-demand, shortage-plagued economy, Congress is mistakenly

April 23, 1974

walking away from its responsibility to assert the public interest in price-wage moderation in an economy plagued by softening demand and rising unemployment.

—While correctly observing that the White House has done its level worst to discredit controls, Congress is mistakenly refusing even to give John Dunlop and the Cost of Living Council the leverage they need to insure that the pledges of price moderation and supply increases made in exchange for early de-control by many industries will be redeemed.

Granting that controls are in ill repute, one wonders how Congress can explain to itself today—let alone to voters next fall—the discarding of all wage-price restraints in the face of record rates of inflation of 12% in the cost of living and 15% in wholesale prices (including an ominous 35% rate of inflation last month in industrial commodity prices). Is it the product of a growing "what's-the-use" attitude? Is it an implicit surrender to an inflation that is deemed in part to be woven into the institutional fabric of our economy and in part visited upon us by uncontrollable external forces like world food and material shortages and oil cartels? In short, is inflation now thought to be not just out of control but beyond our control?

MILTON FRIEDMAN'S STREAK

An affirmative answer to these brooding questions seems to underlie Milton Friedman's recent economic streak—one which evokes surprise, astonishment, and disbelief in the best streaking tradition—from Smithian laissez-faire to Brazilian indexation. At present, we use the cost-of-living escalator selectively to protect 32 million Social Security and civil service beneficiaries and 18 million recipients of food-stamps and to hedge inflation bets in wage contracts for 10% of the labor force. Mr. Friedman would put all groups—those who profit from inflation and those who suffer from it alike—on the inflation escalator and thus help institutionalize our present double-digit rates of inflation.

Meanwhile, interest rates are soaring as Arthur Burns and the Fed man their lonely ramparts in the battle against inflation. With wage-price control headed for oblivion in the face of seething inflation, the Fed apparently views itself as the last bastion of inflation defense. So it is adding to the witches' brew by implicitly calling on unemployment and economic slack to help check the inflation spiral.

In this atmosphere, and deafened by the drumfire of powerful labor and business lobbies, Congress seems to have closed its mind to the legitimate continuing role of price-wage constraints. What is that role in an economy relying primarily, as it should, on the dictates of the marketplace?

First are the important transitional functions of the Cost of Living Council for which Mr. Dunlop, with vacillating support from the White House, asked congressional authority. In its new form after April 30 the Council would have:

enforced commitments made by the cement, fertilizer, auto, tire and tube, and many other de-controlled industries to restrain prices and/or expand supplies—commitments that would become unenforceable when COLC goes down the drain with the Economic Stabilization Act on April 30;

protected patients against an explosion of hospital fees by keeping mandatory controls on the health-care industry until Congress adopts a national health insurance plan;

prevented an early explosion of construction wages and the associated danger that housing recovery might be crippled;

maintained veto power over wage bargains that are eligible for reopening with mandatory controls are lifted.

Beyond Phase 4's post-operative period, government needs to assert its presence in wage-price developments in several critical ways.

The first would be to continue the important function of monitoring other government agencies, of keeping a wary anti-inflationary eye on their farm, labor, trade, transport, energy and housing policies. The point is to protect consumers from the price consequences of the cost-boosting and price-propelling activities of the producer-oriented agencies. The White House could continue this function without congressional authority, but a statutory base would give the watchdog agency much more clout.

Second would be the task of working with industry, labor, and government units to improve wage bargaining and relieve bottleneck inflation by encouraging increased production of scarce goods and raw materials.

Third, and by far the most important, would be the monitoring of major wage bargains and price decisions and spotlighting those that flout the public interest.

The trauma of Phase 3 and 4 has apparently blotted out memories of the painfully relevant experience of 1969-71:

The school's-out, hands-off policy announced by Mr. Nixon early in 1969 touched off a rash of price increases and let a vicious wage-price spiral propel inflation upward even while the economy was moving downward.

Only when Mr. Nixon finally moved in with the powerful circuit-breaker of the 90-day freeze was the spiral turned off.

Today, the urgent task is to see that it's not turned on again. In that quest, some forces are working in our favor:

Much of the steam should be going out of special-sector inflation in oil, food, and raw materials.

The pop-up or bubble effect of ending mandatory controls should work its inflationary way through the economy by the end of the year.

As yet, wage settlements show few signs of shooting upwards as they did in 1969-70, when first-year increases jumped from 8% to 16% in less than a year. Wage moderation in 1973—induced in part by wage controls, but even more by the absence of inordinate profits in most labor-intensive industries and by the fact that the critical bottlenecks were in materials and manufacturing capacity rather than in labor supply—has set no high pay targets for labor to shoot at.

Thus far in 1974, the aluminum, can, and newly-signed steel settlements won't greatly boost those targets. So the price-wage spiral is not yet at work. Since in addition, cost-of-living escalators apply to only one-tenth of the U.S. work force, the ballooning cost of living has not yet triggered a new price-wage spiral. Still, there is a distinct calm-before-the-storm feeling abroad in the land of labor negotiations.

A MODERNIZATION IN INFLATION

With demand softening and shortages easing in large segments of the economy, the old rules of the marketplace would suggest that inflation is bound to moderate. And the odds are that it will—but how fast, how far, and how firmly is another matter. And that's where a price-wage monitor with a firm statutory base is badly needed. It could play a significant role in inducing big business to break the heady habit of escalating prices and in forestalling big labor's addiction to double-digit wage advances.

Industry after industry has gotten into the habit of raising prices on a cost-justified basis as energy, food, and raw material prices skyrocketed. De-control will reinforce that habit.

Once these bulges have worked their way through the economy, we tend to assume that virulent inflation will subside. Indeed,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in some areas such as retailing, farm products, small business, and much of unorganized labor, competitive market forces will operate to help business and labor kick the inflationary habit.

But in areas dominated by powerful unions and industrial oligopolies, a prod is needed if habitual inflation—*inflation with no visible means of support from underlying supply and demand conditions in the economy*—is to be broken. If it is not, the threat of a wage break-out will loom large in upcoming wage negotiations in the construction, communications, aerospace, ship building, airlines, mining, and railroad industries. In those critical negotiations, the wage moderation of the past two years could go up in smoke if the ebbing of non-labor cost pressures is simply converted into profits rather than being shared with consumers in price moderation.

Congress and the White House are taking undue risks if they rely entirely on market forces to achieve this end, especially in those large areas of the economy where competitive forces are not strong enough to protect the consumer. To serve as his ombudsman and to help prevent the picking of his pocket by a management labor coalition, the consumer needs a watchdog agency that will bark and growl and occasionally bite. Such an agency—which could accomplish a good deal by skillful exercise of the powers of inquiry and publicity and much more if it were able to draw, sparingly, on powers of suspension and rollback when faced with gross violations and defiance—could provide substantial insurance against inflation by habit.

CONTENTS OF AN ACTION PROGRAM

An action program to accomplish the foregoing would have included—indeed, given a miracle of courage, conviction and speed could still include—the following elements:

A quick and simple extension of the standby powers of the Economic Stabilization Act.

Granting of the authority requested by John Dunlop for the transitional period.

The establishment of a monitoring agency—preferably by statute and equipped with last-resort suspension and rollback powers, but if that is not to be, then by White House action and relying mainly on instruments of inquiry and publicity—to look over the shoulder of big business and big labor on behalf of the consumer.

To declare open season on wage-price decisions under present circumstances—as we seem hell-bent to do in our disenchantment with controls and sudden revival of faith in the market system—would be one more example of the classic action-reaction pattern that excludes the middle way. The Congress and the country may well rue the day when, largely at the behest of big business and organized labor, the government presence in their price and wage decisions was mindlessly liquidated, leaving the consumer to fend for himself.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that an extraordinary effort should be made to restore public confidence in Government. One way to achieve this goal is to assure the public that potential conflicts of interest among their elected Representatives have been disclosed as part of a disclosure of financial

interests made available for public scrutiny.

For these reasons I am releasing a statement of my financial holdings, income, taxes, and other information beyond that required by rule XLIV of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Income: My total income for 1973 was derived from my congressional salary; income from my law practice of less than \$10,000; and bank interest and stock dividends of less than \$1,000. There were no other sources of income.

Taxes: I paid in excess of \$6,000 in federal, state and city income taxes. Like many of my colleagues in Congress, I have had my prior federal tax returns duly audited by the Internal Revenue Service.

Financial Holdings: My major financial interests include stock in Katy Industries with a present market value of \$13,500. I also own a home assessed at less than \$30,000. I do not know the present market value. The Home Federal Savings and Loan Association holds a first mortgage on the home in excess of \$25,000. I also own United States Savings Bonds with a value of approximately \$5,000.

I do not serve as a Director or Officer of any business entity (Corporation, partnership, etc.) other than my law firm, which does not engage in federal practice.

At this point, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of that form which must be filed by Members of Congress with the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

PART A—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (WHITE FORM: MEMBERS ONLY)

STATEMENT OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ASSOCIATIONS AS OF DATE OF FILING AND CERTAIN OTHER FINANCIAL DATA COVERING CALENDAR YEAR 1973

Filing required by April 30, 1974

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct
(Member's name) Joseph P. Addabbo
(District). Ozone Park.
(State). New York.

Part A: (See instructions and text of House Rule XLIV on reverse side).

The interest of a spouse or any other party, if *constructively controlled* by the person reporting, shall be considered to be the same as the interest of the person reporting.

1. List the name, instrument of ownership, and any position of management held in any business entity doing a substantial business with the Federal Government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies in which the ownership is in excess of \$5,000 fair market value as of the date of filing, or from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. Do not list any time or demand deposit in a financial institution or any debt instrument having a fixed yield unless it is convertible to an equity instrument.

Business Entity—Katy Industries; Instrument of Ownership—Common Stock;

Position of Management—none.

Business Entity—U.S. Savings Bond; Instrument of Ownership—E Bonds; Position of Management—none.

(If additional space needed please attach supplemental listing, unsealed.)

2. List the name, address and type of practice of any professional organization in which the person reporting, or his spouse, is an officer, director, or partner, or serves in any advisory capacity, from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year.

Name—Addabbo, DeSena and Mavro; Address—96-11 101st Ave., Ozone Park, N.Y., 11416; Type of Practice—Legal-partnership.

3. List the source of each of the following

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

items received during the preceding calendar year:

(a) Any income from a single source for services rendered (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$5,000 and not reported in section 2 above. None.

(b) Any capital gain from a single source exceeding \$5,000, other than from the sale of a residence occupied by the person reporting. (As reportable to IRS.) None.

(c) Reimbursement for expenditures (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$1,000 in each instance. None.

(d) Sources of honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source. (Name the original source, not a speakers' bureau.) None.

4. List each creditor to whom the person reporting was indebted for a period of 90 consecutive days or more in the preceding calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 excluding any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of assets of the person reporting of appropriate value. None.

(Date of filing) 4/23/74.

(Signature of Declarer) J. W. Addabbo.
Campaign moneys are not to be taken into account in this report.

HOW EPA DESTROYS OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the story of the failure of Government involvement in what should be private matters is so overwhelming that it is surprising that the American people have not yet learned the important lesson which Thomas Jefferson understood many years ago, that that Government is best which governs least.

In an effort to protect consumers, Government has regulated a variety of prices, such as those in the area of air travel. The result is that the cost of a flight from New York to Washington is significantly higher than the cost of a flight from San Francisco to San Diego, an equivalent distance, but within a single State and, therefore, not regulated by the FAA. When regulation ceases to exist, the consumer receives the benefit of a lower free market price. Now, in the name of protecting our natural resources, Government programs threaten to do precisely the opposite.

Discussing recent events in the Northwest, M. Stanton Evans notes that:

Thanks to efforts by the ecocrusaders to block the use of DDT, the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho have suffered a massive infestation of insects called tussock moths which feed on stands of timber. The result—has been to kill or damage at least a million acres of trees, with grievous effects upon the local economy, wildlife, birds and the general public health.

Mr. Evans reports that:

Similar results have occurred in the Eastern states where budworms and gypsy moths have ravaged trees in kindred fashion. Forest products spokesmen estimate gypsy moths alone were responsible for a 60 per cent defoliation level on some 500,000 acres of trees

in New England, Pennsylvania, New York and New Jersey. Spruce budworms have been epidemic in the state of Maine.

Despite the fact that foresters and others petitioned the Environmental Protection Agency to relent in the ban against DDT, this request was denied on the grounds that the tussock moth epidemic would run its course and come to a natural end. Mr. Evans notes that:

Unfortunately, this did not occur, and as a result evergreen trees were defoliated over a 1,400-square-mile area of the Pacific Northwest.

Finally, after much damage was done, the EPA reversed itself. The reversal still does not extend to the Eastern States. In addition, the EPA initially banned DDT against the recommendations of its own hearing examiner. The examiner found that, "DDT is extremely low in acute toxicity to man. DDT is not a safety hazard to man when used as directed."

The irony is clear. Mr. Evans concludes that:

There are the environmentalists, allegedly concerned to save our natural resources, promoting a policy which results in the destruction of thousands and thousands of acres of timber.

Hopefully, we will finally learn the futility of Government coercion and the tendency toward blindness on the part of Government administrators. I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "How EPA Destroys Our Natural Resources," which appeared in the April 13, 1974 issue of *Human Events* and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

How EPA DESTROYS OUR NATURAL RESOURCES
(By M. Stanton Evans)

Foresters, growers, public officials and just plain citizens in the great Northwest may be forgiven if they have a less than charitable view of the nation's environmentalists.

Thanks to efforts by the eco-crusaders to block the use of DDT, the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho have suffered a massive infestation of insects called tussock moths which feed on stands of timber. The result, according to Rep. Steve Symms (R-Idaho), has been to kill or damage at least a million acres of trees, with grievous effects upon the local economy, wildlife, birds and the general public health.

In testimony before a House Agriculture subcommittee, Symms and a host of other witnesses spelled out the scope of the damage: Loss of big-game cover, increased temperature levels in waterways, lack of nesting sites, augmented danger of forest fires. In economic terms, some 500 million-plus board feet of timber have been lost, and on Symms' figuring regeneration of the area will be a 50-year process.

Similar results have occurred in the Eastern states where budworms and gypsy moths have ravaged trees in kindred fashion. Forest products spokesmen estimate gypsy moths alone were responsible for a 60 per cent defoliation level on some 500,000 acres of trees in New England, Pennsylvania, New York and New Jersey. Spruce budworms have been epidemic in the state of Maine.

All of which inspired foresters and others in such areas to petition the Environmental Protection Agency to relent in the ban against DDT. A year ago, then-EPA chief William Ruckelshaus denied such a request on the grounds that the tussock moth epidemic would run its course and come to a natural end. Unfortunately, this did not occur, and as a result evergreen trees were de-

foliated over a 1,400-square-mile area of the Pacific Northwest.

Faced with mounting evidence of ecological damage, EPA this year reversed itself and permitted use of DDT in the Northwestern states. This does not, of course, undo the damage already inflicted by EPA policy, which Symms describes as "a national disgrace." Nor does the reversal extend to the Eastern states which are still trying to control their own pests while being denied resort to mankind's most effective pesticide.

It is noteworthy in this connection that Ruckelshaus issued the ban on DDT in the first place against the recommendations of EPA's own hearing examiner. The examiner found "DDT is extremely low in acute toxicity to man. DDT is not a safety hazard to man when used as directed....

"The uses of DDT under the registration involved here do not have a deleterious effect on freshwater fish, estuarine organisms, wild birds, or other wildlife. The adverse effect on beneficial animals from the use of DDT . . . is not unreasonable on balance with its benefit . . . There is a present need for the continued use of DDT for the essential use defined in this case."

Because these findings were overridden, a million-plus acres of American forest land have been killed or seriously damaged, and even more calamitous results may ensue in other nations. Nobel laureate Dr. Norman Borlaug, for one, fears the effects of the so-called "green revolution," spurred by his researches, will be reversed.

Borlaug asserts that "the safety record of DDT is remarkable," and that "conservationists and environmentalists embarked on a crusade to end the use of agricultural chemicals . . . give no thought to the result of such actions: the eventual starvation and political chaos that will plague the world." These worries are echoed by scientists of the World Health Organization, who credit DDT with saving five million lives during its first few years of deployment.

As pointed out by Melvin Grayson and Thomas Shepard in their book, *The Disaster Lobby*, WHO studies indicate as many as 100 million illnesses were prevented by DDT during the early days of its use for insect control. All told, WHO estimates, a billion people have probably been liberated from disease by this pesticide, and "even temporary lack of DDT for malaria control can seriously jeopardize the gains achieved at such great cost."

That doomsday projection appears to be borne out by the case of Ceylon, which a decade ago had the problem of malaria totally under control. In 1961, there were only 110 cases of malaria in that nation, and no malaria deaths. Then in 1962 the DDT scare began and use of the spray was progressively diminished. By 1968, there were two and a half million malaria cases in Ceylon, and 10,000 deaths.

The irony of all this is apparent enough on the face of it. Here are the environmentalists, allegedly concerned to save our natural resources, promoting a policy which results in the destruction of thousands upon thousands of acres of timber. And here are self-styled humanitarians waging holy war against a technical advance that has meant improvement of nutrition and health for millions of people around the world. All to ban the use of a pesticide that, on the official record, has never been a hazard to man. It's enough to make you doubt the wisdom of our rulers.

Rep. Symms and others have offered a bill in Congress which would remove authority for banning DDT from the EPA altogether. Given the history of the agency on this issue, that appears to be an excellent suggestion.

April 23, 1974

April 23, 1974

CONGRESSMAN HUDNUT MAKES
PUBLIC FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HUDDNUT. Mr. Speaker, recently I made public disclosure of my Federal and State income tax returns and my total personal financial assets. I took this step because I have always believed that the strength of our democratic form of government is based on openness, integrity, and honesty of the leaders in Government.

Also, I have taken this action in an effort to lead by example and it is my hope that other Members of Congress and public officials will make similar disclosures in an effort to help restore public confidence in Government.

Last fall, I introduced legislation—H.R. 11426—which would require Members of Congress and certain employees of Congress to make public financial disclosures. In my judgment this bill should be passed and other action taken to dispell the suspicions that have resulted in a crisis of confidence on the part of American people toward their Government.

At this time, I would like to make my personal financial statement part of the public record of Congress:

PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. HUDDNUT III, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 11TH DISTRICT—STATE OF INDIANA, APRIL 15, 1974

(In preparing this statement, I have received assistance from George S. Olive and Company. The figures are as of April 15, 1974.)

ASSETS	
Cash and savings	\$2,204.07
Checking accounts	202.00
Savings accounts	2,002.07
Federal income tax refund due	2,778.16
Investments	44,836.83
U.S. Treasury bills	19,587.31
1,000 shares, Indiana Professional Sports, Inc.	2,500.00
Cash value, insurance policies	22,749.02
Apartment furnishings	5,000.00
Automobile: 1972 Buick Electra 225, four door hardtop	2,600.00
Real estate (at cost)	39,289.00
Property in Leland, Mich.	14,800.00
Property and home in Johnsburg, N.Y.	24,489.00
(Sale blocked: no market value)	
Total assets	96,705.56

LIABILITIES	
Bills outstanding	3,276.54
Net worth	93,429.02

WILLIAM H. HUDDNUT III,
Member of Congress.

WILLIAM H. HUDDNUT III, 1973 INCOME TAX RETURNS

My income taxes for over ten years have been prepared by George S. Olive and Company. While I am happy to share with any interested person copies of my income tax returns for 1963-1972, I am not herewith

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

including the figures since I did not hold public office at the time.

My 1973 returns were prepared by the George S. Olive Company in Indianapolis and an IRS agent in Washington. The complete returns are on file in my office, and available to interested representatives of the media. My summary of them is as follows:

I. FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN—1973

Income:	
Wages as a Congressman (11 months)	\$38,722.08
Dividends (less exclusion)	1,742.84
Interest	127.51
Miscellaneous income (net figure including capital loss)	15,620.18
A. Honoraria (less expenses)	1,972.72
B. Congressional office account contributions	14,417.83
Total gross income	56,212.61
Adjusted gross income	52,540.76

Itemized deductions: 26,153.74

Medical	150.00
Taxes	2,519.72
Interest	2,119.28
Contributions	3,144.03
Congressional office	17,981.13
Miscellaneous	239.58
Exemptions	4,500.00

Taxable income 21,887.02

Tax:	
As computed by income adjusting, schedule G	4,435.18
Other taxes	157.82
Total tax paid	4,593.00

II. INDIANA STATE TAX

Total tax paid	1,065.29
----------------	----------

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—REFLECTIONS BY INTERN TOM BRACKETT

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the first quarter of 1974, I had in my office a Dartmouth student as an intern. Over the years, I have had a rather extensive intern program, as a means to bring young people into our system to see how it is really operating. Tom Brackett, from Greenland, N.H., summed up his work by writing an excellent paper centered on the need for congressional reform.

I am inserting this excellent and perceptive paper into the Record at this point, because Tom has succeeded in capturing the central thrust of many of the currents of our time. In addition, however, it is most helpful to an institution such as Congress to have the benefit of reasonably objective analysis of its role, and directions it should be taking. While often only the critical or the praising gets attention, perhaps the most valuable of all is the dispassionate.

Tom Brackett's excellent article follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—REFLECTIONS BY AN INTERN

One of the major problems presently facing the nation is the marked decline in the people's faith that the government is functioning honestly and wisely. Clearly, the Congress is no exception to this sentiment. A recent Harris survey indicated that only 21% of the public felt that Congress's overall performance was better than fair.

In a free society, the officials hold office at the pleasure of the electorate. Consequently, if the people lose faith in their elected officials, they can reject them at the next election. However, when the people lose confidence in an entire government institution, then it must assume that either the principle behind the institution has proven unworkable or the institution itself requires structural change. I do not subscribe to the former view, a view that republicanism is no longer workable in a society vastly different from its creators world of 18th century America. Such a view accepts the unmanageability of Congress as given, and urges that the power of Congress be diminished in order that a more responsive branch of government might serve the public interest.

Such negativism undermines the very foundations of a federal structure. Admittedly the Congress speaks amid numerous voices in a debate often divided along regional and party lines. However, it is unreasonable to demand the unity within the Congress that could be found within the Executive or Judicial branch. The legislature will maintain its diversity, its numerous voices, and divisions because it is designed to express the views of a nation of diverse interests, numerous states, and regional divisions. Rather than advocate the eclipse of legislative power, a more realistic approach would seek reform within the institution itself, recognizing that a strong and effective federal power cannot exist if the separate components of that structure are weakened.

There is no single cause for the decline in public confidence of the Congress, no one elixir that will suddenly resolve all problems. Rather the rebuilding of the public trust will require a directed effort extending into all facets of Congressional activity from the primary race to the committee meeting. I believe that the public regard for Congressional performance would be substantially increased if: 1. the public were exposed by mass media to the expertise of individual members and the tremendous workload developed by the institution; 2. the Congress made a greater effort to co-ordinate its members' time and talents by minimizing time-conflicting hearings and eliminating multiple committee jurisdictions, and therefore investigations, over national problems; 3. the Congress, actively encouraged a greater reliance on and utilization of state and local agencies and talents.

It is widely held that increased publicity of the Congress (both the institution and individual members) would promote better action. It would certainly produce greater public understanding and appreciation for Congress' job. The televised Watergate hearings of last summer were an excellent lesson in Congressional operations and were followed with great interest. For many citizens it was the first time they had ever watched a committee hearing or witnessed a roll call vote. Millions of citizens have never visited Washington, never heard their representative speak outside of the campaign trail, and know little of their votes other than promises. Public understanding bred public confidence for us as the hearings progressed, public trust in the members of the Watergate Committee increased dramatically. Unknown Senators became nationally recognized and their

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

voices familiar to millions of citizens. However, they were only 7 out of 535 members. Though coverage of the remaining 528 could not be as intensive, the potential for improving the public image of Congress through the electronic media is very great.

To those who would challenge such openness within the Congress on the grounds that: 1. the decorum of the legislature would be destroyed and 2. its ability to function severely hampered, the public will ask: how is the ability of the people's representative to represent his constituents impeded if the people know of his actions? The implication will be simple and direct. Those most against opening the Congress to the media could be seen as: those with the most to hide from electorate; those in the greatest danger of losing their positions; and those who have contributed most to undermine public confidence in Congress.

Common sense would dictate adequate staffing for members as well as a co-ordinated schedule of the member's time and talents. Unfortunately, common sense is a scarce commodity on Capitol Hill. Committee staffs are often limited, committee meetings conflict between committee assignments, and members are sometimes poorly informed on the actions of the floor. Tragically, reform is blocked through majority dictation and entrenched committee chairs. Opposition is stifled; Congress is viewed as inoperative and obstructionist; public disgust rises and confidence in Congress falls to new depths.

Perhaps it is the curse of an evicted swamp god or a potion in the waters of the Potomac that has convinced many Congressmen and thousands of bureau-packed employees that the public interests can be served best under the aegis of Washington. Clearly, there are areas where the national government must exercise a monopoly: e.g. defense, finance, interstate commerce, foreign relations. However, the national Government should act to insure that in matters which the state and local governments are capable of managing effectively, Washington encourages state and local responsibility. This is not to decry centralism per se or to advocate state's rights a la 1850, but rather to note the practical limitations placed upon any government program when it becomes removed from the problem it seeks to resolve and the people it serves. I submit nothing more than that there is a natural limit to what the federal government can accomplish more effectively than the state and local governments. A limit which can be determined by weighing the advantages of preserving strong state and local government as necessary and creative elements of the federal structure against the advantages of central command and national implementation.

The federal government is not villainous—only near sighted. Nationally-directed programs were initiated because states deferred action through unwillingness or inability to sponsor the programs themselves. Federal control seemed a panacea. Funds were plentiful and the resolution of a problem was physically divorced from state and local centers. It was merely a matter of time before the dangers would surface in a maze of sprawling and fragmented agencies.

Centralization has obvious advantages, one of which is the referral power that a body of national experts can offer state and local agencies almost as one would consult a librarian for assistance. Washington's greatest contribution to the "New Federalism" might well be to loan the state governments 100,000 of its consultants. With such a federal attitude coupled with a revived national legislature, the components of a strong and effective federal structure: strong and effective national, state, and local government, would be revitalized. But there is no real alternative. Only the prospect of national

centralism amidst a paralyzed legislature—an environment too frighteningly close to 1984.

THOMAS BRACKETT.

MARCH 15, 1974.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of my 1973 financial statement:

Congressman Gerry E. Studds' 1973 financial statement

Part A—Income 1973:

Salary	\$38,722.08
Honorarium—Speech to National Fisheries Institute, Colorado Springs, Colorado (money given to Constituent Services Committee)	250.00
Dividends—See attached explanation (Part B)	1,387.66
Interest—See attached explanation (Part C)	106.56

Total income 40,466.30

Actual official Expenses—(travel, stationery, district offices, telephones, printing, etc.) 17,818.18

Congressional allowances for official expenses (travel, stationery, district offices, telephones, etc.) 10,342.56

Difference: i.e., official expenses paid from my pocket 7,475.62

PT. B—DIVIDEND INCOME 1973

Security	Number of shares	Market value as of Apr. 22, 1974	Income derived 1973
Burlington Industries	40	990.00	28.00
Exxon	87	6,894.75	203.66
Trans Union Corp.	93	3,603.75	66.72
Kennecott Copper	33	1,361.25	33.33
Burlington Northern	133	—	25.00
Burlington Northern, Pfd.	117	—	4.58
Union Pacific	133	—	20.00
Fruehauf	157	—	49.59

Total 430.88

Income from Maud Eastman Studds Trust—Between death of trustee and dissolution of trust (see attached explanation, pt. D) 956.78

Total 1,387.66

1 Sold during 1973.

PT. C—INTEREST INCOME 1973

Security	Bonds	Market value as of Apr. 22, 1974	Income derived 1973
Loew's Theater 6 1/2% debenture	\$3,100.00	2,146.75	106.56

Part D—Further explanation, Maud Eastman Studds trust:

This trust was established by my late grandmother, Maud Eastman Studds, with my late father, Eastman Studds, as lifetime beneficiary and trustee—and with myself, my brother, Colin A. Studds, and my sister, Mrs. Howard Babcock, as legatees upon my

father's death. The trust, which is now dissolved, included the securities listed herein and the family home at 16 Black Horse Lane in Cohasset, Massachusetts.

Upon acquiring this inheritance, my brother, my sister, and I determined upon the following disposition:

1. The following securities were placed in an irrevocable trust for our mother, Beatrice Studds, with my brother as trustee. All income from these securities goes to our mother for as long as she shall live. My brother, my sister, and I each own one-third of the securities—and they will revert to us upon the dissolution of the trust at our mother's death.

COLIN A. STUDDS, III, TRUSTEE, BEATRICE STUDDS IRREVOCABLE TRUST, UNDER AGREEMENT DATED AUG. 1, 1973

Security	Number of shares	Market value as of Apr. 22, 1974
Bonds:		
Seaboard World Airlines cvt 5's, due Apr. 1, 1986	10,000.00	\$5,025.00
Common stocks:		
Northwest Industries, series A cvt pfd	150	10,800.00
West Point Pepperell	460	11,960.00
General Motors	200	9,800.00
Chessie System	100	4,975.00
Liggett & Myers	276	8,280.00
Marine Midland	240	5,640.00

2.—THE FOLLOWING SECURITIES ARE NOW MY OWN

Security	Number of shares	Market value as of Apr. 22, 1974
Bonds:		
Loew's Theater, 6 1/2% debenture	\$3,100.00	\$2,146.75
Common stocks:		
Burlington Industries	40	990.00
Exxon	87	6,894.75
Trans Union Corp.	93	3,603.75
Kennecott Copper	33	1,361.25
Gulf Oil	180	1,750.00
Union Carbide	167	2,680.00
Zenith Radio	167	1,691.75
Data General	133	1,105.50

1 Bought in 1973.

3. Our family home at 16 Black Horse Lane, Cohasset, Massachusetts—with an estimated market value of approximately \$65,000, owned jointly by my brother, my sister and me.

Part E—Other assets:

1. 1973 Chevelle Station Wagon.

2. 1966 Chevelle Sedan.

Part F—Liabilities:

Automobile bank loan outstanding as of April 1974—\$1,600.00.

Part G—1973 taxes paid:

Federal income tax	\$6,428.25
Massachusetts income tax	1,364.88
Local property tax (one-third of taxes on family home)	881.34
Automobile excise tax	290.95

Total taxes 9,025.42

FINANCIAL STATUS OF REPRESENTATIVE LESTER L. WOLFF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, ever since first entering Congress, it has been my belief that it is proper for public officials in decisionmaking capacities to reveal

for the public record the sources of their income and their financial holdings. In accordance with this belief, I have always tried to exceed the requirements of law to disclose all relevant information for the constituents to whom I am ultimately responsible. Therefore, I am today inserting in the RECORD my accountant's statement of my own and my wife's income and other economic interests, along with explanatory notes:

FASS TUCHER & MUSTER,
Great Neck, N.Y., April 17, 1974.

Hon. LESTER L. and BLANCHE WOLFF,
Great Neck, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. WOLFF: As per your request we are enclosing the following information for the year 1973:

Salary received as Congressman, \$42,500.
Interest earned on savings, \$978.12.
Interest received on mortgage participation, \$233.39.

Dividends received, \$3,233.25.
Reimbursement of expenditures for Tapes (radio and video), \$2,215.79.

Reimbursement of expenditures for studio time, \$3,522.05.

Net gain from sale of publicly held securities, \$910.29.

Other income: radio appearances, \$158.60.
Securities in publicly held and active corporations, partnerships and individual proprietorships, whose fair market value is in excess of \$3000.00:

403 shares of Massachusetts Investors Trust.

379 shares Century Shares Trust.
11,400 shares Associated Madison Corp.

220 shares Dana Corp.
368 shares American Telephone and Telegraph.

Federal and State income taxes paid, including local real estate taxes \$18,573.01.

If additional information is required, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very Truly Yours,
HENRY MUSTER.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Upon entering Congress, I sold the business in which I was engaged, to devote my self to my congressional career on a full time basis. Neither I nor my wife have any income from any sources other than those listed above.

Both the American Telephone and Telegraph stock and the Dana Corporation stock were bequeathed to my wife fourteen years ago, prior to my entering Congress.

The stock in Associated Madison Corporation, wherein I am merely a shareholder, was purchased more than 12 years ago.

The other stocks in Massachusetts Investors Trust and Century Shares Trust were purchased prior to my entering Congress.

The reimbursements for television and radio are for weekly programs furnished to radio and television stations, and are paid to the House Recording Studio and the House Office Equipment supply service, for tapes, and studio time.

I do not perform any managerial or consulting services or functions for which I am compensated.

CIVILIANS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense is attempting to totally

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

circumvent civilian efforts to control the number of civilian bureaucrats at the Pentagon.

Last year as part of the Department of Defense authorization bill the House and Senate approved legislation which would require an annual congressional ceiling on the number of civilians the Department of Defense can employ. But in legislation proposed by the Pentagon in this year's authorization bill the various categories of employees have been excluded from the ceilings and loopholes are proposed by the Department of Defense that would permit the Pentagon to exceed the congressional ceiling. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is engaged in a conscious program to torpedo this new law designed to curb the Pentagon's huge civilian bureaucracy.

For example, the Pentagon has inserted a clause in this year's proposed Defense authorization legislation which would allow the DOD to increase the number of civilian personnel above the proposed ceiling when a service Secretary or the Secretary of Defense decides that it will "result in economy without adverse effect upon national defense." The Pentagon will be allowed to break the ceiling by replacing military personnel with civilians without notifying the Congress.

This proposal is a mammoth loophole that makes any ceiling on civilian personnel irrelevant and meaningless. There is no use in having a ceiling when senior officials can hire as many people as they want without regard to any ceiling and without notifying the Congress.

Another example is the Pentagon's proposal that whenever a reorganization occurs by either moving an agency from one part of the Defense Department to another or when an agency is moved either into or out of the Pentagon the ceiling can be exceeded or broken. In addition, the Pentagon's proposal permits the Secretary of Defense an increase by 1 percent the total civilian manpower when he decides that such an increase would be in "the national interest." This would result in automatically raising the ceiling by more than 10,000 employees. In this case the Secretary of Defense would be required to notify the Congress of his actions.

Not only does the Pentagon's proposed legislation provide certain loopholes, this year's bill excludes large numbers of civilian employees, including approximately 103,000 foreigners employed overseas at U.S. bases on a so-called "indirect" hire basis. These employees are not hired directly by the Department of Defense, but work for their own government, which has a contract with the Pentagon to operate certain facilities and functions at overseas bases. Also, 22,000 employees who participate in special equal opportunity programs and summer jobs at the Pentagon are excluded from the ceiling. Seven thousand eight hundred overseas teachers and 32,000 employees engaged in so-called civilian functions, such as the Corps of Engineers are also excluded from the ceiling. In total, at least 169,800 civilian

employees of the Department are not included in the ceiling.

The number of employees of the National Security Agency is not included in the current civilian manpower ceiling because the number is considered classified. The Pentagon claims that for reasons of national security this number must remain secret. Keeping this number classified is an effort to frustrate the will of Congress to set ceilings on civilian manpower in defense.

Explaining why the Pentagon is seeking to allow various exemptions which allow the Department of Defense to exceed the congressionally imposed ceiling, Department Assistant Secretary Clewlow told a member of my staff that exemptions allow for "contingencies for the smooth functioning of the system." Mr. Clewlow said that breaking ceilings would "help resolve turbulence" when reorganizations occur within a department by allowing "temporary overstrengths."

Mr. Clewlow also indicated to a member of my staff that the Department of Defense proposed a system of fiscal control as opposed to a specific ceiling on the number of civilian employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is also planning to rapidly increase the number of authorized civilians on the payroll by July 1, 1975. Authorized strength could be increased by 27,000 between today and July 1, 1974. As of February 28, 1974, there were 1,000,720 civilian employees working for the Defense Department. The Pentagon is seeking an increase of nearly 19,000 employees, costing approximately \$61.5 million as part of the fiscal year 1974 supplemental appropriation. The House has already rejected this unwise increase but it still must be considered by the Senate.

According to the proposed fiscal year 1975 authorization the Pentagon would be allowed 1,027,000 employees on July 1 of this year, or a net increase of approximately 27,000 employees. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am suspicious that the Pentagon is rapidly increasing the number of authorized personnel in order to establish an artificially high ceiling for next year. It looks like the Pentagon is involved in a little featherbedding in case Congress lowers its proposed ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a substantially lower ceiling is needed on civilian manpower, particularly in view of the Pentagon's efforts to increase the number of employees by 27,000 in just a few months.

UNION WOMEN FORM COALITION

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as women continue to work for the long-overdue equality in employment opportunities, in salaries, and before the law, I am pleased to draw to the Members' attention yet another coalition of women who are working within the system our

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

laws provide for the rights they so deserve. I note with great interest the founding of a new organization, the National Coalition of Labor Union Women.

Union women, a substantial portion of the labor force, have contributed over the years an incalculable amount of time and energy resulting in a Nation that is productive and prosperous beyond belief. Now these women are joining together in order to gain their rightful share of and place in our economy and in our national mainstream.

The following news story by Ruth Jordan best explains the goals of this fledgling group:

LIKE OLD TIMES 3,000 WOMEN UNIONISTS FROM 58 UNIONS FORM COALITION

(By Ruth Jordan)

CHICAGO.—It was just like any other big labor union convention. Standards dotted the floor marking the places where Machinists, Steelworkers, Clothing Workers, Teachers and Teamsters and Auto Workers were sitting—well, not quite like any union convention in recent years.

The delegates were different too—3,200 union women and several men from 58 unions, most of whom had paid their own way to attend the founding convention of the Coalition of Labor Union Women here.

The organizers of the convention, who had met last summer in the Chicago airport to discuss the idea for the first time, had watched their baby grow through several regional conferences. They expected some 1,500 women to attend this first national meeting.

Instead, by Saturday morning when sessions began, there were 2,000 registrants and the Chicago Fire Marshall had ruled that the overflow crowd would have to be accommodated in the lobby outside the Hotel Pick Congress' "Great Hall." And still the women kept coming. Three busloads from the Midwest arrived in the afternoon delayed by a Spring snowstorm. The credentials committee was called into action again.

Addie Wyatt, one of the organizers of the meeting and director of the newly formed Women's Department of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, told a crowded night session—"We have had a difficult labor, but nine months after we began, we have given birth to this wonderful child . . ."

The Coalition adopted a structure and organizational guidelines to keep the organization growing until the first delegated convention planned for next year.

The majority of the delegates resisted efforts that would extend the organization's framework to include women outside organized labor voting down amendments that would open the organization to "all working women" and to "women in the Welfare Rights Organization."

Instead the organization was limited to "union members and retirees of bona fide collective bargaining organizations . . ."

Sheer size forced the delegates to discuss substantive issues in smaller workshops rather than in plenary sessions. And as the convention threatened to be overwhelmed by work, the delegates turned over all resolutions to the incoming National Coordinating Committee of 200.

The Committee was chosen by union caucuses, each electing four delegates. State caucuses also elected state convenors from various unions who will be charged with local and state organization of CLUW chapters.

The officers of CLUW, elected by the National Coordinating Committee, are: National Chairperson Olga Madar, International Vice-President of the United Auto Workers from Detroit; Vice-Chairperson Addie Wyatt, di-

rector of the Women's Affairs Department, Amalgamated Meat Cutters, Chicago; Executive Secretary Linda Tarr-Whelan, AFSCME deputy director of program development, Washington, D.C.; Treasurer Gloria Johnson, IUE director of education and women's activities, Washington, D.C.; Regional Vice-Presidents Joyce Miller, executive assistant to the General Officers and director of social services for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, N.Y.; Elinor Glenn, International Union Executive Board Member, Service Employees International Union, Los Angeles; Dana Dunham, rank-and-file member of the Communications Workers, Atlanta, Ga.; Clara Day, Teamsters Local 743, Chicago.

The new organization adopted as its purposes:

Organization into unions of the 30 million unorganized women workers in the labor force;

Affirmative action in the workplace to encourage women "and their union brothers" through their unions to take positive action against job discrimination in hiring, promotion, classification and other aspects of work;

To encourage women to run for political office and to press for child care legislation, full employment and job opportunities; ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment and an extension of "truly protective legislation for all workers";

To encourage union women to take an active role in their unions and to encourage their movement into leadership positions in their unions and the labor movement as a whole;

At several points, the convention's success was threatened by side issues. One major debate took place around the issue of supporting the United Farm Workers boycott.

There was strong sentiment that the basic unity of the delegates would be destroyed if they reflected the tensions that might exist between their international unions or between unaffiliated and affiliated organizations.

CLUW organizers, in an effort to avoid potential rifts in the fledgling organization had included a structural clause saying CLUW would not take part in jurisdictional disputes. The clause would have barred an endorsement of the Farm Workers boycott.

Militant supporters of the boycott, none of them members of the Farm Workers, rose time and again to strike the clause so that a resolution could be introduced. It was an emotional issue, since clearly most of the delegates supported the Farm Workers strongly. But many expressed concern that the issue was being used to divert the organization from its goal of unifying union women.

After a stormy and potentially divisive session that lasted until nearly midnight, the delegates killed that clause and opened the way for a floor fight over the boycott issue.

Instead Farm Worker women and Teamster women called Evelyn Dubrow at 1:00 a.m. The legislative director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Ms. Dubrow had chaired one of the many workshops. They told her they didn't want the convention to be diverted from its major task and said they'd like to get together and discuss their problems.

The next day, a member of the Farm Workers rose to address the delegates. Josephine Flores said "You know sisters we have been struggling for a long time . . . not one day, not one year, or ten years. Please sisters," she told them, "the Farm Workers put everything on your table." Then she asked for support of a resolution to call for union organization of all women in the fields.

The Farm Workers woman wore a red bandana around her head, her arm was wrapped in a heavy cast, her brown, round

April 23, 1974

face reflected her years of toil. Next to her stood Clara Day, a beautifully groomed, black

In the most touching display of trade union unity to be seen in many decades, the two women turned suddenly toward each other and embraced. The entire audience rose and cheered, some with tears streaming down their faces. And Edith Van Horn, a United Auto Workers staff representative for many years, tried to carry on.

"This is what CLUW is all about," she said, her voice choked with emotion. And then she added, "In 54 years, I've never been prouder to be a woman."

One reporter who had covered a number of feminist meetings in recent years commented how astonished he was at the complete lack of hostility toward men or the male leadership of the unions.

Feminist spokeswoman Gloria Steinem attended the meeting as a delegate but was not introduced from the platform. At the press conference following the convention, however, Olga Madar offered a vote of gratitude to the organizers of the women's movement and said they had helped make union women aware of their need to organize as women.

In the final moments of the convention there was a ringing call from Addie Wyatt to remember that the bosses are the real enemies of women in the labor force.

"Remember we are not each other's enemies," she said. "Our unions are not the enemies because we are the unions. . . . We are telling our unions that we are ready, available and capable to fight the fight," she added.

And then in a powerful conclusion she told the women: "I still believe that the union is the most viable and available channel through which we can win our goals. . . ."

"I am still committed to work within the framework . . ."

And then reciting the words of Solidarity Forever, she said, "For the union makes us strong . . ."

With that the delegates rose, hands clasped and bodies swaying, sang Solidarity Forever. The founding convention of CLUW was over and union women were on the move.

IN MEMORIAM: HON. JAMES EMMERT, OF SHELBYVILLE, IND.

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Judge James Emmert, of Shelbyville, Ind., was saddening to the many in the State who, like myself, had the great privilege to call him a friend.

The following tribute to Jim Emmert by Ben Cole, of the Washington Bureau of the Indianapolis Star, which appeared in the Star on April 21, 1974, is both fitting and moving, and it is a pleasure to include it in the RECORD.

FRIEND'S TRIBUTE TO EMMERT

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—It's going to be hard getting used to a world without Jim Emmert. Just knowing he was around somewhere made it a lot happier world to be in.

He was the attorney general of Indiana when this reporter first got to know him. His string neckties, his doeskin spats and his soulful brown eyes were the first things you noticed about him.

Even when he was a young man, his face seamed and lined as if he had personally

bore the sins of the world for centuries. When he was in his early 50s he used to pronounce, "By the time a man's 40 you ought to be able to read his character in his face."

To a callow reporter still shy of that venerable age, it was a challenge. Frequent examinations in the mirror, however, failed to disclose the development of the kind of character that Jim somehow had acquired.

The attorney general's office was the place to learn what was going on in Indiana government. Every problem had a way of finding its way to Jim Emmert's desk, and his deputies were always trying out the common sense of their legal scholarship on a young reporter without many prejudices.

Jim Emmert's desk had beside it a towering, swivel bookcase which he could twirl with the twist of his wrist when he looked up the law.

He was patient, kind and a trusted friend. In three years of conversations he must have imparted what was nearly the equivalent of a law school education. Better! It was the kind of instruction that was never forgotten and is as useful and fresh today as when Jim peered over those little half-moon glasses and catechized his eager student.

His heart was always light, and he enjoyed political anecdotes to the full. His laughter was unique—high-pitched and cackling, ending in a sober ritual of enjoyment.

He was a born judge, and even when he sat in a courtroom as counsel in a case he was busy judging the evidence. He used to say it made it easier to win his cases, knowing how he would decide if he were on the bench.

Then he was elected to the Indiana Supreme Court. Somewhere there is a picture of Jim, his lovely wife Bernice and a young newspaper reporter—all three with their feet on the judicial bench in evidence of informal friendship.

After he became a judge, Emmert refused to join his brother jurists at lunch. He would join the reporters at the old Indianapolis Press Club, in those days on Monument Circle. Law was forgotten while he discussed politics, gunsmithing and tombstone inscriptions with his newspaper friends.

He gave this reporter a key to his judicial chambers, saying he didn't want any newspaper accounts of legal questions written without proper background. The free use of his considerable law library was a treasured advantage.

Each day at noon, this reporter used to leave the Statehouse pressroom and walk around the corridor to Judge Emmert's office. There was always a little "stomach medicine" available to ward off any microbes that might lurk in the Press Club kitchen.

As a judge, he was without peer. Once a lawyer who argued a case before him remonstrated, "Jim, you decided the case in my favor all right; but I wanted to win on the issue I raised, not the question you decided it on."

Emmert looked up with the mischievous grin that was one of his most delightful features. "Well," he said, "you can't say I didn't read the record."

History miscarried when Jim Emmert somehow never got to be a justice of the United States Supreme Court. It is interesting that he should have been known as Indiana's "great dissenter," for he would have filled the void on the highest court left when Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes passed away. Holmes was also called "the great dissenter."

Ted Knap of Scripps-Howard Newspapers said the other day that Jim Emmert had "too much common sense" ever to be named to the Supreme Court. He was probably right; and it is a sorry comment on the way justices are picked.

In recent years, he always kept in touch with notes and letters—usually approving and urging fidelity to the rugged individualism that was his hallmark.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He was a powerful teacher, a devoted friend and a mentor of highest principles. He was the personification of everything that is good about partisan politics—a Republican who knew where he stood and respected his opponents for their convictions.

He lived a long, full life; but the years passed all too quickly. For his farewell the words of Hoosier Poet James Whitcomb Riley are most fitting:

"Well, good-by, Jim: Take keer of your self."

CHARLES BLACK, SENIOR WAR CORRESPONDENT

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 16, 1974, edition of the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer, provides an excellent discussion of the President's conduct of the Vietnam war. The editorial, written by my good friend and a truly outstanding journalist, Mr. Charles Black, the Enquirer's associate editor, is both well written and scholarly and I commend it highly to the attention of our colleagues.

The editorial reads:

NIXON AND VIETNAM

Along with all of the rest flying round on the political gales in Washington of late, we have noted a particular howl for the blood of the President which maintains he should be impeached for his actions as commander in chief in the waning era of the Vietnam War.

The raids into Cambodia and Laos, the decision to allow meaningful bomb targets in the north, the decision to blockade Haiphong, and the covert warfare (clandestine probes, raids, air strikes, etc.) waged against Cambodian and Laotian sanctuary bases are called illegal acts by this set of critics.

It is probably going to come as a complete surprise to just about everybody, but on the basis of a precedent already in the Supreme Court record, President Nixon is the only occupant of the White House since the Vietnam affair began in earnest in 1962 who isn't in violation of the Constitution on this matter.

In 1850 in a case recorded as "Fleming vs. Page" which had grown out of the horrendous political flap in our nation which came with the Mexican War, the Supreme Court related the President's authority to fight wars to an assigned duty to achieve success while doing it:

"As Commander in Chief, he is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass and conquer and subdue the enemy."

PRESIDENT'S DUTY

In 1895 in "The United States vs. Sweeney," the Court again stated that the President is expected "to wage a successful war" once the war has commenced.

It would appear that the refusal of previous administrations to address the clear, tactical advantages so obviously available to them as Commander in Chief by cleaning out Cambodian and Laotian sanctuaries and to apply effective measures against North Vietnam were violations of long-standing Supreme Court definitions of the President's duty as Commander in Chief.

There is a specific howl, within this particular style cacophony, that clandestine ac-

tions against the Cambodian sanctuaries during 1969-1970 which were kept from general knowledge of Congress and the public were especially reprehensible and illegal acts by President Nixon. Objective consideration in light of established legal precedent, that the duty of a president is to obtain military success sufficient to meet his strategic goals, would seem to make him culpable if he had done otherwise, however.

Consider that it was established by an American operation in October-November of 1965 (the battle of the Ia Drang as it is usually referred to, the Plei Me-Ia Drang Campaign in official Army histories) that North Vietnamese regiments fought by the 1st Air Cavalry Division had attacked from Cambodian bases and had fled there after defeat. A White House decision relayed to the field headquarters through the Saigon command barred American pursuit into Cambodian territory.

The truly illegal act by a President would seem to have been the decision by the late President Lyndon Johnson not to legally pursue an enemy into his illegal sanctuary area. It was a decision which guaranteed there could be no success for his war strategies. The impossibility of defeating light infantry or irregulars allowed privileged sanctuary to have been established in military history since the ancient Chinese general Sun Tzu wrote it as a principle that:

"The privileged sanctuary confers great advantages on the antagonist who enjoys it and multiplies the problems of the antagonist not so blest."

HEAVY CASUALTIES

By 1966, field generals were openly angry that they were denied the necessary political permission to solve the problem of these sanctuary bases and supply routes. Lt. Gen. Stanley Larsen, at that time commander of our Field Forces Vietnam (I), returned from Vietnam and held a press conference in which he explained the sanctuary situation. He said American casualties would continue to be heavy because of it, that the military problem couldn't be solved until that matter was solved.

Then-Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and then-Secretary of State Dean Rusk both took occasion to go on national television and tell the American people that there were no sanctuary bases in Cambodia.

The general was forced to mutter that he was "simply a field commander, and they probably know more about it than I do" because his political command had spoken. The American people were to be lied to about the existence of the Cambodian sanctuaries. The policy was set and put into operation until President Nixon changed it.

When the Nixon administration commenced, it was therefore impossible to assault those bases without great threat to the domestic tranquillity of the nation. It was also impossible to continue to abide them because they were bringing the deaths of American soldiers and denying success, which was demanded of the President by Supreme Court decisions.

GRAVE REACTION

The record shows that when open raids were finally launched, because of the overpowering necessity to commit sufficient force to the effort, there was a grave domestic reaction. The Kent State tragedy is an example of what happened. His judgment concerning the need for guarding against that earlier is proved correct by the record of 1970, then. His judgment that the sanctuaries had to be assaulted was proved by the success which attended the aftermath.

On this particular matter, President Nixon was doing his legal duty as President and Commander in Chief. There were others in times before him, however, who certainly have much to answer for.

MAINE MADE SENSE

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago an article by Sandra Garson appeared on the "Op-Ed" page of the New York Times which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Entitled "Maine Made Sense," the article outlines Miss Garson's perceptions upon leaving New York City at age 29 to settle in Maine. While this article certainly does not portray all aspects of life in Maine—unfortunately, we have as many problems as any State—it does portray with sensitivity and insight one important slice of Maine life. I know Miss Garson's article will be of interest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I commend it to their attention:

MAINE MADE SENSE

(By Sandra Garson)

FIVE ISLANDS, ME.—People kept telling me I had guts to move to Maine. Frankly, I thought I had common sense, for I wanted to play where I understood the rules of the game.

I had already tried and abandoned a gaggle of life-styles: my Philadelphia heritage, the bittersweet Big Apple, world travel and expatriation (not glamorous but depressing, even if you speak the language)—so at a ripened 29 it seemed time to stake my claim to being what I was: an American, whatever that meant.

The nineteenth-century passion for going West didn't move me, for, I, born in the mid-twentieth, suspect that God strategically placed America's major geological fault in California in order to replay His wipe-out of Gomorrah easier. So I went East to a state of mind, and landed in the state of Maine. Suddenly the jig saw locked. Maine made sense.

Recently Bridgton voted to reduce to almost zero the taxes on land left untouched for the appreciation of passing townspeople when it was learned that local landowners had been forced to sell or develop land merely to bear the tax burden. A human being understands that.

The comfort of comprehension, something mid-nineteen-seventies Americans fear they've bartered to Beelzebub to get away from it all, has not been lost up here because Maine has never tried to get away.

As adamant as the tall pines and time-washed cliffs of her spine, it refuses to be moved one millimeter from the human condition.

Some people call its residents Mainiacs, but they are intensely sane. They know there is no getting away and so they adapt to life, setting out humane values and goals. They are the tortoises in the great race, but it is perhaps their Yankee genius that by not moving one inch they have gotten away from all that is troubling everyone else.

With less civilization there are fewer discontents. There are more chances to get in touch. Up here on this hardline landscape, nature whittles life down to human scale, peeling off the question marks.

Guerrillas in a war of attrition against the highly charged forces of nature and the well-equipped army of "progress," Maine's people live in that constant state of alert that novelists say is exhilarating. When they lie down to sleep at night they know what it means to survive the measure of a day. Nothing is more worth knowing.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

I understand better what it means to be human when I have to spend three hours chopping wood for a fire to keep warm than when I have to drive six times around the block trying to park and then get a ticket because it's the wrong day for the right side of the street. The other day a woman came into the general store and handed Ray a dollar. She had just gotten home and noticed that he had given her too much change.

Maine is what this country must have been all about once. I was an immigrant to this land, a single woman homesteader. Yet nobody posed tacky questions. Rather, they let me hang myself out and seeing that my pursuit of happiness wasn't inimical to their life or liberty they called me "friend" and "neighbor."

Democracy grows here because people need each other to survive. Here the town meeting is a bridge between neighbors. Decisions are not relegated to politicians. Self-determination is the Yankee way, and in Maine I have come to learn what that means.

On the agenda of my last town meeting were votes on a moderator, \$500 to retain counsel to determine the rights of townspeople to certain water access, and \$378 for transportation services for the elderly.

I have seen the past and it works. The present is out of order. Maine satisfies my human longing for consistency. I live now in a house that has stood by the sea for 150 years, in a village incorporated since 1716 and among people who still do what humans are supposed to do. Maine people not only endure, they prevail. On this terrain they have no choice. And they have chosen this terrain.

In moving here from New York to join them, I did not abandon a sinking ship as some thought. I merely satisfied my own needs. Maine, the vast undeveloped country making possible the exploration of human alternatives, was not out of the question for the urban me because in desperation I dared pose the big question: Do I want to lead and understand my one and only life?

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Financial Disclosure of the New York State delegation to Congress, I am pleased to provide herewith data regarding my financial status for 1973.

First, sources of all noncongressional income: Sale of Dreyfus fund stocks; sale of real estate; income from law firm of Roncallo, Leff, Weber, and Shapiro.

Second, all unsecured indebtedness: None.

Third, sources of all reimbursements for expenditures: \$3,000 from the Republican Congressional Committee as is apportioned to all freshmen Republican Congressman for public relations.

Fourth, all stocks, bonds, and other securities owned outright or beneficially: Three-mile Harbor Marina; Filmway; Villa D'Est Leasing Corp.; Cobrook Developers, Inc.; one share Ford stock each for each of my five children; Romat Realty, Inc.; Webco Enterprises, Inc.

Fifth, identity of all business entities—

including partnerships, corporations, trusts, and sole proprietorships—professional organizations—of a non-eleemosynary nature—and foundations in which I am a director, officer, partner, or serve in an advisory or managerial capacity: Partner in the law firm of Roncallo, Leff, Weber, and Shapiro.

Sixth, shown below is my individual income tax return face sheet for 1973:

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN

Angelo D., and Priscelle Roncallo, 226 Toronto Avenue, Massapequa, N.Y. 11758.

Occupation: yours, U.S. Congressman; spouse, housewife.

Filing Status—check only one:

2 Married filing jointly (even if only one had income).

Exemptions:

6a. Yourself, b. Spouse.

c. First names of your dependent children who lived with you: Marc, James, Jean-Marie, Paul John.

7. Total exemptions claimed, 7.

9. Wages, salaries, tips, and other employee compensation, \$39,105.

10a. Dividends, \$29.

11. Interest income, \$657.

12. Income other than wages, dividends, and interest (from line 38), \$20,303.

13. Total (add lines 9, 10c, 11, and 12), \$60,065.

14. Adjustments to income (such as "sick-pay," moving expenses, etc. from line 43), \$2,758.

15. Subtract line 14 from line 13 (adjusted gross income), \$57,307.

16. Tax Rate Schedule X, Y, or Z, \$8,720.

17. Total credits (from line 54), \$38.

18. Income tax (subtract line 17 from line 16), \$8,682.

19. Other taxes (from line 61), \$833.

20. Total (add lines 18 and 19), \$9,515.

21a. Total Federal income tax withheld (attach Forms W-2 or W-2P to front), \$10,130.

b. 1973 estimated tax payments (include amount allowed as credit from 1972 return), \$1,541.

22. Total (add lines 21a, b, c, and d), \$11,671.

23. If line 20 is larger than line 22, enter balance due IRS, None.

24. If line 22 is larger than line 20, enter amount overpaid, \$2,156.

26. Amount of line 24 to be credited on 1973 estimated tax, \$2,156.

This information is released, according to the suggestion of the ad hoc committee, on April 23, 1974.

OPIUM PRODUCTION BAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very important letter that has been sent to the President by the commissioner of the New York City Addiction Services Agency, Mr. Jerome Hornblass.

Mr. Hornblass' letter is evidence of the well-founded nature of our concern over the possibility of the Turkish Government lifting the ban on opium production. For the past several weeks, I and my distinguished colleague from New York (MR. RANGEL) have been urging the White House to stand firm on the opium

growing ban. Now we are joined by a man who, as head of New York City's Addiction Services Agency, is in a position to realize the impact which the opium production ban has had on heroin availability and use on our city streets. I reemphasize Mr. Hornblass' statement that—

If the United States Government, bowing to pressure from Turkish poppy growers and the domestic pharmaceutical industry, agrees to a lifting of the ban, it will be a backwards step that is almost guaranteed to lead to an upsurge in heroin addiction.

Mr. Speaker, less than 1 percent of the Turkish population, and only 1 percent of the economy is dependent on opium growing. Our question is, how many Americans will become drug dependent if poppy production is resumed? Surely, the Turkish Government has a responsibility to teach this small fraction of its citizenry about the seriousness of our drug problem and its relationship to poppy production in Turkey. If the Turks lift the ban on opium growing, they will be showing their utter disregard for the mutual assistance pact that is imperative for fighting the drug war that ravages this Nation's youth.

For the RECORD, I would like to include the full text of Commissioner Hornblass' letter to the President:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following letter advising against the possible decision of the U.S. Government agreeing to the lifting of the opium ban by the Turkish Government was sent today by New York City Addiction Services Agency Commissioner Jerome Hornblass to President Nixon:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Commissioner of New York City Addiction Services Agency, with responsibility for the administration of more than 300 drug treatment facilities caring for over 40,000 drug abusers, I wish to register grave concern over recent unofficial reports that the United States Government may shortly agree to a lifting of the ban on production of the Turkish opium poppy.

Since 1972, when the Turkish Government, in return for compensation from the United States, agreed to suppress the growth of opium poppy there has been a dramatic decrease in the amount of heroin available in the streets of New York. Data compiled by our agency indicates not only that heroin is relatively unavailable in our streets but that this scarcity reflects the national situation. According to one recent congressional study the number of pure heroin addicts has decreased nationally from at least $\frac{1}{2}$ million to no more than 200,000 in the last two years.

Although it is now possible to draw a direct relationship between New York's recent decrease in addict-related crimes and the Turkish opium ban, there is no reason to doubt that the latter is at least partially responsible for this decrease in criminal activity.

Also, because of the extremely short supply of illicit heroin resulting from the ban, the purity, and therefore the addictability of street heroin in New York City has declined from an average of 7.7 percent pure heroin per "bag" to an average of 3.7 percent of purity per "bag" according to a recent report of the drug enforcement administration. Moreover, the past year has seen a marked decrease in New York City and throughout the United States in overdosed deaths due directly to heroin, as well as a decrease in drug-related hepatitis. These decreases are primarily attributable to the short supply of illicit heroin. If the United States Government bowing to pressure from Turkish poppy growers and the domestic pharmaceutical in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dustry, agrees to a lifting of the ban, it will be a backwards step that is almost guaranteed to lead to an upsurge in heroin addiction nationally, with a consequent rise in addict related crimes. We are now on the threshold of coming to grips not only with the heroin problem but the entire drug abuse problem. Therefore, now is the time to persevere in our efforts to stem the tide of drug addiction by drying up the Turkish poppy fields. On behalf of the thousands of drug rehabilitation workers in the city, State and federally supported programs, nationally, and of young people everywhere who may be future victims of heroin addiction, I urge you to reconsider any lessening of the United States Government attitude toward opium production in Turkey.

Sincerely,

JEROME HORNBLASS,
Commissioner.

SAVE THE WETLANDS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

MR. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, by permission previously granted, the testimony delivered by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, April 23, 1974, before the Subcommittee on Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection of the House Committee on Appropriations, which calls for the preservation of this Nation's precious wetlands.

I joined with Congressman Reuss in support of this statement urging the subcommittee to reverse the proposal in the President's fiscal year 1975 budget which halts two vital programs geared to save the wetlands.

The text of Congressman Reuss' statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY S. REUSS OF WISCONSIN

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to urge your rejection of two proposals in the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 1975 which, if adopted by Congress, would have disastrous consequences for our Nation's irreplaceable wetlands. Congressman John D. Dingell, who could not be here today, joins me in urging this.

The first proposal is to strike from the Agriculture Department's 1975 Appropriation Act (by funeral brackets) a proviso¹ prohibiting the use of Agricultural Conservation Program² funds to drain wetlands designated as types 3, 4, or 5. Your Subcommittee has included this proviso in the Department's annual Appropriation Acts ever since 1962.

The second Administration proposal for Fiscal Year 1975 is to discontinue the Water

¹ The proviso is as follows:

"Provided that no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetland Types 3(III), 4(IV), and 5(V) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956; . . ." [P.L. 93-135, p. 18.]

² Now the Rural Environmental Conservation Program (RECP).

Bank Act program as a separate program and to provide that Water Bank funds will no longer be available solely for wetland purposes, but will be spread out to serve several purposes.

Apparently the decision on these proposals was made without benefit of any input from the Interior Department, which is chiefly concerned with the conservation of wetlands.

In a March 7, 1974, memorandum to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Reed, the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife said that the proviso which the President's Budget proposes be stricken "has been of inestimable value to the Nation's remaining wetland resources" and that preservation of the Water Bank program "deserves all the support we can muster." He then concluded:

"We are, frankly, very surprised and disappointed with these proposals. The direct and indirect ramifications to the Nation's wetlands resources would be tremendous.*** We are very much concerned at what appears to be an effort to stimulate farm operators to all-out production—to the detriment of wildlife habitat. We believe the reaction by the conservation minded public would be one of disillusionment and outrage."

In a March 8 letter to Chairman Russell W. Peterson of the Council on Environmental Quality, Assistant Secretary Reed urged "continuation" of that proviso, and said that the Water Bank program "can be helpful in preserving our national wetlands resources".

Prior to 1962, the Agriculture Conservation Program—which is a valuable tool for genuine soil conservation practices such as strip cropping, terracing, contour plowing, and tree planting—was given a black eye for subsidizing drainage of wetlands valuable to migratory waterfowl and other wildlife. During the previous 10 years, almost half of the more than 1.3 million acres of wetlands in the prairie pothole area of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota was drained with ACP aid.

In 1959, your Subcommittee noted the utter senselessness of the Agriculture Department's policy of paying farmers to drain wetlands valuable for wildlife while at the same time the Interior Department was buying such wetlands to protect wildlife. At this Subcommittee's request, the two Departments in 1960 agreed that Federal subsidies for drainage of these wetlands should not be approved where Interior recommended against such drainage.

But by 1962, it was evident that the interdepartmental agreement was ineffective. Interior's recommendations were generally being disregarded.

On July 24, 1962, the House adopted, with the support of your Chairman, Mr. Whitten, the so-called "Reuss Amendment," which I offered to stop the use of Federal ACP funds to drain wetlands considered most valuable to wildlife. It has been re-enacted in every one of the Agriculture Department's annual appropriation Acts since then.

It achieved its purpose well. On April 9, 1974, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife advised us that between October 1962 and December 1972, the Agriculture Department had received 7,449 requests for financial assistance to drain over 85,745 acres of "high value" wetlands (types 1, 3, 4, and 5) in North Dakota alone. The Amendment has saved about 57.7 percent (49,475 acres)—the Types 3, 4, and 5—of these "high value" wetlands from being drained with Federal ACP funds. Thus, if landowners wanted to drain these areas for farming or real estate development, they had to use their own money, not the taxpayers' money.

After 11 years of compliance with the Reuss Amendment, the new budget will now authorize the shelling out of millions of tax dollars to destroy these natural wetlands. It is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 23, 1974

bad enough when the Administration hurts the conservation cause by refusing to spend needed dollars to acquire dwindling wetlands for migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas. But it is sheer hypocrisy for the Office of Management and Budget to approve spending additional millions of dollars in order to hurt these conservation practices.

On February 14, 1974, we asked OMB Director Roy Ash why he recommended the deletion of this important proviso. In his March 27 reply, Mr. Ash admitted requesting deletion of the proviso because, he said, it is "superfluous language since Rural Environmental Program funds are not permitted to be used for such drainage in the 1975 program."

But Mr. Ash is in error. Without the Reuss Amendment, REP funds may be used for this purpose in Fiscal Year 1975.

Under Secretary of Agriculture Campbell assured us on March 7 that his Department would not spend REP funds for wetland drainage purposes in FY 1975. However, his assurance is a poor substitute for a statutory prohibition against the use of those funds for such purposes, for several reasons:

First. Administrative decisions are subject to change. This Subcommittee remembers, I am sure, the Agriculture Department's public announcements in the fall of 1972 that the REAP and Water Bank Act programs were being funded in Fiscal Year 1973. The Department even listed the States in which Water Bank funds would be spent. But only a few weeks later, on December 26, 1972, the Agriculture Department abruptly reversed itself and terminated both programs.

Second. Removal of the proviso could be interpreted as indicating Congressional approval for use of REP funds for wetlands drainage. Even legislative history to the contrary might not be sufficient to prevent such an interpretation by the Agriculture Department a few years from now, or by a court in a suit challenging the Department's authority to withhold funds for this purpose.³

Third. These assurances were made only after we protested the Administration's decision. Indeed, to our knowledge, these assurances have never been made public. The Administration's budget document, which is public, does not include these assurances. In fact, we reached a different conclusion upon reading it.

Mr. Chairman, these Administration officials apparently do not object to the concept of prohibiting subsidies for drainage of wetlands. Rather, they object to a Congressional prohibition for this purpose. But we believe our Nation's wetlands will be afforded greater protection by Congressional enactment of the Reuss Amendment than by the vagaries of an administrative decision.

Let me stress, however, that the present Reuss Amendment is not a panacea. There are 20 wetland types described in the Interior Department's definitive publication (Circular 39) entitled "Wetlands of the United States." Many of these are navigable and therefore cannot be drained or filled without a Corps of Engineers permit. But Type 7 wetlands—the wooded swamps—are generally not subject to these Corps' permit requirements and are being drained with the aid of REP funds. On April 19, 1974, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife advised me that several studies and reports have shown that in the past 18 years mil-

lions of acres of wetland forests in the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal plains and in other areas of the United States have been drained, often with the aid of Federal funds.

Even more disturbing is the December 1973 "Rural Credit Program Fact Sheet" of the Farmers Home Administration which clearly advertises that Federal soil and water conservation loans are available for "drainage" of lands, including, of course, types 3, 4, and 5 wetlands, as well as type 7 wetlands.

The Interior Department is currently spending Federal funds to prevent the drainage of these wetlands. Congress should not allow the Agriculture Department to defeat that program by encouraging their drainage.

We urge that the Reuss Amendment be continued and, indeed, expanded to prohibit the use of any Agriculture Department funds for the drainage of not only wetlands Type 3, 4, and 5 but also wetlands Type 7. A suggested amendment for this purpose is enclosed with my statement.

II

As proposed by the Administration, the Water Bank Program would lose its identity as a separate program and Water Bank funds could be used for purposes other than those authorized by the Water Bank Act. We urge that you reject that proposal.

First. Public Law 93-86 did not contemplate that the Water Bank Act program should be discontinued as a separate program. Indeed, that law specifically recognized the existence of the Water Bank Act and did not repeal it. Congress intended that the program continue unscathed within the new RECP program. The Administration's budget proposal is not in accord with that intention.

Second. The Administration's 1975 budget proposal lumps the Water Bank Act program into a broad category entitled "Recreation and Wildlife." An appropriation of \$900,000 for this category is requested in Fiscal Year 1975. In a March 7 letter to Congressman Dingell and me, Under Secretary Campbell said that his agency plans "to use the funds only for preserving wetlands."

But the Under Secretary's promise contradicts the Administration's statement in the Budget Appendix (p. 144) and other public documents on this matter. That Appendix expressly states that these funds would be used primarily for wetlands purposes, and that recreation and other wildlife practices which in the past have received about \$3.6 million annually "would continue to be supported but on a somewhat lower priority basis than at present." If Mr. Campbell's administrative commitment prevails, none of the funds could be used for recreation and other wildlife practices. They would have to be used solely for Water Bank purposes and these other practices would go unfunded in fiscal year 1975.

We urge that this Committee maintain the identity of the Water Bank program at the funding level provided for that program in Fiscal Year 1973 and Fiscal Year 1974.

We also urge that the funding for recreation and other wildlife practices be continued apart from the Water Bank Act funding.

PROPOSED REUSS AMENDMENT TO THE AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION APPROPRIATION ACT—1975

"None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to provide financial or technical assistance of any kind for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III), 4 (IV), 5 (V), and 7 (VII) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956."

WILL THE ARABS BUY AMERICA?

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 60-cent-a-gallon gasoline is a leading contributor to our escalating cost of living. As serious a problem as the boost in oil prices is to our Nation's welfare, the windfall of the billions of American dollars to Arab oil producers poses a threat to America even more dangerous than inflation itself.

These American dollars are now becoming a weapon in the hands of the Arab States who are already beginning to use their financial investments to gain control of our sensitive and vital businesses and institutions.

Already in South America, the penetration of Arab oil money has changed the editorial content of the news media. The change in outlook of a major Brazilian newspaper after its purchase by the Sheikdom of Abu Dhabi is just one example.

Money talks and foreign money can talk through financial control of magazines, newspapers, radio, and television. We are a nation of free speech, but if that free speech is directed and controlled by foreign dollars, then we should be taking a very close look at just who is running our news media.

Last year, Middle East oil revenues totaled \$22 billion. In the past year, however, the Arab States have increased their royalties on oil by 400 percent. This year, Arab oil revenues should total between \$85 and \$110 billion. An estimated \$40 to \$50 billion each year will be available for investments beyond the borders of the Arab States. By 1980, Arab foreign investments will total twice as much as U.S. investments abroad.

In addition to the media, the Arabs are also moving heavily into real estate, buying land, hotels, apartments, and office buildings. To cite just a few examples, Kuwait paid \$17.4 million in cash for an island off Charleston, S.C., which it plans to develop as a resort. Kuwait also put up funds for a project in downtown Atlanta that includes the new Atlanta Hilton Hotel. A Dallas builder is using about \$200 million in Middle East financing for an apartment development in St. Louis. Indeed, in the past few months, it is estimated that up to \$400 million has been lent directly to U.S. borrowers by Arab investors.

Arab penetration is also felt strongly in banking as Arab institutions and investors seek to buy interests in U.S. banks. A bank in Oakland, Calif., recently purchased by Saudi Arabian investors is just one example of this move.

Energy-related projects are another prime target of an Arab economic takeover as Arab governments and investors seek to penetrate the U.S. oil and petrochemical industries. There is a chain of service stations in New York State now owned by the Arabs. In this case, Arab control of U.S. energy needs runs all the way from the well to the gas tanks.

³ A recent lawsuit challenging the termination of the REAP program was successful only because Congress had included statutory language which the court said required the Department to continue the program. *Guadalupe v. Roy L. Ash*, (Civil Action 155-73, D.C.D.C., Dec. 28, 1973).

I was disturbed to learn that the U.S. Government has no idea of the full extent of foreign investment in the United States. The last survey on direct foreign investment in the United States was undertaken by the Department of Commerce in 1959. Present law makes it easy for a foreign investor to hide his identity by using third party agents and other techniques in conjunction with brokerage houses and banks. Clearly this lack of control over foreign investment cannot be allowed to continue.

On April 10, I joined in sponsoring H.R. 14136, a bill to establish a National Foreign Investment Control Commission. The Commission would maintain a National Registry of Foreign Investment. Foreign persons who own U.S. securities or property either directly or indirectly would be required to provide complete information about their holdings for the registry.

The Commission itself would be designed to restrict foreign ownership or control of U.S. industries, real estate or other resources deemed to be vital to the economic security or national defense of the United States. It would be empowered to order any foreign person or entity determined to have a controlling interest in an area vital to our national security to divest himself from all or a portion of his holdings.

In addition, I have sponsored a companion measure, H.R. 14138, to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Investment Control to oversee and monitor the actions of the Foreign Investment Control Commission to insure that the Commission does its job.

We have always allowed a measure of foreign investment in the United States. However, these investments have always been from friendly Western countries who have been our long-term allies. Never before has there been the potential for radical and unfriendly governments to buy control of our major industries. Such an occurrence would open the way for massive internal disruptions of our economy at the whim of unstable and hostile foreign governments.

According to some calculations, the Arab oil nations will have enough money in a few years to buy all the shares of all the companies currently traded on the American Stock Exchange.

The penetration of Arab investment into American economic life is like a time bomb ticking away. We must defuse this threat before we lose control of our own Nation.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the financial disclosure guidelines of the New York delegation, the following is submitted for the RECORD:

A. Sources of all non-Congressional income: Interest on bank savings; income from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sole practitioner as attorney; compensation as director of Sunrise Federal Savings and Loan Association; rental income.

B. Unsecured indebtedness: Note, National Bank of Washington, \$2,000.00.

C. Source of reimbursements of Congressional expenses in excess of \$100.00, none. Honorariums, none.

D. Identity of all stocks, bonds and other securities owned outright or beneficially: None. (Wife, Mary, owner of shares in AT&T, inherited 1973.)

E. Management positions in business entities, foundations, etc.:

1. Partner in GALS Realty. Owner of one business parcel at 194 Deer Park Avenue, Babylon, New York.

2. Attorney at Law. Sole Practitioner.

F. Amount of 1973 Income Tax: Federal, \$16,050.89; State, \$6,849.19.

Report of income filed annually as required by House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO ST. PHILIP NERI CHURCH ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 75TH DIAMOND JUBILEE ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1974, Mrs. Biaggi and I attended a church service in my home city of the Bronx, N.Y. This was far from an ordinary service, indeed, we and hundreds of others had the distinct honor of being in attendance as His Eminence Terrence Cardinal Cooke celebrated the 75th anniversary of our church, St. Philip Neri. It was a beautiful and moving experience truly befitting the momentous event we were celebrating.

St. Philip Neri Church has had a history rich in tradition and equally abundant in services provided to its parishioners. During these 75 years, many changes have taken place in the community as well as the world. Two global wars were fought, and countless other local and international crises occurred. Yet through them all, this fine church has endured by both preaching and practicing the word of God. From its outset St. Philip Neri Church has been blessed with men and women who through dedication and self sacrifice have made this church one of the finer houses of worship in this country. In addition to this many of St. Philip Neri's parishioners have become outstanding members of the community.

On this joyous occasion of the diamond jubilee celebration, I would like to reflect on the growth and development of this fine church by focusing on the five men who served as pastors throughout the long and glorious history of the St. Philip Neri Church.

The man who had the most profound effect on this church was its founder and first pastor, Father Daniel F. X. Burke. Father Burke who was ordained in 1883 was assigned the difficult task of building a church in the Bedford Park section of the Bronx, N.Y., in 1898. From this came the St. Philip Neri Church, which like the city she was located in spent a good deal of their time assisting and welcoming immigrants who were in desperate need of help and guidance.

The church's beginnings were as humble as their first parishioners. The first masses were celebrated in a clubhouse of the Jerome Park Race Track, and to demonstrate the extent of the percentage of immigrants in the early parish, these masses were also spoken in Italian.

Yet, through many long hours of toil, in May 1900 the church as we know it today was officially dedicated. This represented an enormous personal triumph for Father Burke. The fledgling church under his expert guidance and leadership began to thrive. The parishioners began to demonstrate the kind of solidarity and involvement which has distinguished them through the years. The growth of the church was so rapid that

CLEVELAND COMMENTS ON CONSUMER PROTECTION LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the House action setting up a consumer advocate within the Federal Government to effectively represent and protect consumer interests is a major step forward for consumers.

This legislation is the culmination of a growing recognition of the need to balance the well-organized interests of business and labor with Government representation for the unorganized, but vitally important, consumer interests.

The Consumer Protection Act of 1974 creates a Consumer Protection Agency, making it an independent, nonregulatory body within the executive branch; and grants the Agency full powers to serve as a consumer advocate before Federal agencies and the courts.

Mr. Speaker, although I applaud the House action, I would like to point out that creation of a Government agency does not always provide a true solution to problems; indeed, it sometimes causes problems. The Occupational Safety and Health Act is an illustrative example of the excessive burden that Government regulations sometimes place on businessmen. To prevent such excesses in the Consumer Protection Agency, I supported several amendments which were added to the bill.

For example, one amendment provides that should the Consumer Protection Agency exercise its authority to take another Federal agency to court, the burden of proof rests with the Consumer Protection Agency to demonstrate that further court action is in the interest of justice.

The Agency would also be given authority to solicit consumer complaints and refer them to the manufacturer as well as the appropriate Government regulatory agency, whose responses would eventually be made public.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

by 1908, the church was forced to enlarge and the larger structure was subsequently rededicated that same year.

As the church grew, so did the numbers of young children in the parish. Father Burke decided that a school was also needed to better serve the needs of all the parishioners. The formal beginning date for the school was September 1908, and while the school had no facility of its own it was able to accommodate the limited number of children in its opening class.

Father Burke's untiring and dedicated work did not go unnoticed. In 1912 he received the prestigious Domestic Prelate designation from the Pope. In 1931, Father Burke died and left behind him a tradition of excellence which has remained with the church for all of its 75 years.

St. Philip Neri Church's next pastor was Father Sinnott who served with distinction for 13 years. His years were highlighted by the laying of the groundwork for the new school. Yet the thrust of his work was directed at assisting the hundreds of depression-ravaged parishioners. His untiring service and strong guiding hand were instrumental in preventing many of these people from falling into permanent despair and destitution. He earned eternal gratitude of the St. Philip Neri parish.

St. Philip Neri's third distinguished pastor was Msgr. William R. Kelly, who beside being a renowned priest, also had an impressive background in the field of education. He took over the reins of the church immediately after the Second World War when the parish was deep in mourning at the loss of 34 of their members. Father Kelly personally directed and established a lasting memorial shrine for those deceased individuals. Also during Monsignor Kelly's tenure, work was continued on the new school, and the parish marked their first 50 years of service to the community.

Msgr. Edward A. McGrath became the fourth pastor of St. Philip Neri in 1961. He was responsible for a number of important internal improvements in the church. His strong dedication and work on behalf of the parishioners was acknowledged by his being accorded the high honor of being named pastor emeritus of St. Philip Neri Church.

On July 11, 1971, the present pastor of St. Philip Neri Church, Rev. Philip S. Shannon was installed. At this difficult juncture for the church, dynamic leadership was needed, and this is precisely what Father Shannon was able to supply. He set out and was successful in establishing a parish center to be used by the youth and the elderly of the parish. In addition, Father Shannon was successful in raising revenue to help the financial condition of the church. Finally, Father Shannon has been instrumental in the planning of the diamond jubilee celebration which was highlighted by a fabulous restoration and renovation of St. Philip Neri Church which now has to rate as one of the most beautiful churches in all of New York.

Under the expert leadership of Father Shannon, the St. Philip Neri Church has adapted itself to meet the ever changing

needs of its parishioners. A church can no longer expect only to be a place of worship, for the true work of God continues long after the recessional hymn at Sunday Mass. His work is helping those in trouble, those alone, and those in need of the spiritual and moral guidance which Father Shannon and his church provides. Father Shannon typifies the active, involved priest of the 1970's and his parishioners have responded favorably to his work.

I would also like to pay a special tribute to another fine member of the St. Philip Neri community, Sister Annunziata who runs the widely respected Bedford Park Multiservice Center for Senior Citizens. She singlehandedly provides almost 350 senior citizens with an opportunity for meaningful social contact, a privilege which so many of our lonely senior citizens are denied. In addition, Sister Annunziata operates an outreach program which provides over 100 more elderly citizens with one hot meal a day. Her tireless work in both these programs have made them overwhelming successes they are today.

The 75th anniversary of the St. Philip Neri Church represents an important and prestigious milestone in the annals of New York City history. It is both a fitting tribute to the fine work already accomplished, and an incentive for the work to continue and expand in the coming years. This anniversary has special and personal importance to me as a parishioner. My church blends tradition with modernization. They have demonstrated that a church need not be an island separated from the rest of the community, but rather St. Philip Neri is the focal point of the community. I know I speak for my fellow parishioners when I congratulate and commend Father Shannon on this important occasion.

It is my fervent hope that his years with St. Philip Neri will be long and rewarding. The present beautiful church St. Philip Neri stands as a tribute to the work of Father Shannon and his illustrious predecessors. He deserves the continued grace of God, for he has truly fulfilled His work here on Earth.

ARE ALL THE PRISONERS HOME?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1974, a group of 18 former prisoners of war in Indochina met in Washington in order to discuss methods whereby they might assist in bringing about the release of 3 prisoners of war whom they know the Government of North Vietnam to be holding.

Chai Charn Harnavee and Wapadom Wang Chom are Thai soldiers who were captured in Laos by the Hanoi Army. They have been seen and identified in Hanoi by returning POW's. There is no doubt that these men are being held, in

April 23, 1974

spite of the fact that Hanoi has tried to deny it. They should have been released in 1973, when the other POW's were released, but Hanoi, for reasons which are obscure to any but the Communist mind, still seeks to retain them in their prisons.

Emmett Kay is an American civilian who was flying relief supplies in Laos when he was captured by the Communists. It is not certain that he is being held in Hanoi, but it is certain that Hanoi could bring about his release if Hanoi were so inclined.

In addition to securing the release of these men, we in the Congress should continue to press Hanoi for further information on our MIA's. The recent return of some bodies was a hopeful sign, but we are still a long way from resolving the fate of the remainder of the MIA's. How long, Hanoi, must we wait?

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HERMAN BADILLO

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the recommendations of the ad hoc committee on financial disclosure of the New York State delegation to Congress, I submit the following report for the calendar year 1973:

FINANCIAL REPORT

A. Sources of all noncongressional income:
1. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 61 Broadway, New York, New York—law office, of counsel—terminated December 31, 1973.

2. Honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source:
Fordham University, New York, N.Y.
State University of New York at Plattsburgh, Plattsburgh, N.Y.

Jersey City State College, Jersey City, N.J.
3. Radio program, WABC, New York, N.Y., under \$500.

B. Unsecured indebtedness in excess of \$1,000—none.

C. Sources of all reimbursements for expenditures in excess of \$200 per item other than from the U.S. Government or from reported campaign receipts:
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, reimbursement for overnight trip to El Paso, Texas to speak to striking workers of Farah Manufacturing Company, January 23, 1973.

D. The identity of all stocks, bonds, and other securities owned outright or beneficially, none.

E. The identity of all business entities, professional organizations, and foundations on which I serve and position held:
1. Fordham University, Adjunct Professor, School of Urban Education.

2. Mount Sinai Hospital, board member.
3. Bronx Lebanon Hospital, board member.
4. Aspira of America, Inc., board member.
5. Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, board member.
6. Institute for Mediation & Conflict Resolution, board member.

7. Muscular Dystrophy Association of New York, vice president and board member.
8. Bronx Boys Club, board member.
9. Bronx Council on the Arts, board member.

10. National Conference of Christians and Jews, board member.

F. I have filed income tax returns for the year 1973 and have paid the following taxes for that year:

Federal Income Tax—\$17,168.00.
New York State Income Tax—\$6,521.00.
New York City Income Tax—\$2,091.

**COSTS FOR THE NEW TRIDENT
MISSILE AND SUBMARINE**

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Navy is hiding at least \$2.8 billion in costs from its estimate provided to Congress for the new Trident missile and submarine program. Both the Navy's selected acquisition report—SAR—to Congress and the unclassified portions of a recent General Accounting Office staff study indicate that there are substantial hidden costs in the program.

At the moment, the most recent SAR provided to Congress indicates that the Trident program will cost \$12,431 billion but the real cost of the Trident program is at least \$15.2 billion and possibly as much as \$16.2 billion. The increased cost occurs because the Navy has failed to include at least \$2.8 billion in the cost estimates which are directly related to the development and procurement of the Trident missile and submarine.

For example, \$1,529.5 billion in additional costs will be used to begin in fiscal year 1979 and outfitting of new Trident I missiles on 10 existing Poseidon submarines. This huge cost is not included in the Trident estimate provided to Congress. On orders from the Department of Defense, \$926.6 million are excluded from the cost estimate, including training costs, shore support, equipment costs, testing, initial spare parts, and the price-tag of initial stock supplies, through fiscal year 1975.

The cost of developing the Trident II missile which is a more advanced version of the Trident I missile is also excluded. According to the General Accounting Office, the cost of developing the missile could be from \$300 million up to \$1.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, there are also a number of costs indirectly related to the Trident missile and submarine which are either considered "classified" or not specifically defined in dollar terms by the Navy.

For instance, the Navy has not included estimates of the cost of production of the Trident II missile.

Costs related to the nuclear propulsion plants and warheads provided by the Atomic Energy Commission are classified "secret" by that agency.

During the last quarter of calendar year 1973 the Navy's official estimate of the Trident program increased \$666.2 million—from \$11.7 billion to \$12.4 billion. The increase included \$449.7 million in submarine construction costs and \$188 million resulting from the stretching out of missile production. This cost increase is the first tentative sign that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cost overruns may become a serious problem on the Trident.

All costs that are borne by the taxpayer as the direct result of the decision to build the Trident missile and submarine should be included in the estimates provided to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am not charging that an overrun has occurred, but only that the Navy has not been frank with Congress and the public about Trident's true price tag. The Navy should come clean and provide Congress and the public with a total disclosure of all of the costs directly related to this new program.

The Navy is seeking \$2,042 billion in this year's budget to continue the program and purchase two Trident submarines. Last year Congress approved the first ship but cut \$278 million from the total program.

**CLEVELAND APPLAUDS MINIMUM
WAGE INCREASE**

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is good news that the President has signed H.R. 12435, an increase in the minimum wage, as a compromise bill close to the provisions of a measure I have cosponsored for months.

It is unfortunate that the bill omits a provision allowing for a youth differential to make it possible for unskilled youths to find entry-level jobs at a reduced rate which employers can afford to pay for inexperienced workers.

Yet, as I have indicated, I support enactment of the bill. The real misfortune is the fact that it has been so long in coming to the floor. Many of us have supported this sort of compromise for months since a less reasonable bill was vetoed and the veto sustained last September. And in that period alone, the cost of such necessities as food, rent, interest rates, and educational expenses has increased substantially.

In taking this action, it is imperative to make clear that the effect of this bill is not to contribute to inflation, but rather to compensate for inflation and its effects on workers at the lower end of the earnings scale. The last general increase in the minimum wage was enacted 6 years ago. Since then, there have been substantial increases in the cost of living, wages of higher skilled workers, and earnings of Government employees.

In reality, what we are enacting is a catch-up for the lowest paid.

As I would be among the first to point out, there have been times when our inflationary problem has stemmed most directly from cost-push factors in which labor costs have been the primary influence. Yet this is not the case today.

A great deal of the price pressure stems now from fuel costs and a shortfall in agricultural production and other scarcities resulting from soaring worldwide demand. The fact is that inflationary pressures, while seemingly endless, do

vary as to cause from time to time. It would be unfair not to recognize the true nature of the situation in dealing with the minimum wage situation.

Not to be forgotten is the responsibility of Government to keep Federal spending in check, especially in inflationary times. This can only be accomplished by final enactment of spending controls by Congress under our pending legislation to equip Congress to set priorities by enacting a unified legislative budget.

The merits of this approach include not only the balancing of conflicting demands among various program areas, but the weighing of overall spending levels against the state of the economy and projected surplus or deficit of the budget period.

It may be recalled that I cosponsored a version of the budgeting act which contained a provision to make the budgeting committee more representative of the House as a whole, which was incorporated in the measure as initially passed the House. Now the Senate has passed its version and it remains for the differences to be resolved. This should be a tiptop priority consideration when Congress returns from the Easter recess.

A final note: A recurrent failure of the Congress as an institution has been the tendency to enact programs and go on to other matters without keeping watch over their impact or effectiveness. A classic example has been the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, produced by the same Committee on Education and Labor which reported, belatedly, this compromise minimum wage bill.

To its credit, a subcommittee of Education and Labor has begun hearings to determine the true facts of OSHA's operations, albeit belatedly. It is my hope that the Labor Committee will be far more alert to its responsibility to monitor the impact of this minimum wage increase, and respond to any need for prompt amendments in the event it proves a hardship for small business or for low-skilled workers priced out of the job market.

Meanwhile, as we look ahead, it seems unlikely that much inflationary pressure can result from basic rates which are limited to \$2 an hour shortly after enactment, \$2.10 in January of 1974, and \$2.30 in January of 1976. It is unfortunate but likely that living costs will rise—for reasons quite aside from the minimum wage—at a pace equal to or greater than the rate of increase.

It will be the responsibility of the Congress to address these problems as a matter of highest national policy. So far, it has hardly begun to do so.

**GRACE McDONALD CELEBRATES
85TH BIRTHDAY**

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I hope that when I am 85 years old I will have one half as much achievement to look back upon as does Mrs. Grace McDonald.

We today think the idea of a "People's Lobby," a la Ralph Nader and John Gardner, is something ultra new and progressive. Progressive it may be, but new it is not. Mrs. McDonald, together with her husband and Louis Brandeis, founded a People's Lobby before the First World War.

After the war, she became instru-

mental in the establishment of the 5-day workweek. She then turned her efforts to the establishment of a national industrial safety code, and this too became reality.

In the 1930's, she moved to California, where she helped found California Farmer-Consumer Associates, Inc., and served as its executive secretary for 33

years. In this capacity, she played major roles in seeing that the interests of the people of California were served in matters of land use, water and power, and agricultural sales.

I join my California colleagues in wishing Mrs. McDonald a very happy 85 years young.

SENATE—Wednesday, April 24, 1974

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for all that is good in America—for homes and schools and churches—for institutions which endure all change—for millions of God-fearing, law-abiding citizens who love and care for their neighbors and their country. We thank Thee for scientists, educators, and administrators, for prophets, priests, and missionaries whose lives have lifted the lot of mankind. We thank Thee, too, for that host of trustworthy men and women, the great and the humble, who serve at all levels of government. Unite all who serve and all who are served in a common endeavor to correct what is wrong and to heal our divisions. Grant us enabling grace to reflect Thy love in our private and public life that Thy higher kingdom may come and Thy will may be done on Earth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 22, 1974, the President had approved and signed the bill (S. 1745) to provide financial assistance for research activities for the study of sudden infant death syndrome, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with an accompanying draft of proposed legislation, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

For more than twenty five years, America has generously provided foreign assistance to other nations, helping them to develop their economies, to meet the humanitarian needs of their people and to provide for their own defense.

During this era foreign aid has become an indispensable element of our foreign policy. Without it, America would risk isolating herself from responsible involvement in an international community upon which the survival of our own economic, social and political institutions rests. With the continuation of a healthy foreign aid program, this Nation can continue to lead world progress toward building a lasting structure of peace.

Now that we have ended the longest war in our history and no American troops are serving in combat for the first time in more than a decade, there is a temptation to turn inward, abandoning our aid programs and the critical needs facing many of our friends in the process.

We must not succumb to that temptation. If we lay down the burden now, we will foreclose the peaceful development of many of the nations of the world and leave them at the mercy of powerful forces, both economic and political. Moreover, we will deny ourselves one of the most useful tools we have for helping to shape peaceful relationships in the most turbulent areas of the world.

Many of the nations which were once dependent upon our direct assistance for their survival are now managing their own economic and defense needs without our aid. Those nations which still need our aid will not need it indefinitely. We expect those nations we help to help themselves. We have made it clear that we do not intend to be the world's policeman, that our aid is not a substitute for their self-reliance, and that we do not intend to do for others what they should be expected to do for themselves.

But as long as there are governments which seek to change the frontiers and institutions of other nations by force, the possibility of international conflict will continue to exist. And as long as millions

of people lack food, housing, and jobs; starvation, social unrest and economic turmoil will threaten our common future.

Our long-range goal is to create an international environment in which tolerance and negotiation can replace aggression and subversion as preferred methods of settling international disputes. While this goal is not as distant as it once was, present circumstances do not now permit reduction in foreign assistance. We must not only maintain our efforts, but also make special efforts in two critical areas of the world—the Middle East and Indochina.

In the Middle East, we have an opportunity to achieve a significant breakthrough for world peace. Increased foreign aid will be a vital complement to our diplomacy in maintaining the momentum toward a negotiated settlement which will serve the interests of both Israel and the Arab nations.

In Indochina our assistance is no less critical. South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are trying to make the difficult transition from war to peace. Their ability to meet their defense needs while laying the foundations for self-sustaining social and economic progress requires continued and substantial amounts of American aid.

To meet these continuing and special needs, I am proposing to the Congress a total foreign aid budget of \$5.18 billion for fiscal year 1975. In my judgment, these amounts represent the minimum which the United States can prudently afford to invest if we are to maintain the present degree of international equilibrium and advance our efforts to construct a durable peace with prosperity.

TOWARD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The hope for a lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute is stronger today than at any time in the previous quarter century. American diplomatic initiatives have helped create the conditions necessary for an end to conflict and violence. While our diplomatic efforts must and will continue, there is already much that can be done to supplement and consolidate what has been achieved so far. I am therefore requesting a Special Assistance program for the Middle East, and have asked the Congress to provide the following:

—For Israel: \$50 million in security supporting assistance and \$300 million in military credit sales. Israel's continued ability to defend herself reduces the prospect of new conflict in the Middle East, and we must