

amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of judges of the Supreme Court and of inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREEN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, and Mr. MOORE):

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the election of the President and Vice President and the nomination of candidates for the Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT (for himself, Mr. McDONALD of Georgia, and Mr. SYMMS):

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.J. Res. 24. 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.

H.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to participation in voluntary prayer or meditation in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning on the last Monday in September each year as Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution prescribing model regulations governing implementation of the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to the administration of social service programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

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

1. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to air service by Trans World Airlines to Guam; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, relative to the application of the Internal Revenue Code in the Virgin

Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council of the city of Renton, Wash., relative to imposing price, wage and profit controls; to the Committee on Banking, Currency, and Housing.

2. Also, petition of Statewide Committees Opposing Regional Plan Areas, Powell Butte, Oreg., relative to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

3. Also, petition of the Grand River Band of Ottawas Descendants Committee, Muskegon, Mich., relative to the plan for the use and distribution of judgment funds awarded in docket 40-K before the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

4. Also, petition of the Swinomish Tribal Community, LaConner, Wash., relative to the plan for distribution of judgment funds awarded in docket No. 294 by the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

5. Also, petition of the New Mexico Philatelic Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex., relative to misleading advertising of philatelic supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6. Also, petition of Gaymond E. Milligan, Houston, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. Also, petition of Clifford Barrister, New York, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8. Also, petition of the annual meeting of the Southern Division of the American Fisheries Society, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., relative to the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

9. Also, petition of the Farmers Co-Operative Association, Alva, Okla., relative to Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RX FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, American consumers are forced to pay over \$1 billion annually in unnecessary prescription costs because of prohibitions on retail drug price advertising, over-protective patent laws, exorbitant promotional expenditures by industry, and unreasonable markups.

These are among the findings of an 18-month study conducted by my staff in New York and in Washington.

Americans are spending some \$7 billion annually on prescription drugs—about \$33 for each man, woman, and child—and the evidence is strong that they are being overcharged, on the average, by at least 25 percent.

One reason for this, we found is a callous disregard for the financial plight of consumers, especially the elderly, on the part of drug manufacturers, retail pharmacists, and State pharmacy boards.

The report also documents the huge disparity in the prices for identical prescriptions at different pharmacies in the same community. We surveyed over 120 pharmacies in Queens and in the Washington, D.C., area to compare retail prescription prices under a variety of conditions. The survey revealed markups generally averaged in excess of 200 percent. Pricing was grossly inconsistent, even among stores of the same chain for the same prescription.

Price advertising of drugs, extensively used on the wholesale level, is banned on the retail level in about two-thirds of the States, including New York State. This double standard results in a wide disparity of prices for identical drugs, from store to store and, in some instances even from customer to customer at the same store. The drug retailer is able to benefit from manufacturers' vigorous price competition, but he denies that same right to the consumer.

To correct some of the glaring abuses uncovered by the study, I am introducing the following legislation:

The Prescription Drug Freshness Act, which requires the open dating of all

perishable prescription drugs, showing clearly on the dispensed product's label the date beyond which the potency is diminished or the chemical composition altered by age;

The Prescription Drug Labeling Act, which requires the labeling and advertising of prescription drugs by their established—generic—name and an end to all laws prohibiting generic substitution by pharmacists;

The Prescription Drug Price Information Act, which would end all State prohibitions on retail prescription drug price advertising and require the posting of prices for the 100 most commonly prescribed drugs; and

The Prescription Drug Patent Licensing Act, which would make compulsory the licensing of new prescription drugs during the 17-year patent period.

Joining me in sponsoring these bills today are:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Bella Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, George E. Brown, Jr., Cardiss Collins, James Corman, Dominick V. Daniels, Ron de Lugo, Thomas Downey, Robert Drinan, Bob Eckhardt.

Don Edwards, Dante B. Fascell, Benjamin Gilman, Ken Hechler, Robert Kastenmeier,

Edward I. Koch, William Lehman, Clarence D. Long, John Melcher, Ron Mottl.

Richard Nolan, Charles Rangel, Donald Riegle, Patricia Schroeder, John Seiberling, Stephen Solarz, Fortney H. Stark, Gerry E. Studds, Frank Thompson, Lionel Van Deerlin.

THE FUTURE OF FORMOSA-TAIWAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been concerned about the future of Formosa-Taiwan.

The national security of the United States does not require that the United States try to determine who governs each nation of the world or what geographic area should or should not be sovereign.

But international harmony depends, I believe, upon people having a voice in determining their future. And today the people of Formosa do not.

The New York Times printed an editorial on this point Saturday, January 4, 1975. The final paragraph opens with this sentence:

Before the political deliverance of Taiwan to China is accomplished with the acquiescence of the United States—which for the past quarter-century has for better or for worse had deep responsibilities in Taiwan—it might be appropriate to consider the genuine wishes of the island's whole population.

I concur in this sentiment although I believe I would use stronger language: the wishes of those now resident in Formosa must be determined and honored if the United States is to be a party to the political solution of the problem of Formosa.

The Times editorial follows:

THE FUTURE OF TAIWAN

Twenty-five years ago last month the demoralized Nationalist Chinese leaders under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sought refuge on the offshore island of Formosa, proclaiming themselves sovereign over not only ten million residents of the island but over the whole of the mainland from which they had just been routed. Some two million military and civilian refugees from the mainland lent strength to the claim. The anniversary passed unmarked and largely unnoticed in Taiwan.

The Chinese province of Taiwan fell under the sovereignty of Imperial Japan in 1895. From that day to this, and despite its ancient heritage, Taiwan has lived apart from the mainland. For their different reasons, the governments in Peking and Taipei cling to their common claim that Taiwan remains an integral province of China whatever may have been its fate during the past eighty years of separation. For still different reasons, most other governments of the world find it convenient to their own interests to echo this formula.

The problem now is that Peking seems to be pressing for an end to the contrived ambiguity which has been tolerated over Taiwan's status for the past three years, ever since former President Nixon's landmark visit to the mainland early in 1972. The continuance of a defense treaty with the United States and the maintenance of an American Embassy in Taipei are the central issues

up for resolution during President Ford's scheduled visit to Peking later this year.

For the sake of smoother relations between two superpowers, an independent society which has developed a life, an economy, and perhaps a nationality of its own over many decades is in danger of being abandoned. No one seems interested in finding out whether the fourteen million people now resident in Taiwan, 85 percent of them native to the island, want to become another province in what, despite their indubitable cultural, linguistic and historic ties, has become a largely alien society on the mainland.

Before the political deliverance of Taiwan to China is accomplished with the acquiescence of the United States—which for the past quarter-century has for better or for worse had deep responsibilities in Taiwan—it might be appropriate to consider the genuine wishes of the island's whole population. Perhaps the generation of Taiwanese who chose to overlook the anniversary of the Nationalists' arrival would freely decide to associate themselves with the powerful mainland, with which they share a cultural heritage; perhaps they would not. By rights, the decision should be theirs alone, and neither that of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek or his followers, nor that of the Chinese rulers in Peking.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, early in the 91st Congress, I introduced H.R. 768, the "Rule of 80" retirement bill. I reintroduced an identical bill, H.R. 1266, in the 92d Congress. The latter measure was approved by the retirement subcommittee, with amendments, cosponsored in the form of H.R. 11255 by members of the subcommittee, and reported to the House by the Full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. No further action was taken thereon in the 92d Congress.

At the beginning of the 93d Congress, I again reintroduced the legislation, H.R. 437, which is substantially identical to the bill I am submitting today. The primary purpose of this legislation is to permit a Federal employee to retire voluntarily when his attained age plus length of service aggregates at least 80 years, with the annuity reduced by the equivalent of 1 percent for each year the retiree is under age 55 at time of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, over the years Federal employee organizations have advocated the adoption of a provision to allow employees to retire optionally after 30 years of service, regardless of age and with unreduced annuity benefits. Their representatives have contended that such a provision would make it more economically practicable for employees with partial disabilities, or with declining capacities or interests, to withdraw from the active Federal work force at some additional cost to the retirement program, but with an overall saving in agency personnel costs and gain in Government's efficiency.

On the other hand, many civil serv-

ice employees argue that 30 years is a full career, justifying retirement at any age, without penalty. Others claim that the existing provisions of the retirement law discriminate against those who entered Federal employment at early ages. A further contention is that opportunities for earlier retirement will ease, to an extent, our country's unemployment problem by making room for new hires.

I feel that there is merit in the various proposals to ease retirement opportunities for partially disabled workers and employees with substantial periods of service. I believe that there would probably be mutual advantage, also, in facilitating the retirement of long-term employees whose skills are supplanted by new technologies, or have simply lost interest in their work.

While my bill would apply to some employees having less than 30 years of service, it has the flexibility of accommodating to the cases of those between ages 55 and 60 who presently need 30 years of service in order to retire on immediate annuity.

MISSOURI STATE SENATE AGAINST MOVING AIR FORCE BASE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1974, the Senate of the State of Missouri adopted a resolution urging the Department of Defense to reconsider its plan to relocate Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base from the State of Missouri.

For the information of my colleagues, the full text of the resolution adopted by the Missouri State Senate is set out below:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Senate of the Seventy-seventh General Assembly of the State of Missouri has learned of the proposed relocation of the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base from the State of Missouri by the Defense Department; and

Whereas, the community surrounding the Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base has experienced an excellent relationship with the Air Force Base; and

Whereas, the Secretary of the Defense Department has indicated his awareness in the past of the excellent relationship which exists between the community and the Air Force Base; and

Whereas, the community has derived socioeconomic benefits from its relationship with Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base which are irreplaceable; and

Whereas, the citizens of the community have provided a highly trained labor force vital to the performance of the Air Force Base; and

Whereas, the proposed relocation of Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base will create hardships for the residents of Jackson County and will have a deleterious effect on the economy of the area as well as the State of Missouri; and

Whereas, substantial amounts of tax dollars have been expended to upgrade Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base to its present potential; and

Whereas, relocation would result in needless expense to the United States Government; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate urges the Defense Department to reconsider its plan to relocate Richards-Gebaur Air Force; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Defense Department, the Secretary of the Air Force, the United States Senators from Missouri, and the Missouri Congressional Delegation.

CHILE—THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a commonly known, but not always commendable, fact that the passage of time diminishes emotional and intellectual reactions to any given event. This very human response often aids one in coping with an unalterable circumstance, but it can also be a detriment when one is dealing with a situation that can and needs to be changed.

My distinguished colleagues, I am referring to the continuing objectionable lack of human rights in Chile, a complete lack that has existed since September, 1973. In the last session of Congress many of us worked on this problem, which resulted, I believe, in a slackening of the rigid totalitarian control and systematic arrests and torture of the Chilean people by the military junta. But the problem still exists. Cases of disappearances in the night, arrests, and detention without trial are being brought to my attention without cease.

The University of California has deemed it necessary to temporarily suspend its faculty exchange program with Chile due to such a situation. The following article, from the Los Angeles Times of January 9, 1975, explains this new development:

UC SEVERS LINK WITH CHILE OVER MISSING TEACHER

(By Don Speich)

The University of California has suspended its nine-year-old faculty exchange program with the University of Chile because of concern over the disappearance of a Chilean physics professor connected with the program.

Boris Chornik, a Chilean national who as a member of the exchange program received a Ph.D. from UC Berkeley in 1971, disappeared from the University of Chile in Santiago late last month, UCLA Asst. Chancellor Elwin V. Svenson said Wednesday. Chornik, a physicist and head of the university's laboratory of magnetic nuclear resonance, has not been heard from since, Svenson said.

There are reports indicating Chornik was arrested by the security arm of the military junta which seized control in Chile a year ago.

United Press International in Santiago quoted Chornik's father as saying his son was picked up in a downtown Santiago apartment on Sunday, Dec. 15, by military intelligence agents.

Friends of Chornik, UPI said, report he is being held in a Santiago detention camp, Tres Alamos, for interrogation regarding a friend who was arrested for allegedly having two machine guns in her possession.

Last Thursday, upon hearing of Chornik's

disappearance, UCLA Chancellor Charles E. Young, who heads the universitywide policy committee which supervises the exchange program, wired the University of Chile for information concerning Chornik's whereabouts. A reply to the query was demanded by Monday.

"We believe this situation (Chornik's disappearance) constitutes a threat to (the) continued ability to obtain and maintain well-qualified professionals with the University of Chile," the Young telegram read in part.

"Conditions are such that if this information cannot be supplied by the requested date, it will be necessary for me to suspend all (exchange program) operations . . . until such time as appropriate responses to the above concerns are received."

Under the suspension, Svenson said, no new Chilean faculty members will be admitted to the program. However, he said, the approximately 40 Chilean instructors currently studying at UC campuses will be allowed to complete their graduate work.

Currently there are no UC faculty members at the University of Chile. But, Svenson noted, one was expected to depart for Santiago Friday and others in the near future. All, added Svenson, have been informed that their departure dates have been "postponed."

The exchange program, which has been under fire for some time because of complaints that UC should not cooperate with the junta-run Chilean government, is largely funded by a \$1 million annual grant from the Ford Foundation. It trains present and prospective University of Chile faculty members by exposing them to UC graduate instruction and research.

Members of the program currently are enrolled on all UC campuses. The program also involves Chilean students. But the suspension—at least at this point—affects only that part of the program involving faculty members.

There are indications, however, that the suspension might extend to the entire program because of reported attempts by the Chilean government to recall one of its students now enrolled at one of UC's Southern California campuses.

The student, whose name UC has requested not be published because of fear of possible political repercussions, recently was ordered back to Chile within two days to appear at a hearing, according to a letter from Young to members of the exchange program policy committee.

"When he requested a postponement, (the student) received a second notice, this time notifying him of charges against him for not returning to the country to resume his academic duties (at the University of Chile)," the letter states.

On Monday, Dec. 30, the letter continues, the student's dean at the UC campus notified the student that the dean "had been visited by two officials of the Chilean military intelligence who said that they had well-founded information that (the student) had made defamatory statements about the government of Chile."

The student is still at the UC campus and negotiations between UC and University of Chile officials aimed at resolving the situation reportedly are underway.

Attempts by The Times to reach Chilean Embassy officials in Washington who would comment on Chornik's disappearance and the student matter were not immediately successful. A representative of the Chilean consulate in Los Angeles told The Times: "We don't have any official information about this case."

Since last September the exchange program has been under criticism by some UC faculty members and student groups who argue that the arrangement appears to sanction the military junta.

I draw this to your attention, my fellow Representatives, with the hope that the Chilean people will not be forgotten in this new Congress. "A large part of history is replete with the struggle for human rights, an eternal struggle in which a final victory can never be won. But to tire in that struggle would mean the ruin of society." (Albert Einstein, Feb. 20, 1954.)

URGES GOVERNMENT TO STOP SPENDING

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, one of my first acts in the 93d Congress was to join in sponsoring a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. Had such a measure been enacted by Congress at that time, and swiftly ratified by the States, our national economy would be in far better condition today.

I have just introduced a similar bill, the first piece of legislation I present in the 94th Congress. I earnestly hope that we can pass this amendment and restore fiscal sanity to these halls of Congress.

The American people are demanding action from their Representatives on ending inflation. But, as I and many of my colleagues have pointed out, there can be no end to inflation until the Nation's budget is brought into balance. Overspending by the Federal Government is the chief cause of inflation. The policy of deficit spending causes the Government to compete for cash in the money market and drives up interest rates. By pouring more and more money into the economy, the Federal Government drives up the price of goods and services. This reckless spending over the decades has resulted in intolerable double-digit inflation. It has saddled us and our descendants with an astronomical \$505.5 billion debt, the interest on which alone costs the American taxpayer \$55,000 per minute.

I am deeply concerned that in an effort to combat unemployment and the economic slowdown, Congress will deal with every problem but the paramount one of inflation. We would make a grave error indeed were we to embark on a course of massive Federal spending to combat recession and thus insure an ever-increasing rate of inflation.

What we must do instead is beat inflation by refusing to spend more money than we have, and insuring that our budget will always remain in balance. At the same time we must begin to repay our national debt and remove this burden from our children and grandchildren.

This Congress can make a new start and put our fiscal house in order. I shall do my best to achieve a balanced budget and to defeat bills that can only add to the inflation which so cruelly attacks our citizens.

REGULATORY AGENCY AUTHORIZATION BILL

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide a 3-year authorization of funds for the following Federal regulatory agencies: Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Aviation Administration, Civil Aeronautics Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration.

This bill is similar to legislation I introduced at the beginning of the 93d Congress. That bill also included a 3-year authorization for the Federal Trade Commission, a provision which was included in the recently enacted Consumer Product Warranties-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act.

I have grown increasingly concerned with the failure of the Congress to exercise its legislative oversight authority in a number of areas. The various regulatory agencies come readily to mind as examples of congressional abnegation of authority.

These agencies were established by Congress as independent bodies charged with regulating various aspects of trade and commerce. In reality, however, there has been very little congressional overview of the job these agencies are doing, the way their authority is exercised, or the direction in which they are moving in the issuance of far-reaching regulations.

Some of the issues which Congress should explore when reviewing regulatory agencies are whether regulated industries are being treated fairly, whether consumer interests are being protected, whether the public interest is being served, and whether these agencies are following the intent of Congress in their day-to-day activities. In this overview, needed amendments to the enabling acts should also be considered.

My bills, which would authorize funds for fiscal years 1976, 1977, and 1978 for the above-mentioned agencies, would insure a greater degree of congressional oversight by controlling the budgets of these agencies. Under present procedures, these agencies present their budgets directly to the House Appropriations Committee. The committees with legislative authority over the activities of the regulatory agencies seldom take the opportunity to review their operations. At present, our only legislative contact with these agencies is to amend the enabling legislation to provide them with greater authority than they now possess.

By establishing a 3-year authorization of funds, my bills would permit Congress to conduct an in-depth study of each regulatory agency every 3 years. The authorizations provided under these bills are based on agency appropriations for fiscal year 1975, with moderate increases for succeeding years.

An example of the procedure I am recommending is contained in the act establishing the Consumer Product

Safety Commission, which was enacted in the 92d Congress. Under that legislation, which I had a large part in drafting, the Consumer Product Safety Commission received a 3-year authorization. This authorization expires this year and the Commission must come before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to request an extension of the act. It is the firm intent of the committee to review the Commission's activities at that time.

As I mentioned earlier, my 3-year authorization amendment was adopted as part of the Consumer Product Warranties-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act. This same 3-year authorization provision is also contained in the recently enacted Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act. I offered this amendment to the bill on the House floor.

I also offered the 3-year authorization amendment in the 93d Congress to H.R. 5050, the Securities Exchange Act Amendments. The amendment was adopted as part of the legislation which was reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but never acted upon by the House.

I am convinced that there is a definite desire on the part of the Congress to reassert its oversight authority, to make all Federal agencies more responsive to the interests of the businesses, industries, and consumers they were created to regulate and represent.

It is quite possible that this legislation will need polishing and perfecting before it is enacted into law. I want to state my strong intentions of pursuing this goal in the 94th Congress, and I welcome the help and support of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO NICK BETANCOURT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the rich inheritance which constantly seeks the justice, liberty, prosperity, and independence bequeathed by our fathers will not endure in perpetuity unless we, as individuals, are willing to pay the price, bear the burden, and shape both our destiny and the destiny of our descendants.

In each generation, in each community, leaders come forward to change those institutions, conditions, values, and codes which hamper humanity or which would improve the quality of existence.

All too often, however, those individuals who are committed in both word and deed to preserving and extending the legacy and the ideals of this Nation are rewarded only with a good conscience and the knowledge of doing their very best for mankind.

The California Democratic Central Committee in the 32d Congressional District is changing this by saluting, on February 18, those people who have played a particularly important role in

shaping both the present and the future of mankind. One of those who is being singled out for his especially significant contributions to our society is Mr. Nick Betancourt.

Nick has long been a leader in Mexican-American and Democratic Party organizations in the Harbor Area, where he has lived since 1931.

In addition to working in all the Democratic campaigns, Nick Betancourt has been an active and influential member of the Wilmington Democratic Club and the Harbor Area Ethnic Political Coalition.

During the 1974 general election, Nick was cochairperson of the California Democratic Committee's headquarters in the 32d Congressional District. As such he was responsible for keeping the headquarters in operation 7 days a week, at least 10 hours a day, from August 25 through the election—a monumental task which he performed with the greatest dependability.

However, a man cannot work as hard as Nick Betancourt, and volunteer as many hours, without the understanding and cooperation of a devoted wife. Therefore, we all extend our thanks to Clementine Betancourt as well.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated above, we are often negligent in expressing our appreciation to those who work so hard outside the public spotlight to preserve the ideals on which this country was founded. I am pleased, therefore, to have this opportunity to say "thank you" to one such individual, Nick Betancourt.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE COST OF LIVING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the 1971 White House Conference on Aging called for the prompt enactment of a minimum floor of income for the elderly, and to set that minimum in accordance with the intermediate level budget established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The conference's recommendations are more valid than ever today in the face of rapidly rising inflation and growing unemployment which has served to reduce job opportunities for elderly workers and erode the purchasing power of fixed incomes.

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

My bill would:

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

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

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

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

The erosion of the purchasing power of fixed incomes is a relative problem. For \$2,053.24 a year an elderly person living in a nonmetropolitan area of the South can have all the goods and services and enjoy the same standard of living that would cost him \$2,425.08 in New York City. Yet, regardless of where he lives and what it costs to live there, his social security check is the same—\$2,244 a year, for the average retired worker.

For the person living in the lowest cost areas, this means social security benefits cover the costs of his minimum needs. But this is not the case for a New Yorker, where the cost of living is much higher. Obviously, it is time that the differences in costs of living be accounted for in fixed income programs. My bill would do that by increasing benefits for those living in metropolitan areas where the cost of living exceeds the national average.

Beyond this, in raising the minimum income to the intermediate budget level, my bill would increase benefits by about \$1,260 a year per recipient. This allotment would insure that each elderly individual could live on more than a subsistence budget.

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

AMBASSADOR YOST ON THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Charles W. Yost, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and one of our country's wisest elder statesmen, has written a compelling piece on the United Nations for the December 28 issue of the New Republic. His message is one we should all heed: That the need for an effective United Nations is too urgent to allow the organization to fall apart over intemperate actions arising from bloc rivalries. In making this point, he criticizes the recent attitudes of both the numerical majority of developing Third World countries and the practical majority of developed countries on whose material support the success of U.N. programs depends.

Ambassador Yost urges restraint on both majorities, offering a piece of advice from Talleyrand—"Above all, not too much passion." During the 1974 U.N. General Assembly, there was such hostile divisiveness between the have and have-not nations that if this pattern is not altered in the future, the United Nations may be rendered incapable of meeting the challenges of the great global issues of the coming years. Ambassador Yost says in regard to these issues that—

It is indeed in this economic area of urgent international concern that the future indispensibility of the United Nations most probably lies . . . Survival of organized and civilized human society . . . depends on controlling population growth, assuring adequate and accessible supplies of food, fuel and fertilizer, developing and modernizing the underdeveloped two-thirds of mankind, rationalizing and stabilizing our trade and financial systems, protecting our threatened environment.

Indeed, the United Nations presently is not capable of dealing effectively with these problems, but since the problems affect all nations they must be confronted in a broad multilateral forum where almost all nations are represented, and that is the United Nations.

I include Ambassador Yost's article in the RECORD at this point:

CLASH OF THE "TWO MAJORITIES": WHOSE UNITED NATIONS?

(By Charles W. Yost)

In an address to the United Nations General Assembly in December the US representative John Scali spoke bitterly of the "tyranny of the majority," noted that "every majority must recognize that its authority does not extend beyond the point where the minority becomes so outraged that it is no longer willing to maintain the covenant which binds them," and concluded that in consequence of recent majority behavior in the Assembly, American support of the United Nations "is eroding—in our Congress and among our people."

Somewhat similar speeches were made on the same day by representatives of France, Britain, West Germany, Italy, Sweden and Belgium.

What occasioned this concerted outburst of indignation by the developed countries? Their frustrations have been building up for some time but were confirmed this year by actions of the majority on these subjects: international economic relations, South Africa and the Palestinians.

As to the first, the assembly adopted by a vote of 120 to 6 a "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States" proposed by the President of Mexico. Among the handful of negative votes were those of the US, West Germany and Britain, and among the few abstainers Japan, France and Canada. In other words this is a charter that asserts the rights of the less developed countries and the duties of the developed but does not, in the view of the latter, adequately protect their rights or the interests of their private investors. As Ambassador Scali said: "the minority which is so often offended may in fact be a practical majority, in terms of its capacity to support this organization and implement its decisions."

On the second subject, a proposal to expel South Africa from the United Nations under procedures laid down in the UN charter was vetoed in the Security Council by the US, France and Britain. The Assembly majority thereupon proceeded to deny the South African delegate his seat in the current Assembly on very dubious procedural grounds.

Finally, and this action was the most

provocative, the Assembly majority voted that, for the first time in the history of the organization, a spokesman not representing a member government might participate in an Assembly debate. This spokesman, moreover, Yasir Arafat, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, was accorded the honors not merely of a delegate but of a chief of state. To add insult to injury the Israeli representative, who wished to rebut seriatim his numerous adversaries in the debate, was prevented from doing so by a ruling of the Algerian Assembly president, which when challenged was upheld by the majority.

Coincidentally the same majority in UNESCO, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which is supposedly nonpolitical, cut off support for regional programs in Israel on the grounds that Israel, in defiance of UN injunctions, is altering the physical and cultural character of Jerusalem.

These were the actions that the Western ambassadors so rigorously attacked and that provoked such angry reactions among press and public in several countries. For example Switzerland reduced its contribution to UNESCO by 10 percent, and on December 10, 71 US senators joined in declaring the PLO a "direct threat" to the foreign policy of the United States.

Were these strong reactions justified? To some extent they certainly were. But in fairness to the Third World majority their intemperate actions, rather than being matched by equally intemperate Western responses, should be examined dispassionately and with some perspective. In order to do so one needs to cast a glance at recent history.

First, as Ambassador Scali reminded his audience, the UN Assembly is not a legislative body. It cannot enact laws. Except in regard to internal procedural and budgetary matters, its resolutions are not binding on member states. What they are is a public expression of the opinions of a majority of member governments, in many though not in all cases representing a large majority of mankind. As Dag Hammarskjöld used to say, the Assembly is "a reflection of the world as it is," not as we might like it to be. In that sense it is worth listening to, if we wish not to deceive ourselves about the state of the real world. Adlai Stevenson once remarked in this connection that what the United States needs most is a hearing aid.

Second, we should not forget that from 1945 to 1960 the overwhelming majority in the United Nations consisted of Western Europeans and Latin Americans. Those were the days when the Soviet Union and the few nonaligned member states repeatedly protested "the tyranny of the majority." But we had then no qualms about passing resolutions over their strong objections. Now the shoe is on the other foot, and we are crying foul.

The history of the three issues that have provoked the present excitement also needs to be kept in mind.

Ever since the less developed countries became the majority they have been passing resolutions calling on the rich to assist much more substantially in their development, to improve the terms of trade that have until recently been heavily in their disfavor, and to police multinational corporations, which they believe have in many cases exploited them. The fact that there has been only a very modest response to these repeated appeals accounts in substantial part for the recent quadrupling of oil prices by OPEC, for the wave of nationalizations of foreign properties, particularly in Latin America, and for the one-sided resolutions on these subjects adopted by the UN Assembly.

As to South Africa, it should be recalled that the Assembly and the Security Council have for many years been passing resolutions, which the US has almost always supported and only two or three states have opposed,

calling on South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid or racial segregation.

Yet practically nothing has happened. Apartheid remains as firmly entrenched as ever. Efforts to impose sanctions on South Africa or to expel it legally are blocked by vetoes in the Security Council. The procedural device adopted to deprive South Africa's delegate of his seat in the present Assembly was, therefore, while legally improper and politically unwise, a symbolic expression of long pent-up frustration on an issue that deeply affronts the human dignity of all the non-white members of the United Nations.

The questions revolving around the Palestine Liberation Organization likewise raise issues carrying an enormous emotional charge; there is no doubt that, just as much of the world community experienced a deep sense of guilt for having failed to prevent the holocaust of the Jews, so have many, particularly in the Third World, felt a growing sense of guilt for having allowed two generations of Palestine refugees to pass their lives in economic squalor and a political vacuum. A very large majority of UN members now clearly feels that, just as Israel is entitled to self-determination, independence and secure sovereignty, so too are the Palestinians.

Had this problem been squarely faced and decisively dealt with some years ago, it might have been resolved within the framework of the Jordanian state. Having been neglected too long, the initiative passed, as has been the case in many other emerging nations, into the hands of ultra-nationalists and revolutionaries willing to use terror to achieve "liberation." Outrageous as terrorism is, we must not forget that it has been used in similar struggles by French revolutionaries, Russians, Yugoslavs, Israelis, Algerians and many others, and is even now a daily practice among both Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland. This does not excuse it but helps explain why it is tolerated. To the great majority of UN members, Arafat is the fighting leader of an oppressed people, and it was in that capacity that he was recognized and honored.

Even the many who do not consider these explanations and parallels sufficient excuse for "irresponsible" behavior by the General Assembly would do well to recall the not insignificant accomplishments of the United Nations, not those of the distant past but those of 1974.

Valuable UN peacekeeping capabilities have again been demonstrated in the Middle East by the establishment of multinational forces in the Sinai and on the Golan Heights, forces that now play an important part in maintaining the fragile peace in the area and that, if there is to be a political settlement, will no doubt be an indispensable element in it. Moreover the Soviet Union has in this case for the first time joined in creating and paying for such a force and is co-chairing the UN-sponsored Geneva Conference. Through the UN, it is thus deeply and usefully involved in the peacemaking process. A similar UN force in Cyprus was helpful in preventing last summer's conflict from doing even more harm than it did and remains a partial barrier to further hostilities.

Even the General Assembly, so bitterly reproached for one-sidedness, has during the past month upheld the US position by narrow margins on two critical Asian issues: the representation of Cambodia and the maintenance of a UN command in Korea.

Of far more long-range significance were three UN conferences held this year on matters of profoundest import: the law of the sea conference in Caracas, the population conference in Bucharest and the food conference in Rome. It is true that none of these did more than begin to resolve these problems—by defining their magnitude, by proposing and debating means of dealing with

them, and by exposing clearly the disastrous consequences of failing to cope. But had the United Nations and its family of economic agencies not existed, it is doubtful that even this beginning would have been made.

It is indeed in this economic area of urgent international concern that the future indispensability of the United Nations most probably lies, even more than in its traditional peacekeeping role. It is becoming ever clearer that the survival of organized and civilized human society into the 21st century depends on controlling population growth, assuring adequate and accessible supplies of food, fuel and fertilizer, developing and modernizing the underdeveloped two-thirds of mankind, rationalizing and stabilizing our trade and financial systems, protecting our threatened environment.

All of these are problems that affect all nations and their solution will, in this age of accelerating interdependence, require the active cooperation of most of them. The focus of such cooperation can best be international organizations in which almost all nations are present. To quote Hammarskjöld again, if the UN did not exist we would have to invent it. It will be simpler to preserve and improve it than to reinvent it. But it cannot be improved without patience, restraint, mutual accommodation and shared leadership on the part of all concerned.

These qualities will be required both from the numerical majority of Third World countries and what Ambassador Scali called the "practical majority" of those countries on whose economic, political or military power usually depends whether UN resolutions are mere empty gestures or lead to consequential action.

Rather than trying to reserve decision-making on these critical issues for a "rich man's club" of affluent states, the "practical majority" must, if it wishes the decisions to be carried out, submit them at an early stage to a forum of all concerned. To the same end the "numerical majority" must forego the symbolic "triumphs" that so provoke and alienate their powerful partners, must be less compliant to the small coterie of radical activists within their group, and must engage systematically in a far more persistent search for consensus among the two "majorities."

Finally, however, let it be clearly remembered what the General Assembly is and what it is not. It is a sounding board, a spectacular global opinion poll, a "face the world" talk show. It is not a parliament to pass laws or coerce its members. When decisions need to be taken by the United Nations they will be taken, in regard to the maintenance of peace, by the Security Council, where the US and four others have a veto, and in regard to the critical issues of economic interdependence, in the specialized agencies and conferences, few of whose decisions can in fact be implemented without the support of those possessing, in each case, the relevant economic resources.

My concluding piece of advice to both "majorities" would be that of Talleyrand to diplomats: "*Surtout, pas trop de zèle*"—above all, not too much passion. The United Nations belongs to everyone, that is, everyone willing to live in peace with his neighbors.

LEGISLATION LISTED

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today on the opening day of the Congress I am filing 52 bills. Fifty-one of these bills are those that I had introduced in the 93d Con-

gress, with some of them dating back to the 91st Congress when I first came to the House of Representatives. Most of these bills are ones that I have drafted and which have yet to become law and which I intend to pursue in the 94th Congress. Finally, the bill to require disclosure of gifts and loans to or from Federal employees, is a bill which I am introducing for the first time.

In the coming weeks and months I will be sending letters to our colleagues explaining the bills in detail and asking for cosponsorship.

Of the approximately 20,000 bills introduced in the House every Congress, nearly 6 percent receive hearings and are reported from committee, about 5 percent are passed, and 3 percent made public law. In the last Congress eight bills which I initiated became law either as separate bills or as part of more comprehensive legislation. Obviously not all of the bills that I am reintroducing at this time or those I will be adding to the list will become law in the 94th Congress but I hope that some will, and I shall do my best to make that come about.

The following is a brief description of the bills I am introducing today:

LIST OF LEGISLATION

NEW LEGISLATION

1. A bill to require the disclosure of gifts and loans to or from Federal employees.

MUSEUMS AND ARTISTS

2. To provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums.

3. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the 4% excise tax on the net investment income of a private foundation shall not apply to a privately-endowed foundation organized and operated exclusively as a library or museum open to the public.

4. To modify the restrictions in section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code in the case of certain contributions of literary, musical or artistic composition by the artists.

PRIVACY

5. To protect and preserve the confidential relationship between fiduciary institutions and their customers.

6. To protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States and to prevent unwarranted invasion of their privacy by prohibiting the use of the polygraph for certain purposes.

7. To require the destruction of political dossiers maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to Members of Congress.

8. To protect confidential sources of the news media.

The Koch-Goldwater bill to establish privacy safeguards for private organizations and State and local governments.

CREDIT AND EMPLOYMENT

9. To strengthen the Consumer Credit Protection Act, to advise consumers of the contents of reports made on them and to provide that the information is as accurate as possible.

10. To provide a remedy for sex discrimination by the insurance business with respect to the availability and scope of insurance coverage for women.

11. To provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the United States Government for persons unable to work standard working hours.

12. To amend title 5, United States Code, to permit Federal officers and employees to

take an active part in political management and in political campaigns.

CRIME AND DRUGS

13. To amend certain provisions of the Controlled Substances Act relating to the decriminalization of marijuana.

14. To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assist school districts to carry out locally approved school security plans to reduce crime against children, employees, and facilities of their schools.

15. To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for grants to cities for improved street lighting.

16. To amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to allow for the donation of certain surplus commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation to State and local penal institutions.

17. To amend section 201 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that the bribery of State and local officials shall be a Federal crime.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

18. To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation.

19. To amend chapter 3 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for the protection of foreign diplomatic missions by the Executive Protection Service.

20. To grant an alien child adopted by an unmarried United States citizen the same immigrant status as an alien child adopted by a United States citizen and his spouse.

ENVIRONMENT

21. To establish a program of direct Federal employment to improve the quality of the environment, the public lands, Indian reservations, and commonly owned and shared resources through a program of recreational development, reforestation, and conservation management.

22. To provide for loans for the establishment and/or construction of municipal, low-cost, nonprofit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats.

23. To impose additional standards with respect to the construction, conversion and operation of oil tankers in order to prevent the pollution of the marine environment.

HOUSING

24. To authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain airspace for use for housing purposes at less than market value.

VETERANS AND MILITARY MATTERS

25. To amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish independent boards to review the discharges and dismissals of servicemen who served during the Vietnam era.

26. To amend title 38 of the United States Code to make more equitable the procedures for determining eligibility for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

27. To provide that members of the Armed Forces may be separated or discharged from active service only by an honorable discharge, a general discharge, or discharge by court martial.

28. To amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to permit veterans to transfer all or part of their educational assistance under chapter 34 of such title to their spouses, and to provide educational assistance at the secondary school level to widows, widowers, and spouses eligible for educational assistance under chapter 35 of such title.

29. To amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide veterans' educational assistance and home loan benefits to individuals who fulfill their obligation to perform alternative civilian service under the selective service laws.

30. To amend title 38 of the United States

Code in order to eliminate the time limitation on the provision of educational assistance to veterans who served on active duty at any time during the Vietnam era or thereafter.

31. To amend the Military Selective Service Act to clarify the definition of conscientious objector so as to specifically include conscientious opposition to military service in a particular war, and to provide to certain individuals the opportunity to claim exemption from military service as selective conscientious objectors irrespective of their existing selective service status.

32. To clarify the definition of conscientious objector so as to specifically include conscientious opposition to military service in a particular war.

HEALTH

33. To amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe radiation standards for, and conduct regular inspections of, diagnostic and other X-ray systems.

34. To amend the Public Health Services Act to provide for the protection of the public health from unnecessary medical exposure to ionizing radiation.

35. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the excise tax on cigarettes for cancer research.

36. To establish research programs and treatment centers for the study and treatment of problems respecting human fertility and sterility and the human reproductive process.

37. To require federally related health care facilities to test infants for certain diseases.

38. To amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide for comprehensive education programs for severely and profoundly retarded children.

39. To establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia.

40. To provide for regulation of prescription drug promotions, to establish a Center for Clinical Pharmacology, to require submission of data relating to the therapeutic equivalence of drugs, to provide additional drug information to consumers and to provide for the recall of adulterated or misbranded foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

TAX CODE CHANGES

41. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income.

42. To extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed.

43. Single taxpayer bill, to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns.

44. To amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not terminate his or her entitlement to widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits or reduce the amount thereof.

45. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that in the case of a dependent 62 or more years of age the support test shall be satisfied if the taxpayer contributes \$1,500 or more to the support of such dependent.

46. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords.

47. To amend section 216 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include corporations and others within the definition of the term "tenant-stockholder" for purposes of the provisions relating to cooperative housing corporations.

48. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65.

49. To amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual receiving benefits thereunder to earn outside income without losing any of such benefits.

50. To amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (in the case of the old-age, survivors, disability insurance program or the medicare program) or the appropriate State agency (in the case of any of the public assistance or medical programs) shall be liable for attorney's fees incurred by an individual in successfully challenging a decision which denies him the benefits or assistance, or reduces or limits the benefits or assistance, to which he is entitled under such program.

51. To amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to waive the existing requirement that all medical patients be given free choice in the selection of treatment facilities in cases where the services involved are being effectively provided through locally operated public health centers, or where such services may be most effectively obtained in designated specialized medical centers.

52. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$1,500 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for dependents, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness).

MEMBERS AFTER 70

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will, if enacted, prohibit Members to chair any committee of the House after they reach their 70th birthday.

I am understandably reluctant to take this step. I know that there are many individuals both in Congress and elsewhere, who will see this measure as both disrespectful and punitive. Mr. Speaker, it is neither. I have the greatest respect for Members who have toiled long and hard in the public arena; further I do not view this resolution as containing a punishment for some, but rather opening up our committee system and our seniority system for all.

Mr. Speaker, these are difficult times, and the future appears none too bright. Now is the time for fresh ideas and new solutions. I feel that if we require our chairmen to open the way for younger men and women that we will encourage and foster fresh and new ideas.

Further, I do not feel this is an arbitrary piece of legislation in that it does not require any chairman to step down on reaching 70; rather, he or she can continue to serve until the end of the Congress in which the 70th birthday is reached. This allows a continuity which we all know is necessary, without permitting a Member to continue to chair a committee into advanced age and declining capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I will welcome the support of all Members, young and not-so-young freshmen and seniors alike; I hope we can see quick action on this resolution.

DEBUNKING THE ADMINISTRATION'S IMPORT TAX ON OIL

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowen, the respected economics editor of the Washington Post, has written an incisive column on President Ford's proposal to relieve the gasoline shortages and high gasoline prices by driving the prices higher still.

The column is especially appropriate today, since the President has announced that he will place a \$3-a-barrel tax on imported oil and then come to Congress for a more comprehensive program of energy taxes. In his column, Mr. Rowen points out that "it defies all logic" to try to cure high gasoline prices by adding a new tax that will drive prices at the pump even higher.

This is still true, Mr. Rowen notes, even if such a price increase is accompanied by a Rube Goldberg mechanism for returning the tax revenues to the economy.

What these energy taxes really mean is rich man's rationing. Mr. Rowen's column makes sound good sense. I include it in the RECORD, so that all Members may have the opportunity to see it.

DO YOU CURE AN OIL CRISIS BY PUSHING PRICES HIGHER?

(By Hobart Rowen)

For a year now, administration officials have loudly complained that the four-fold increase in the price of petroleum by the Arab-led cartel has devastated the economies of the Western world, creating at the one time both recession and inflation.

The only solution to the problem, they have said repeatedly, is a substantial reduction in the price of oil—the single most important commodity in world trade.

So what does the administration now propose to do, in an effort to deal with the energy crisis? It plans to do just what the cartel has done—raise the price of petroleum by imposing a tax ranging from \$1 to \$3 a barrel.

Moreover, if the U.S. decides that the "right" price for crude oil is \$3 higher than at present, it is not beyond expectations that the cartel will boost its own price by the same amount, touching off yet another shock wave.

The administration's so-called "market approach" to the energy problem presumably would begin with a tariff on imported oil, which could be established by presidential order. Later, an equal excise tax could be put on domestic crude, with all price controls on oil and natural gas scrapped, allowing them to rise to the levels dictated by the cartel.

Despite any system of windfall or excess profits taxes, the result and the intent of the "market approach" is to force all retail prices higher. But the question that the Ford economists should be asking themselves is:

How do you cure the ills of excessively high oil and oil-product prices by making them even higher?

It defies all logic, even if combined with a Rube Goldberg device for rebating some of

the tax to consumers. As a doctor friend observes, a new tax on crude oil is comparable to the now abandoned medical practice of attaching leeches to a bleeding patient.

The crude oil tax, of course, is the Ford administration's answer to the boss' irrational opposition to a retail tax on gasoline at the pump where—if oil has to be taxed further—it might do some good in cutting consumption.

Matthew J. Kerbec, an Arlington engineer who has done some outstanding work in showing the ripple effects of high energy prices, says that a \$3 tax would have a devastating impact throughout the economy.

A \$3 tax per barrel on all crude oil (a 40 per cent increase over the current average price of \$7.50 for imported and domestic crude combined) would total \$15 billion.

But this is only the beginning. Higher crude oil prices will work their way through gasoline, and ultimately through farming, food processing, and all forms of transportation.

The non-gasoline portion of each barrel, converted to industrial fuels as well as feedstocks for the plastic industries and other chemical products, will also move up. So will competitive fuels—gas and coal.

Home heating and industrial oils are likely to be hit harder than gasoline prices—although everyone agrees that the major wastage of energy is on the highways.

The Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently pointed out that a tax on crude would allow refineries to decide how to apportion it among various products. "To avoid losing sales," the committee said, "refiners would have an incentive to pass the tax through disproportionately on the most essential products with the least price elasticity of demand."

"If this were done, it would maximize the price inflation and consumer hardship from the tax and minimize the oil savings."

All in all, Kerbec estimates that the new \$15 billion bite in crude oil prices will result "in at least a \$40 billion increase in prices at the consumer level after all price amplification effects due to markups." Some economists think that number may be high, but few dispute the thrust of Kerbec's argument.

The sensible way to deal with the energy problem is to reduce imports sharply by establishing quotas, and then instituting an allocation or rationing system, perhaps combined with a gasoline tax, to force a meaningful cut in gasoline consumption. This has been recommended to President Ford by his principal advisers, but he has some sort of fixation against it.

His stubborn stand is clearly political: He fears that the public would bitterly resent a sizable gasoline tax. If so, that represents an administration failure to communicate to the citizens of this country the serious nature of the energy crisis. It is not too much to say that the survival of Western civilization may ultimately depend on the willingness and ability of people here and abroad to change and adapt their lifestyles to the reduced use of energy.

But crude oil tax is the worst of all solutions. It would provide a new inflationary impetus to the whole economy, worsen the recession and carry no assurance the gasoline consumption would be significantly diminished.

JET NOISE CURFEW

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, noise pollution is one of the major en-

vironmental problems facing this country today. Aircraft are prime contributors, not just in urban districts, but in suburban and most rural areas as well. This is a national problem, not a regional one.

I am today introducing a bill to create a nine-member commission to investigate the establishment of curfews on aircraft operations during normal sleeping hours. A curfew on aircraft operations is not the ultimate solution to the noise pollution problem, but it is a viable short-term answer that will provide immediate relief to millions of persons plagued by the whine, roar, and soot of low-flying planes.

The cost of a curfew is minimal, there is no question of compromising safety, and no new technology is needed. Curfews may mean some inconvenience for the airlines and an extremely small number of passengers—because most flights during normal sleeping hours contain freight—but that must be weighed against the public's right to domestic tranquility and a decent night's sleep.

The noise impact of a jetliner taking off or landing is 10 times more disturbing during sleeping hours, when it is much more difficult to assimilate sounds, than during the day, according to acoustics experts.

The Commission proposed by this bill would report its findings and recommendations to the Congress within 6 months of creation. It would be composed of the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Aviation Administration, two representatives of the aviation industry, and five public members.

Nighttime curfews already are in effect here at Washington National Airport as well as at Tokyo, London, Geneva, and Zurich; Fresno, Los Angeles, and Newport Beach, Calif; and Boise, Idaho.

MAN AND THE OCCUPATIONAL ENVIRONMENT: LIMITS TO ADAPTATION

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the perplexing dilemmas of our modern age is that rising affluence has been accompanied by a deterioration in the quality of life. All around us we see the indirect effects of economic growth, such as air and water pollution, the increasing incidence of environmentally induced diseases, and a lengthening list of animal species threatened with extinction.

There have been many who have claimed that these environmental trade-offs for economic growth were necessary. This school of thought would have us believe that a certain level of economic well-being is the ultimate in human attainment, and if our land, water, and air have to be despoiled in the process, so be it.

However, in recent years there have been a growing number of advocates on

the other side of the issue, who claim that environmental quality should not be relegated to the nebulous area of aesthetics. Indeed, many of these advocates have presented compelling evidence that deteriorating environmental quality poses a threat to the continued survival of mankind. Their theories are already being proven in the living laboratories that comprise the American industrial sector. The rising incidence of occupational disease not only extracts a cruel human cost, but inflicts damage on our economic well-being.

There is now a growing accumulation of evidence that contaminants in the occupational environment have now escaped the confines of the factory and threaten a public health crisis of monumental proportions.

René Dubos, professor emeritus of the Rockefeller University, recently addressed this complex problem and its larger societal implications in an eloquent speech before the Society for Occupational and Environmental Health.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Dubos' compelling message, "Man Adapting to Working Conditions," be included at the conclusion of my remarks. I know my colleagues will benefit greatly from Dr. Dubos' enlightened perception on this important challenge to our society.

The message follows:

MAN ADAPTING TO WORKING CONDITIONS
(By René Dubos)

I see no evidence that modern man is less resistant to environmental stresses than his Stone Age ancestors. In our century, millions of normal human beings have survived the frightful ordeals of combat in the trenches of the First World War or among the devilish electronic weapons of more recent conflicts. Many have survived for years under the bestial conditions of concentration camps. All over the world men and women now spend much of their adult years working in the noisy and traumatic environments, either of industrial plants contaminated with chemical fumes or of offices clouded with tobacco smoke. Spectacular increases of populations are occurring in areas where living and working conditions are detestable from all points of view. And even though most human beings suffer in the modern urban environment, the most polluted and congested agglomerations have great appeal for people of all races and ages.

Mankind is thus displaying now, as it has always displayed in the past, a startling ability to survive and function in environments which are highly unnatural and hostile to its biological and psychological nature—including the environments created by scientific technology and urban complexity. The long-range cost of this adaptability however is the emergence of new disease patterns and an impoverishment of emotional life. The theme of this essay is that modern man is not on his way to extinction, but that the quality of his life will undergo progressive degradation if he does not design environments better suited than the present ones to his unchangeable biological and psychological nature. I shall emphasize the effects of working conditions on physical and mental health.

Concern for a better environment is widespread in all technological countries, but surprisingly little attention is given to the fact that factories and offices commonly expose workers to working conditions which are not only unpleasant but also potentially dangerous. There is of course much information concerning the workers who are killed on the job or made obviously sick by

their professional activities but this represents only a very small part of the influence of working life on health and disease. Toxic materials, noise and other stimuli, stresses or monotony, may not cause obvious disturbances at the time they are experienced. In many cases, however, conditions which appear tolerable exert deleterious effects that do not become manifest until long after the initial exposure. A large percentage of the chronic diseases that now plague our society—the so-called diseases of civilization—can probably be traced to the fact that modern man has made some form of adaptation to environments which are fundamentally objectionable, although they are tolerable. I have emphasized the word adaptation because its misuse is at the origin of many medical and behavioral problems. I shall first illustrate this statement with examples not necessarily related to working conditions.

A few years ago, an American medical journal carried an article entitled "Villagers adapting to their arsenic-filled water". According to this article, the underground water of a certain Mexican village is so heavily contaminated with arsenic that two-thirds of the inhabitants exhibit skin lesions, blood protein abnormalities, neurological disorders and other signs and symptoms of chronic arsenic poisoning. Yet, most of the villagers so affected are able to work and go about the usual activities of Mexican life. The author of the article used the word adapting in the title to convey the notion that, in his words, the villagers "appeared well accustomed to their disorder." What he really meant of course was that they had come to accept chronic arsenic poisoning as an inescapable fact of life.

Tolerance of environments that are deleterious is a common occurrence. Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, for example, the air in many parts of Northern Europe has been contaminated with a variety of pollutants from coal smoke and chemical fumes. These pollutants are made even more unpleasant and dangerous by the inclemency of the Atlantic climate. On the whole, however, the inhabitants of industrial Northern Europe have "adapted" to their dismal atmosphere; they have multiplied, produced great economic wealth and contributed to knowledge. The price has been that, as a consequence of exposure to air pollution, a large percentage of North Europeans suffer from chronic pulmonary disease—which they tend to accept as a matter of course much as the Mexican villagers mentioned above accept chronic arsenic poisoning. The various forms of chronic pulmonary disease are increasing also in North America and in all other parts of the world which are heavily industrialized.

Similarly, most people become "adapted" to loud noises. In this case, "adaptation" is achieved through a decrease in the ability to perceive certain sounds by impairment of the hearing apparatus and therefore at the cost of the enjoyment of music and of the finer qualities of the human voice. People also become "adapted" to working and living in crowded and confused environments; this kind of adaptation means in reality developing protective attitudes and behavioral patterns of which the ultimate outcome is to restrict pleasurable social contacts and to impoverish human relationships.

Countless other examples could be provided to illustrate that the word adaptation, as commonly used, denotes processes that have some initial protective value against environmental insults but that commonly result in long-range deleterious effects. In most cases, the exposed person is not even aware of these long-range dangers because the physiological or psychological insult is of a low level, and the protective response is sufficiently effective to mask the effects of the initial exposure.

The recognition of environmental insults is especially difficult when these cannot be perceived by the senses, as is increasingly common in the world of modern technology. We still function anatomically and physiologically with the equipment of our Stone Age ancestors and our evolutionary past has not provided us with any biological mechanisms to warn us of the dangers lurking in an invisible beam of radiation or in an odorless kind of vapor. Neither instinct nor biological experience can make us detect the environmental threats that cannot be perceived by our senses and that do not produce immediate deleterious effects readily linked to their cause.

The following substances are among those generally regarded as constituting major health hazards in the modern environment: carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, nitrates and nitrites, DDT and related pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB), mercury, manganese, lead, asbestos, vinyl chloride mycotoxins—and of course ionizing radiations. All the items in this list are associated with industrial or agricultural operations, and since most of them escape detection by the senses they present difficult problems for the protection of the workers.

A further difficulty in the identification of environmental stresses is that substances and situations that exert no apparent ill-effect under normal conditions may become dangerous under stress. For example, lead stored in the bones can be suddenly released into the general circulation during episodes of pneumonia. Many toxic or carcinogenic compounds are stored in a harmless state in the liver by conjunction with glucuronic acid; however, the process of detoxification can be impaired by liver disease, it can be swamped by overload with other ligands and it can be reversed by glucuronidase. DDT, dieldrin, and other halogenated pesticides which do not cause obvious damage when stored away in body fats can generate gross and even fatal pathologies when they are suddenly released into the general circulation. Release can occur in various forms of physiological stress such as pregnancy, lactation, food deprivation, intoxication or acute infection, or even as a result of emotional disturbances. Synergistic effects have been described in several other situations—for example in experimental systems involving a polychlorinated biphenyl hydrocarbon (PDB) and the duck hepatitis virus. Thus, many different kinds of physiological or infectious stresses can act as triggers to activate potential toxicities that would otherwise remain unmanifested under usual conditions.

Environmental insults of a physico-chemical nature have been the ones most extensively studied, in part because they have probably been the most important etiological agents of disease in industrial work until a few decades ago and also because methods for their control can be formulated at least within economic limitations. Under modern conditions of industrial and office work, however, environmental insults of psychological character are becoming increasingly important.

It has long been known that most sudden changes are stressful. When Hippocrates wrote, "It is changes that are chiefly responsible for diseases, especially . . . the violent alterations" he was referring to seasonal changes. However, this statement applied also to other kinds of changes as suggested by the passage in the same text that "gradual changes of any regimen" are safer than abrupt changes.

Experience has in fact repeatedly confirmed that sudden changes in working conditions or life situations are likely to be stressful; they do not allow for the orderly emergence of the progressive adaptive mechanisms required for a satisfactory adjustment to new conditions. An example of physiological disturbances caused by abrupt changes in the routine of

life has been recently provided by Dr. Len-nart Levi in his studies of the effect of piece work on the urine flow and hormonal balance of healthy Swedish women. When ex-traneous stimuli of physical or psychosocial nature were introduced into their lives, these women experienced subjective disturbances such as fatigue and discomfort and also ob-jective measurable changes in their urine flow and in their excretion of epinephrine, norepinephrine and creatinine.

While sudden changes and overstimulation commonly have a variety of traumatic effects, paradoxically deprivation of stimuli seems to be becoming a more common cause of pathology under modern conditions of work. The reason is that a certain amount of di-versity is essential for mental well-being and probably also for physical health.

In the course of evolution, human beings have been exposed to a large variety of stim-uli, in part because their physical environ-ment was complex and changeable and more importantly because their own activities con-stantly modified their relationships to the external world. It will suffice to mention here that while the human species emerged in a semi-tropical savanna kind of country, it has now colonized all types of climatic and topo-graphical zones on earth. Since environ-mental stimuli have affected all aspects of human evolutionary development, it can be expected that some forms of stimulation are essential for the normal performance of phys-iological and psychological processes. This evolutionary conditioning is reflected in the fact that in animals and man a constant bombardment by a variety of stimuli is es-sential for successful development and func-tion.

There is much empirical experience con-cerning the effects of restricted stimulation on adults. For example, mental aberrations are common among prisoners in solitary confinement, or among people who are iso-lated during long periods of time, either for accidental or for professional reasons. People who are completely isolated are likely to experience abnormalities in feeling states, deterioration of ability to think, perceptual distortions, even hallucinations and delu-sions. Empirical findings of this nature have been confirmed and extended by studies of sensory deprivation in experimental animals. Such experiments have revealed for example that both the development and the mainte-nance of nervous tissue are dependent on metabolic phenomena conditioned by a proper intensity of stimulation. The atrophic changes caused by removal of stimuli can be reversed if the stimulation is resumed soon enough, but they can become permanent if deprivation is prolonged. In human beings objective evidence of the damage done by sensory deprivation has been provided by electro encephalographic studies—showing a decrease in the alpha range of brain waves—and also by physiological studies—revealing disturbances of epinephrine and norepi-nephrine excretion.

Needless to say, the physiological and psy-chological effects of sensory deprivation have their counterpart in the disturbances asso-ciated with the monotony of automated work and dial-watching tasks. It is possible and indeed probable that workers can be-come "adapted" to such monotonous work-ing conditions, in the sense that they toler-ate them to earn better wages. As in the case of exposure to low levels of environ-mental pollutants, however, such tolerance has long-range deleterious effects. The vari-ous forms of assembly line work are objec-tionable not only because monotonous ac-tivity is boring but perhaps even more be-cause monotony can generate physiological and behavioral disorders. Diversity is not only the salt of life; it is an essential ele-ment of physical and mental health.

I have focused my remarks on certain types of working environments that appear

almost innocuous and the pathological ef-fects of which are delayed and indirect. Un-der such conditions, it is extremely difficult if not impossible to demonstrate convinc-ingly a link between cause and effect. As-bestos, lead, pesticides, and countless other potentially toxic and mutagenic substances are absorbed by the tissues without the ex-posed person being aware of their presence in his environment. Dial-watching or re-petitive tasks appear only boring to the operator who is usually unaware of the fact that continued monotony may generate physiological and behavioral disturbances.

The classical mechanisms of protective or-ganismic response to injury do not operate in such situations. A truly adaptive response is one which brings into action metabolic, hormonal and mental processes which cor-rect the disturbing effects of outside forces on the body and the mind, thus reestablish-ing the equilibrium state. This is the process W. B. Cannon called homeostasis in his book *The Wisdom of the Body*. Such responses were developed in the course of evolution to deal with the environmental insults that primitive man encountered in his daily life. The human body, however, has no "wisdom" for the new kinds of insults created by mod-ern technology, because there was no coun-terpart for most of them in the evolutionary experience of the human species. Even when the response to an insult of the technologi-cal environment has some protective value at the time it occurs, commonly it has de-layed consequences that are deleterious. With regard to the technological world, the wis-dom of the body is at best shortsighted. Air pollution elicits from the lungs an overpro-duction of mucus which at first protects its tissues against the pollutants but this even-tually results in emphysema and chronic bronchitis; and similar misdirected compen-satory processes are elicited by the new phys-ical and psychical insults of the modern en-vironment. These insults rarely destroy life outright, but they spoil its later years.

Furthermore, there is no chance for a ge-netic adaptation to the threats of the modern technological environment. Since they usually do not have marked effects on health until a long period after exposure, they do not interfere with reproductive ability and therefore provide no chance for genetic selec-tion against them. For example, if a certain environmental factor is a cause of cancer, the chances are very great that the person so affected will produce children long before being incapacitated by the disease. In con-sequence, these children will not be better adapted than their parents to the undesirable environmental conditions which produced the cancer. In any case, adaptive changes re-sulting from alteration of the genetic appar-atus are extremely slow, and would require many generations before making a signif-icant difference. Even if it were true that we can become adapted to industrial fumes, to the noises of jackhammers, or to the trau-matic experiences of rat race and competitive life, it would take more than 10 generations before the genes making for adaptation to these insults become established in society as a whole.

The widespread acceptance of the phrase "The wisdom of the body" among patholo-gists and of "Nature knows best" among ecol-ogists is the expression of the polyanna at-titude in which we have been raised and which makes us expect that good is the nor-mal state of affairs, whereas in reality any kind of change implies danger. It is not pes-simism to believe that there cannot be any lasting security; it is simple realism. Modern industrial and office work requires eternal vigilance, but the individual worker cannot possibly take the responsibility for his own health in a complex world which he can-not comprehend and which the experts them-selves do not fully understand.

The time has therefore come to devote as

much thought and research to the health hazards of working conditions as is devoted to engineering design, purchase specifica-tions or sales policies. It must be emphasized, however, that the usual methods of medical research and practice are not well suited to this type of pathological problem. In many cases, the victim does not perceive the threat to which he is exposed, the epidemiologist has no simple way of detecting exposure, and the physician can recognize the signs and symptoms only when the pathological proc-ess is far advanced.

It is unrealistic furthermore to hope that safety measures and other improvements in working conditions could completely prevent industrial and office pathology even if they were based on much greater knowledge than we now have. New substances and new work-ing techniques are constantly being intro-duced so rapidly that there is no chance to evaluate their potential health dangers be-fore they have affected large numbers of people. The only way to deal with this un-fortunate but inevitable state of affairs is to carry out systematically a great variety of tests on samples of the working population, in the hope of detecting evidences of patho-logical changes as early as possible. This ap-proach, which could be regarded as a form of prospective epidemiology or as a medical alarm system, would of course be cumber-some and costly, but the inconvenience would be small compared with the medical load now being created by the chronic dis-abilities resulting from undesirable working conditions. In a truly civilized society, pro-tection of the health of the worker should be regarded—both for humanitarian and eco-nomic reasons—as the most essential and irreducible aspect of production cost.

There is more to the problems of health and disease than the physical and psychol-ogical quality of working conditions. Emotion-al, esthetic and other values should also be considered when judging the working en-vironment. In the final analysis, the human environment means everything that is ex-perienced by man and it is the total nature of this experience that determines the quality of life. Since I do not have the necessary background to discuss these prob-lems from the point of view of environmen-tal quality in factories and offices, I shall briefly illustrate with other aspects of life that faulty adaption can occur with regard to perceptual quality, as it does with prob-lems of health.

I spent my school years in Paris at a time when the historical buildings of the city were covered with a layer of soot and dirt deposited by domestic and industrial smoke. It used to be thought that the prevailing greyness gave a distinguished and refined quality to the Parisian atmosphere. Indeed, there was an outcry of anger when André Malraux ordered that the buildings be washed. Then a miracle happened. When the grey layer was removed from the monu-ments, their surfaces revealed the golden hue of the stone work, as subtle as that of young human flesh. For more than a cen-tury Parisians and the rest of the world had become accustomed—"adapted"—to the somber tonality created by the soot and the dirt of the Industrial Revolution. Perceptual life had thus been impoverished by a cen-tury of unconscious conditioning—of so-called adaptation—to an environmental de-fect. Instructed by this experience, I now feel sorrow and indignation at seeing people in American cities being everywhere exposed to noise, ugliness and garbage in the street. By "adapting" to this kind of environment, the American public progressively accepts messiness and squalor as the normal state of affairs—in factories and offices as well as in the street.

Fortunately, there are reasons not to end on such a gloomy note. Many people in all age and social groups are refusing to "adapt" to undesirable conditions. The campaign for

a better environment is gaining momentum and it is not limited to the health aspects of the environmental problem; it has begun to encompass emotional and esthetic qualities. Sooner or later, the environmental crusade will spread to working conditions in factories and offices. In fact labor unions are beginning to take an active part in this campaign both inside and outside working places. For example, labor unions in Australia have recently put a "green ban" on the construction of some industrial plants until the proper steps had been taken to provide adequate pollution controls. They even refused to build a certain parking lot near the new Sydney Opera House because this would have required the cutting down of three magnificent fig trees that had an emotional value for the local citizens.

Many people, I know, believe that concern for the quality of the environment is just a fad that will vanish when the economic cost and inconveniences of effective control measures become apparent. But there is a new factor in the situation. A large part of the public has come to regard a good environment as a natural right of man—just as civil rights, the right to education, the right to medical care are natural rights. And it is obvious that a good environment will have to include healthy and pleasant working conditions. The environmental movement cannot be merely a fad, because history shows that there has never been a lasting retreat from the recognition of a natural right of man.

TRIBUTE TO ED FONTES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, involvement—political involvement—by earnest, sincere individuals who are interested in righting the wrongs of our society and in preserving the unique nature of our country is what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they conceived this democracy.

The political system which we inherited affords us free speech, free elections, and freedom to participate in deciding the future policies and directions of our Nation. Certainly, there are imperfections in our policies; certainly mistakes are made; but, as de Tocqueville said:

The greatness of America lies not in being more enlightened than any other nation but rather in her ability to repair her faults.

And to "repair her faults," we must depend on ourselves and our abilities. Our Nation has been especially fortunate to have people of great ability, who are sincerely motivated to help their fellow human beings and who are willing to devote both time and effort to bring about the necessary changes in our society.

One such individual is Ed Fontes, who is being honored by the California Democratic Central Committee in the 32d Congressional District for his many efforts on behalf of the people of the area I am privileged to represent.

Ed Fontes has been active in elected capacities, and as chairman and member of numerous committees in community and political organizations since 1953. Among his civic activities, Ed is well known for his hard work in beautifica-

tion programs for the harbor area communities of San Pedro, Wilmington, and Harbor City.

Ed is also vitally concerned about the youth of our area. He has spent many hours working with the East Los Angeles CYO; the Boys Clubs of San Pedro and East Los Angeles; and programs to assist Vietnam veterans, among others.

In the political arena, Ed Fontes is a member of the 32d Congressional District Democratic Council and the Democratic Caucus Steering Committee. In addition he has played an active role in the Harbor Area Ethnic Political Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, I have only touched on the many interests and accomplishments of Ed Fontes. He is truly an unselfish and dedicated individual. And working by his side and supporting his efforts through these years has been his lovely wife, Bonnie.

All too often we take people like Ed Fontes for granted—we come to expect the long hours of hard work they give to their community, and ultimately to the preservation of our democracy. I am pleased, therefore, that we in the 32d Congressional District are taking this opportunity to honor Ed Fontes and to express our deep gratitude to him.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONFERENCE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at their midterm conference in Kansas City, Mo., on December 6-8, 1974, delegates of the Democratic Party met to consider a permanent party charter.

The Missouri House of Representatives, on December 12, adopted a resolution expressing opposition to article 2 of the draft charter and urging that it be rejected.

I thought my colleagues might be interested in the complete text of the resolution which follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the members of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Missouri General Assembly take notice that the Democratic Party of the United States has called a convention to be held on December 6, 7, and 8, 1974, in the city of Kansas City, Missouri; and

Whereas, the members of the Missouri House of Representatives take notice that the convention will consider and adopt a permanent charter for the Democratic Party of the United States; and

Whereas, throughout the history of the Democratic Party, citizens of the State of Missouri have distinguished themselves and their state as loyal and devoted Democrats; and

Whereas, the Missouri House of Representatives notes with alarm, the provisions of Article Two of the Draft Charter beginning with line 72 permitting the National Convention to disregard the very law of Missouri, present or future, and to determine who shall represent Missouri at the convention and concluding with line 78, if adopted, would surely mean the usurpation of power and control of the basic and essential right of Missouri Democrats to choose their own dele-

gation and a myriad of other essential decisions undeniably belonging to the Democrats of Missouri alone, and further presents an awesomely clear and present danger to the Democratic people of Missouri of the failure of any such delegation to truly be representative of themselves, their policies and attitudes, and most certainly would not reflect the true and accurate position of the Missouri Democrat; and

Whereas, the Missouri House of Representatives unhesitatingly rises to defend the right of the citizens of Missouri, without regard to that citizen's particular political affiliation, to govern themselves through their state legislature, founded on local elections so essential to our basic American freedom, and insist that the law of Missouri as enacted by the legislature shall not be usurped by any other person or body politic;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the members of the Missouri House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh General Assembly, Second Extraordinary Session, that the Democratic National Committee and the delegates to the 1974 Conference on Democratic Policy and Organization be advised of the intolerable nature of Article Two of the Draft Charter and demand the most careful and diligent consideration of its obvious threat to that most basic freedom of a people to exercise their right to democratic representative government under the United States Constitution; and

Be it further resolved that the members of the Missouri House of Representatives urge the delegates to that 1974 Conference to reject the majority position on Article Two of the Draft Charter and to adopt the minority report; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Chairman Robert Strauss and the Democratic National Committee; Chairman Terry Sanford and the Democratic Charter Commission; Democratic State Chairman Jim Spain, the Chairman of the Missouri Delegation, and to each of the Democratic Senators and Representatives of the National Congress from the State of Missouri.

Offered by Representative Vernon King.

HOW TO MAKE AMERICA MORE HONEST

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a stimulating and inspiring book: "How To Make America More Honest." I recommend it for reading by all who want to be a part in strengthening our beloved country.

The January 6 edition of U.S. News & World Report comments on the book and on the inspiring work of American Viewpoint, Inc., in the following editorial by Howard Fieger:

HONESTY ON HOLIDAY?

Here is something unsettling to contemplate in this holiday season—

A highly respected, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, nonprofit organization is in the midst of a saturation campaign to popularize the concept that it pays to do right.

In other words:

Honesty is the best policy.

Well, now! Isn't that one of the verities? Have things reached a point in America where people have to be "sold" on that?

Could be. A recent public-opinion poll by the Sindlinger organization asked people to

rate in importance the problems we face. Morality got no votes.

Ivan Hill, the President of American Viewpoint, Inc., which is sparking the crusade mentioned above, recently wrote in "NAM Reports," a publication of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"We want to develop a massive mass media campaign to debunk dishonesty. . . . We wish to make honesty socially and culturally 'all right,' the smart thing, maybe even fairly fashionable. . . ."

President Hill and his associates aren't kidding. They are conducting tests to determine public response to the idea that "it is not stupid or nuts to be honest. Especially do we wish the youth of America to learn that you can be professionally and financially successful—even rich—and be honest."

Right now the organization is immersed in research to develop new teaching materials on ethics and values that can be used in all schooling, from kindergarten right up through graduate school.

At the same time, it has a program to persuade business, professional and trade associations, and labor unions to "develop or update their own codes of ethics. We should like for such groups to take their codes of ethics out of the frames on the walls, read them, practice them, and enforce them."

American Viewpoint, Inc., plans to set up an Ethical Resources Center at Chapel Hill, N.C., to which any school, local government, union, business or professional association can write and obtain sample codes of ethics with suggestion for making them work.

The organization has just published a book, "How To Make America More Honest."

All this activity brings up a question: Is endemic dishonesty a side effect of inflation, or is it the other way around? American Viewpoint, Inc., is convinced there is a relationship between the two. Mr. Hill says:

"Although economic historians may not agree on which comes first, a severe decline in a society's honesty and morality or a severe inflationary spiral, the two do seem to go together. Some already have started asking: Can a free society survive a long and severe period of inflation? The prime basis for this question is the unequal burden of inflation. Those who cannot keep pace in the inflation race will condemn the whole track meet."

As waning morality spreads, many scholars and just plain citizens tend to blame government, arguing that any political system can only be as good as its leaders.

There's where they and Mr. Hill's organization part company. He contends:

"What the leaders believe actually reflects society or they would not be leaders. It's up to the individual participants in a society to develop their own standards."

Has life really come to such a pass that all of us have to be re-educated to the truth that liars and cheaters are both dishonest and alien to our culture?

If so, it is a sad thought to ponder at this particular time of the year—or any time of year, for that matter.

The January 2 edition of the Wall Street Journal pertinently printed the following editorial:

MORAL EDUCATION

Watergate provided the final push, but other social problems from drug use to rising crime have spurred U.S. public schools to pay more attention to questions of moral and ethical development. A Christian Science Monitor survey found widespread enthusiasm in schools for courses in "moral development," "character education" and "value clarification."

In a certain sense this represents a turn-about in the direction of American education. In the early years schools placed great stress on moral and ethical development along with the three Rs. Whatever their other

defects, William McGuffey's "Eclectic Readers" and similar primers sought to impart an ethical consciousness. But directed efforts to impart standards lessened as American society became more complex and pluralistic.

The revised effort to teach moral principles in schools is, however, not a particularly radical change, even in modern terms. It would be hard for good teachers not to convey a set of ethical and moral principles to their students through their words and example and through their interpretations of literature, science and other academic subjects. By this process, there can be little doubt that schools always have tended to reflect the ethical or moral framework of the society that surrounds them.

We would admit to some concerns over efforts to formalize this process and to make it a conscious and directed part of the school curriculum. In a pluralistic society, specific standards of belief are better set by such bodies as the church, where membership is voluntary, or in the home than by state-directed schools.

There is always the danger that the state efforts will come into conflict with personal and private beliefs or that they will attempt to foster an allegiance to selective, and not altogether wholesome values. Militarists in pre-war Japan, for example, seized upon moral instruction in the schools (shu-shin) to forge a doctrine of blind obedience to the emperor. This sort of thing may make for a more orderly society but it carries risks for a democratic, free nation.

Having said that, however, we have little doubt that there are generally accepted ethical and moral verities that have had a place in almost every society and religion down through time. The simple principle of "do unto others as you would have, etc." is a prescription for ethical conduct, for example, that is hard to improve upon, whatever sophists might try to make of it.

We would hope that the ethical revival the Monitor sees would reaffirm doubt that some youngsters in our society receive no worthwhile ethical guidelines, from either church or family. And too many modern adults, in the schools, churches and households, are reluctant to exercise moral authority, perhaps because of a confusion in their own beliefs. If the latest movement restores the notion that adults can and should provide moral leadership, it will be welcome indeed.

The December 23 edition of the Christian Science Monitor published the following article by Clayton Jones:

CAN SCHOOLS TEACH ETHICS?—MORE ADD "VALUE" COURSES; STUDENTS SEEM TO LIKE THEM

An alarm bell is ringing among U.S. educators that public schools need to do more to shape the moral behavior of tomorrow's citizens.

As shock waves from the Watergate scandal subside and the nation's crime rate climbs even higher, these educators find themselves grappling anew with deep and difficult questions about teaching young people the difference between right and wrong.

A Monitor survey indicates:

Many schools are placing "moral development," "value clarification," and "character education" at the top of their lists for classroom subjects—allowing children to conduct their own moral reasoning on such simple values as justice, honesty, and respect for property.

The number of curriculum packages on moral education has more than doubled in the past two years, according to the Social Science Education Consortium in Boulder, Colo. Many publishers of educational materials report booming markets for moral education training across the country.

The number of graduate school dissertations written on moral education has averaged 150 a year since 1970—a significant

jump from a total of 80 such dissertations written between 1940 and 1969.

A nationwide survey of parents, students, teachers and school administrators by the American Institute for Character Education indicates high enthusiasm for the teaching of morals, values, and ethics in the classroom. The institute sought reaction on its curriculum package being tested in 29 states.

The Valley Vista Elementary School in Chula Vista, Calif., for instance, began a "character" education curriculum in 1971 and discovered its vandalism bill dropped from \$400 to \$10 a year—with no additional security, says assistant superintendent Douglas E. Giles.

In Newton, Mass., a fourth-grade class discusses a television documentary which reenacts the White House Watergate transcripts. A class in Cambridge, Mass., public schools, meanwhile, discusses the moral implications of Hiroshima.

Or, 50 children in Chicago's Falconer Public Elementary School visit retirement homes this Christmas, singing carols for residents as part of a program to teach children unselfishness and concern for the elderly.

Educators agree that teaching morality is subtle and can be controversial. They point to angry parent reaction over textbooks selected by schools in Kanawha County, W. Va., recently.

But educators—aware that this generation of schoolchildren is not the first on the planet to be taught their do's and don'ts—are selling a new message.

"Students today want to walk with us as we make our moral choices, not meet us at the gate to receive the distilled wisdom of our experience," says Wilson Riles, California's Superintendent of Public Instruction.

"Society is fearful of what it believes is moral disintegration. Schools can have an impact by creating a climate where a child will experience and practice in learning moral choice," said Mr. Riles.

Most educators cite Watergate as the final catalyst giving moral education an open door to the classroom. Also, increased drug use, rising crime, and a "general moral decline" have caused educators to think there should be more to school than reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Richard Grahm, director of Harvard University's Center for Moral Development, sees another reason: "Parents feel they don't know how to teach morality, that they are no longer in control."

Urgent demands by parents that schools buttress home efforts to help children develop a sense of values is met with a warning from educators: Parents should be consulted regularly on which textbooks to use and which values to teach.

For instance, a two-year-old California law, one of the most stringent in the country, forces teacher-parent cooperation by hinging it with state funding. A plan devised by the American Institute for Character Education calls for a home study course for both parents and children on family relationships.

To be safe from parental charges that they are teaching the wrong values, teachers are beginning to turn to the educational theories of Lawrence Kohlberg, professor of moral development at Harvard University. Educators point to other theories in use, but say Professor Kohlberg's ideas are catching on the fastest.

Essentially, Professor Kohlberg advises teachers to use everyday classroom behavior as a social system with hidden services to help children learn right and wrong behavior. The class discusses the "real moral dilemmas" that often crop up between children, teachers, and the school. By exposing children to their peers' or the teachers' moral reasonings, children naturally rise up a scale of improved morality, Professor Kohlberg explains.

Weaving morality directly in classroom behavior relieves teachers of sermonizing on a

"bag of virtues," as Professor Kohlberg calls it, better stimulates a child's moral development, and often avoids direct conflict with parents.

Contributing to this survey: Monitor correspondents Fred Moritz in San Francisco, Judith Frutiger in Chicago, John Dillin in Atlanta, George Moneyhun in New York, Florence Mouckley in Boston, and Curt Sitomer in Los Angeles.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the article "Honesty and Freedom" by Ivan Hill, printed in the December 2 edition of N.A.M. Reports:

HONESTY AND FREEDOM

I wish to describe what American Viewpoint, Inc. is doing to help make America honest enough to stay free. Last December American Viewpoint announced a program to extend economic and political freedom in the United States by improving our ethics. We bought a full page in the Wall Street Journal to outline our three-phase program.

First, we want to develop a massive mass media campaign to debunk dishonesty. We wish to make honesty socially and culturally "all right," the smart thing, maybe even fairly fashionable. The campaign should be handled on a public interest basis by the media, such as is done for the American Cancer Society, the Heart Association and other groups attacking killer diseases.

We believe that dishonesty, sleazy ethics and crime are highly deadly diseases and can kill the diminishing chances we have of remaining a free society. And certainly these evils are already destroying the quality of our lives.

Although economic historians may not agree on which comes first, a severe decline in a society's honesty and morality or a severe inflationary spiral, the two do seem to go together. Some already have started asking: Can a free society survive a long and severe period of inflation? The prime basis for this question is the unequal burden of inflation. Those who cannot keep pace in the inflation race will condemn the whole track meet.

Our ethics programs are not based on any efforts to change the nature of man. We simply wish to lessen the team-spirit pressure, the duress of team play, on the corporate vice president who wants to tell the truth, just as we wish to lessen the peer-group pressure on the kid in the class who doesn't approve of cheating. Fear of exclusion from the group keeps too many people flexible in their integrity. We must make a liar as alien to our society as a card cheat.

We shall soon start a test campaign in three markets to determine public response to our efforts to demonstrate that it is not stupid or nuts to be honest. Especially do we wish the youth of America to learn that you can be professionally and financially successful, even rich, and be honest. Of course, one may have to work a little harder and know a lot more. Honesty is really not a lazy person's game.

For too long we have failed to recognize that the public, that is every individual citizen, is responsible for maintaining a free society—is responsible for crime, for dishonesty, for dishonest politics. So it is absolutely urgent that we take our challenge to improve our ethics directly to the public through massive mass media efforts. It is too late to wait for another generation to come along and do it. If we don't act to strengthen the ethical underpinnings of our free society, the next generation may not be free to do so.

In reference to our high rate of crime, isn't it reasonable to expect crime to be bred in a bed of pervasive dishonesty? Isn't it true that quickness and certainty of punishment are great deterrents to crime? Isn't it likely that if all elements in our enforcement procedures were fully honest we might

greatly increase the speed and sureness of punishment? But for all this we need the sanction of an honest and responsible citizenry.

The second part of our ethics program is to research and develop new and more relevant teaching materials on ethics and values for use in the public schools—from kindergarten through graduate schools. Some good materials are now being used in public schools. We wish to study and assess such materials as well as to develop new approaches. Good ethics is basic to all good religions and there are no justifiable reasons for public schools to neglect the teaching of values.

The third phase of our program is to encourage all professional and trade associations, corporations and labor unions, to develop or update their own codes of ethics. We would like for such groups to take their codes of ethics out of the frames on the walls, read them, practice them, and enforce them.

In carrying out these programs we hope to establish an Ethical Resources Center at Chapel Hill, N.C., for all the Western world to use—a center where any school could write in for data on teaching values at whatever grade level, any municipality could write in for sample municipal codes of ethics and information about how they worked, a center where any trade or professional association could write in for material that might be used to up-date their codes of ethics.

We have just published a paperback book on "How To Make America More Honest." Our book sells for \$1.50 a copy and all the sales revenue goes to finance our ethics program.

In recent weeks it appears that a lot of Americans are beginning to share our belief that this job of restigmatizing dishonesty needs to be done—must be done and soon. * * *

Now, as to the relationship of ethics and profits, we should first keep in mind that the ultimate goal of ethics is the moral and spiritual perfection of individuals, while the ultimate goal of business is to help provide the opportunity, the means, for man to achieve his ethical goals. For what other purpose should humans live, should any institution exist? The profit system just happens to be the one that has worked best to achieve these goals. (But young people, particularly, rightly decry putting materialism ahead of all other goals. As a primary goal materialism is destructive. As a secondary goal in life it is enormously beneficial and makes all the more possible man's ability to achieve his human potentials.)

In order that we may be thinking together, let's define profits as the favorable result of business operations—the excess of income over expenditures. It's the incentive of an elastic profit that gives vitality to a free enterprise system. If there were no profit in America, it is doubtful that there would be much, if any, political freedom. Profits are still the best measure of the efficiency and beneficial service performance of business in an honestly competitive economy. Thus the making of profits is a highly ethical goal of business.

When we accept profit as a good motive, we should identify it with freedom and responsibility. The American public must understand, before it's too late, that profits and individual freedom go together. And business must understand that destroying competition is suicide for freedom. To maximize either profits or wages under less than honestly competitive conditions, we engage in an expedient, short-range program that has no service feature or ethical base in its strategy. Excessive profit, usually obtained under less than honestly competitive conditions, destroys itself just as excessive wages destroys itself under the same type of non-competitive conditions.

Unfortunately, some of those who have risen to the defense of American capitalism and the free enterprise system do more harm than good. For private property is not a God-ordained institution. It has been created by society, which grants us the right to hold this property in return for the performance of socially desirable ends. But I cannot over-emphasize that when one talks about a free-market economy, one must recognize that the very essence of such an economy is honesty in method and policy.

The main source of criticism of our system today is not that it is not the best, but that it is operated too dishonestly. And we may be surprised that the source of much of this criticism is neither from the far left nor from the far right. It is from independent business and professional people who are the very prototypes of free enterprise, but whose honesty and courage will not permit them to tolerate injustice, unfairness and discrimination from big business, big labor or big government.

In a highly complex interdependent society with an ever increasing technology that binds us all together, the tolerance that allows for irresponsibility and dishonesty in any segment of society becomes narrower and closer. More than those of us now living could have ever imagined, the ethic needed for one to an acre is very different from the ethic needed for one thousand to an acre. We didn't need a population conference to tell us this, but I wish they had done a better job of telling this to the world. The ethic of a world of nations that blackmails one another for food or oil, all in the presence of nuclear power roaming the seas and air and starvation resting in the hills and on the deserts, would have been beyond our understanding. It is even more beyond our understanding now. If technology, rather than ethics or morality, enforces cooperation in order that we may survive, then an imposed centralized authority becomes inevitable.

For the benefit and glory of all Americans, young and old, I hope you will join with us in a crusade against two of America's greatest evils—hypocrisy and dishonesty. That is the road to more efficient business, as well as more efficient and far less government. The cathartic effect of simple honesty can have an extraordinary effect on the moral confusion and so-called alienation in our society.

It can have, too, an enormous benefit on profits and productivity. It may be our single most effective move against inflation. Perhaps a great and unifying improvement in our ethics and basic honesty will so heighten our morale, build our inner strengths, that other nations will respect us all the more for our example and for our determination to uphold the principles of freedom. And if the United States cannot make it up to the next level of civilization, if we cannot survive with a high degree of economic and political freedom, what nation can or will?

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which I hope can be passed in this session. It reads as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach the principles of ethics and citizenship

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "GRANTS FOR TEACHING THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS AND CITIZENSHIP"

"SEC. 813. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and carrying out programs under which students attending public elementary and secondary schools will

be provided instruction in the principles of ethics and citizenship. The content and nature of such instruction shall conform to general standards prescribed by such State agencies.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

SEC. 2. Section 422 of the General Education Provisions Act is amended by inserting after "the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965" the following: "(other than section 813)".

CONSUMER FOOD LABELING ACT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, more than 80 million Americans must be careful of what they eat because of allergies, dietary problems, religious considerations, and other reasons. Everyone has an undeniable right and need to know what is in the food he eats, who made it, how much it really costs, and more.

That is why I am today introducing the Consumer Food Labeling Act. This bill would require the labels on foods and food products to disclose all ingredients; nutritional content; accurate weight data; storage information; true identity of the manufacturer, packer, and distributor; uniform product grades; unit prices; ingredient changes, and it would bar the use of misleading brand names.

It is aimed at closing the still widening gap between the ability of Government to protect consumers and the ability of some segments of the business community to abuse them.

The following is a title-by-title description of the provisions of this legislation:

CONSUMER FOOD LABELING ACT

TITLE I. TRUTH IN FOOD LABELING

Requires food makers to show on their labels all ingredients by percentage, including all additives and preservatives, and by their common or usual names. As many as 80 million Americans must be aware of the food they are eating because of allergies, dietary problems, religious considerations and other reasons. It is presently impossible, thanks to a maze of regulatory exemptions, to tell from a label what is in a food product. The American consumer has an undeniable right and need to know what is in the food he eats.

TITLE II. NUTRITIONAL LABELING

Requires that any packaged consumer food product be labeled by the producer with the following information: (1) nutritional statements including fat content, vitamin and protein value, fats and fatty acids, calories and other nutritional data; (2) the net weight and drained weight of canned or frozen products packed in a liquid medium; (3) the major ingredients by percentage weight of any combination food item. We have been called "a nation of nutritional illiterates." Food labels currently provide little or no information on the nutritional value of the product although this is vital to the consumer's health. Many of the foods Americans eat do not have the nutritional value expected of them. Moreover, existing food labels fail to show the exact proportion of one ingredient to another. Some brands of

combination food items contain more of the major ingredients than others (e.g., some brands of beef stew contain more meat, vegetables, etc. than others).

TITLE III. OPEN DATING PERISHABLE FOOD

Requires that all packaged perishable and semi-perishable foods be prominently labeled to show clearly the date beyond which it should not be sold and the optimum storage conditions at home. It also provides that overage products can be sold but only if they are safe, separated from other items and clearly identified as being beyond the expiration date. There is growing evidence that a significant number of perishable food products offered for sale to the American consumer are overage and may be unwholesome. Open dating information gives consumers personal policing powers over the sale of packaged foods and helps in storing these products at home.

TITLE IV. CONSUMER FOOD GRADING

Requires a uniform system of retail quality grade designations for consumer food products based upon quality, condition and nutritional value. There is currently no consistent and uniform system for determining and labeling the grades of food products. For example, one product may be graded A, B, C, and D, while another is AAAA, AAA and A; hence the two "A" grades are opposites, not equals, but there is no way for the consumer to know.

TITLE V. MARKETING PRACTICES DISCLOSURE

Requires labels on foods, drugs and cosmetics to contain the name and place of business of the true manufacturer, packer and distributor. Its value is two-fold: Most importantly it would aid government, industry and consumers in event of a recall by permitting quick and easy identification. This is now difficult because hundreds of private labels and private brand products on the market do not bear this information. (Bon Vivant vichyssoise was packed under more than 30 different private labels without Bon Vivant's name ever appearing on one of them—a fact which hindered that extensive recall.) Secondly, it would aid consumers in selecting products because they would know who really made the product under the private label. Private label products often tend to be priced lower than their nationally advertised counterparts, although there is frequently no difference between them.

TITLE VI. UNIT PRICING

Requires disclosure by retailers of the unit price of packaged consumer commodities. Individual retail businesses with sales below \$250,000 a year are exempted. The myriad of package sizes makes it extremely difficult for consumers to compare the price of two or more package sizes of the identical product to determine the real cost and the best buy. Recent studies indicate that unit pricing provides valuable, objective price data which can save consumers around 8% on their food bills. Some stores now have unit price information but uniformity and comprehensiveness are lacking.

TITLE VII. NEW INGREDIENT NOTIFICATION

Requires manufacturers to print notices on all food labels that will alert consumers to ingredient changes.

TITLE VIII. MISLEADING BRAND NAMES

Prohibits the use of misleading product brand names. Advertising such names would violate the Federal Trade Commission Act unless the manufacturer can demonstrate that the product lives up to its name.

The following Members are also sponsoring this bill:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, William M. Brodhead, George E. Brown, Jr., Bob Carr,

Cardiss Collins, James C. Corman, Dominick V. Daniels, Ron de Lugo, Thomas Downey, Robert Drinan, Bob Eckhardt, Don Edwards, Dante B. Fascell, Hamilton Fish, Don Fraser, Benjamin Gilman, Gilbert Gude.

Robert Kastenmeier, Edward I. Koch, Clarence D. Long, Ray Madden, George Miller, Richard Nolan, Charles B. Rangel, Thomas Rees, Donald Riegle, Peter Rodino.

Paul Sarbanes, Patricia Schroeder, Stephen Solarz, Fortney H. Stark, Gerry Studds, Frank Thompson, Paul Tsongas, and Antonio Borja Won Pat.

A TRIBUTE TO JOE SINAY

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I take this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to a great American and a personal friend, Mr. Joe Sinay of Los Angeles, who served from 1973 to 1974 as chief barker—president—of the Variety Club of Southern California Tent 25. He was honored by a great number of his friends at a luncheon on Wednesday, January 8, 1975, at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, a luncheon I was honored to attend.

Joe Sinay has accomplished much during his 2-year tenure as chief barker. He inaugurated the Variety Club's first telethon on station KTLA in Los Angeles, an effort which raised more than \$300,000. Moreover, he was instrumental in establishing the electro-limb program for children at the University of California at Los Angeles, under which children who are missing limbs at birth or by accident may receive new ones.

Under Joe Sinay's administration, Tent 25 has raised over \$500,000 for various charitable organizations and activities for the benefit of handicapped and underprivileged children around the world, regardless of race, religion, or national origin.

The Variety Club, under Joe Sinay's leadership, continued some of the outstanding charitable programs it has instituted. The club has established a heart clinic at UCLA; it has set up a "Sunshine Coach" program under which van-sized vehicles are donated to hospitals, schools, and other organizations, which serve children, to transport youngsters. At a hugely successful dinner honoring Dr. Billy Graham and his 25th year in the ministry, Tent 25, working in conjunction with Variety Club International, managed to raise enough money to donate 28 Sunshine Coaches to children all around the world.

Tent 25 has established and supports a Variety Boys Club on the East side of Los Angeles which serves over 3,000 boys from ages 6 to 19. Each year it sends seven of these young men off to college with full scholarships.

It is truly remarkable that Joe Sinay has managed to devote so much energy to Tent 25 of the Variety Club of Southern California and at the same time fulfill other demanding commitments. He is a member of the board of directors of the Friends of Hebrew University, and a member of the board of directors of the Idylwild School of Music and Arts. And,

of course, he has a full-time business of his own.

Tent 25 of the Variety Club is without question among the most effective and dedicated charitable organizations in California, and has accomplished much for which we all should be grateful. Under Joe Sinay's guidance and with his unflagging commitment, Tent 25 has again demonstrated how much can be done when people believe in what they are doing and are willing to work very hard for others. Joe Sinay is a truly great man, and I am honored to count him among my friends.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY BARAJAS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the future of our country belongs to those who can blend passion, reason, and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals of our society. And in our democratic society, we are consistently confronted with an ever-changing challenge to new goals to meet the needs of each succeeding generation.

Those individuals, however, who are content with today, apathetic toward problems and their fellow human beings alike, and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects, do not serve the future, but, instead, serve the past.

Our Nation has been exceedingly fortunate to have been blessed with individuals who are not satisfied with the present, who seek better conditions for their children and their children's children, and who are committed to improving our society.

The California Democratic Central Committee in the 32d Congressional District, on January 18, is honoring those individuals who have made contributions and who have dedicated themselves to meeting the challenges that confront our country. Mr. Tony Barajas is among those few persons who will be commended for their outstanding efforts in working to bring the dreams of the future into reality today.

Mr. Barajas has long been a leader in community affairs in the Harbor Area, and is especially active in the political arena. He has been a member of the influential Mexican-American Democratic Club for 15 years, and ably served as its president for four terms. In addition, Tony has shared his expertise in this area as vice president of the Harbor Area Ethnic Political Coalition.

While he has been active in all Democratic campaigns, Anthony Barajas is being honored for the outstanding work he did in operating the headquarters for the Democratic State Central Committee in the 32d Congressional District during the 1974 election. As cochairperson of the headquarters, Tony volunteered many hours of hard work needed to make things run smoothly and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join the many friends of

Anthony Barajas in thanking him for a job well done.

A SUMMARY OF GOVERNOR REAGAN'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past 8 years, California has been fortunate enough to have one of the most outstanding leaders in America serving as Governor of our State. His notable accomplishments are presently being reviewed by the editors of California's leading newspapers. One of the most outstanding summaries appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner on Thursday, January 2, 1975. I wish to incorporate these remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REAGAN'S RECORD

Gov. Ronald Reagan will turn over the reigns of government to his elected successor next Monday, and become once again Citizen Reagan, a role he has not played since 1966.

To his distinguished career of college student-body president, radio sports announcer, film producer, and narrator for the U.S. Armed Forces, movie actor, film industry official, television host, and articulate spokesman for conservative candidates and causes, Reagan has added 8 illustrious years as California's chief executive.

Rather than retire to his Pacific Palisades home or to his ranch north of Santa Barbara, however, he will immerse himself in activities designed to spread nationwide the admirable gospel of limited government and bureaucratic fiscal restraint.

No one is more capable of propagating these sermons than is Ronald Reagan, and no messages are more imperative to curb greater inflation or relieve business and industrial stagnation.

When he took office as Governor in 1967, Reagan discovered that California was tottering on the brink of insolvency, spending a million dollars more every day than it was collecting in taxes. Through various reforms, he was able to reverse the suicidal spending tide and put the State on a relatively sound, businesslike basis.

His welfare reform measures reversed the pattern of additional thousands of citizens being added each month to the State's welfare rolls. Today there are nearly 400,000 fewer Californians on State welfare, yet the truly needy are receiving a 40-percent increase in benefits. Overall, according to authoritative estimates, the State welfare burden already has diminished by well over a billion dollars.

Reagan's refusal to knuckle under to the threats and demands of riotous anarchists on the State's campuses helped restore order to our institutions of higher learning.

His law enforcement task force recommended some 100 anticrime reforms—a

few major ones, such as the reinstatement of capital punishment for specific major crimes, fortunately were adopted.

California property owners received some needed relief as a result of Reagan's tax reforms.

State assistance to public schools was doubled to assure a basic quality education for every pupil enrolled in public schools throughout the State, no matter how poor his school district.

In a memorable 1964 speech, candidate Reagan told a nationwide television audience:

If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.

The Governor's two terms at the State's helm have been more than justified. In personally doing all that could be done, often against hostile, partisan opposition, Reagan at least partially realized his dream of having California set a standard of economy and efficiency that few contemporary American governments have realized.

Whatever the future holds for him, Reagan's brand of responsible leadership was a fresh breath in an era when profligate government spending was and is a widespread, pathological obsession. His integrity, dynamic personal appeal, clear thinking, and scrupulous courage have been both beneficial and inspiring.

Citizen Reagan has our sincere best wishes for continued good fortune in his future endeavors, wherever the path may lead. His rare and outstanding personal qualities will be genuinely missed from the ranks of responsible helmsmanship.

THE EMERGENCY JOBS AND UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974: HOPE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in today's gloomy headlines about the depressed state of the Nation's economy, one bright note can be found in the immediate success of the emergency jobs program in alleviating the misery of unemployment for thousands of jobless American workers.

I was privileged to introduce the legislation creating the emergency jobs program, and I am thankful for the overwhelming support that my colleagues in the 93d Congress extended to this proposal.

When I introduced the Emergency Jobs Act on September 11, 1974, I noted in my introductory remarks that:

Unemployment statistics are faceless entities to economists; they are a cold reality to an unemployed father struggling to keep his family together after he has been laid off his job or cannot find work through no fault of his own.

The January 11 edition of the New York Times contained a heartwarming article that did, in fact, put a human

face on one unemployment statistic. The benefits of the emergency jobs program for one family in West Islip, N.Y., have been translated into very human terms, and I am sure my colleagues will be as deeply touched, as I was, by the account of how hope and pride has been restored to this fine American family as a result of the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974. I will insert the article from the New York Times at the conclusion of my remarks.

Although Congress can be justifiably proud of the work it has done to relieve the misery of unemployment, it is apparent that much more work remains to be done. The same edition of the New York Times contained another article that described an incident in Atlanta, Ga., in which 3,000 unemployed job applicants broke down the doors of of Atlantic Civic Center to apply for 225 newly created public service jobs. I ask unanimous consent to have this second article included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The account of the Atlanta incident is compelling evidence of the need for the Appropriations Committee to act quickly on fully funding the emergency jobs program. Of the \$2.5 billion authorized by the legislation, \$875 million has been appropriated. I hope that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will agree that the remainder of the authorization needs to be appropriated as quickly as possible to create these much-needed public service jobs.

When the 93d Congress acted on the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 it took a very important first step to confront the growing problem of unemployment. Now that this first step has been taken, it is up to the 94th Congress to take up the banner on behalf of jobless Americans. I hope that this Congress will study the emergency jobs program with a view to possible expansion of the program, and also to determine whether this program should be transformed into a permanent program to aid the Nation's unemployed.

The articles follow:

LAI-D-OFF FOREMAN ON L.I. IS "SAVED" BY U.S. JOB ACT

(By Pranay Gupte)

WEST ISLIP, L.I., Jan. 10.—Sixty-six days after he was laid off as a \$16,000-a-year factory foreman, Joe Guerrero happily, but nervously, went back to work today—as a \$7,700-a-year security guard in the school his children attend.

"This job has saved me," Mr. Guerrero said as he drove to West Islip High School here. "It will help pay our bills."

Although he was eager to get to the school, Mr. Guerrero drove slowly because, he said, he could not afford a traffic ticket.

The 46-year-old father of three was among 125 men and women hired this morning by Suffolk County with funds made available under the new Federal Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act.

The \$875-million national program went into effect today, and Suffolk County, with \$10.3 million, received one of the largest grants of any suburban county in the country to put unemployed persons in public-service jobs.

According to Federal officials in Washington, Suffolk's contingent of 125 persons is the biggest group to become public em-

ployed under the new program, which President Ford signed into law last Saturday. Nassau County today hired 30 unemployed people, while New York City has just started interviewing prospective employees.

The emergency-jobs program supplements the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, which Congress adopted in December, 1973. Thus far \$875-million has been appropriated for a temporary emergency public-service-employment program of 13 months' duration so that jobs in communities with a population of more than 200,000, and with an unemployment rate of at least 6 per cent can be generated swiftly.

The new program becomes Title VI of the 1973 act, which was the first special revenue-sharing bill passed by Congress that in effect gave local governments power to act to fight unemployment.

"NIGHT OF AGONY" ENDS

The day started early for Mr. Guerrero and ended, as he put it, a "two-month-old night of agony." His wife, Mary, wanted to fix him a good breakfast, but he wanted only a cup of coffee.

"He's been so depressed," Mrs. Guerrero told a visitor. "He's held a job continuously since he was 17 and he really could not believe that they would fire him. All of a sudden his world came crashing down."

For nearly 20 years, Mr. Guerrero worked with the Dellwood Milk Company at its factory in Jamaica, Queens—the same company at which his father had worked for 42 years. Sixty-six days ago, he was laid off and the plant was shut, reportedly because of a Federal Government decision that Dellwood, which made Sealtest ice cream engaged in monopolistic practices.

At 8:45 A.M., Mr. Guerrero showed up at the Suffolk County Center in Hauppauge, where, with the 124 other new employees, he participated in an orientation seminar given by Lou V. Tempera, the county's Commissioner of Labor.

"At a time when thousands are being put out of work on account of bad economic conditions, we are putting you back to work," Mr. Tempera told his audience, reminding it that, for every person selected 15 to 20 had been interviewed earlier this week by his staff. "Suffolk is suffering economically in a bad way, but we want you to know that government here is committed to fighting unemployment. This is only a start."

Suffolk, with a population of 1.25 million, was until last year, one of the fastest-growing counties in the country. But the national economic down-swing has hurt it and now it has more than 27,000 people listed as unemployed—a county record, according to John V. N. Klein, the County Executive. With the new Federal grants 1,200 people will receive public service jobs by spring.

They are being placed in clerical and security jobs and in professional positions, Mr. Klein said, and salaries will range from \$5,500 to \$10,000 a year. Arthur Bergmann, Suffolk's chief deputy county executive, said jobs were being offered with state and county agencies as well as school districts.

HARD TIMES AT CHRISTMAS

"We have given priority in our hiring to those who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits and others in great hardship," Mr. Klein said. "This is the most significant employment program in Suffolk's history."

Mr. Guerrero listened carefully. After he had filled in various forms about his background, he set off for West Islip High School.

"What can you say about a nightmare?" he said. "I did not mind so much not being able to get things for myself. But it really hurt me that at Christmas I couldn't get my wife and children the things I'd wanted

to get for them. It was a bleak holiday season."

At the school, Mr. Guerrero went to see William Gereck, the administrative assistant, who explained to him his new job—Monday through Friday, 3 P.M. to 12 midnight. Mr. Guerrero's paychecks, Mr. Gereck told him, would come from the county under the employment program. "Welcome," Mr. Gereck said.

For the first time in the day, Mr. Guerrero grinned.

3,000 SEEKS JOBS IN ATLANTA MELEE

(By B. Drummond Ayres, Jr.)

ATLANTA, Jan. 10.—Several persons were bruised and cut here early today when 3,000 unemployed men and women, most of them young blacks, surged into the Atlanta Civic Center to apply for 225 newly created public service jobs.

Extra policemen and Mayor Maynard Jackson were summoned to help restore calm. Some people in the crowd had been standing in a chill rain all night in hopes of finding work in a city that is in the full squeeze of the recession.

"What's happening here," the Mayor said as order was restored, "is what's happening all over the country—a desperation for jobs."

Over-all unemployment in the Atlanta area has risen to 7.5 per cent. But unemployment among blacks, who make up more than half the downtown population, now stands at 9.2 per cent.

Among Atlanta's black teen-agers, one of every four is unemployed.

Nationally, the over-all unemployment was 7.1 per cent as of Dec. 1. The rate for blacks over-all was 12.2 per cent. The rate for teen-agers nationally was 18.3 per cent.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The 225 jobs offered today were created with the help of funds made available by the Federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The work offered was mainly in construction and general maintenance, with wage ranging from \$114 to \$174 a week. Similar public service work programs are being established in a number of other cities in the United States.

Rain was still pouring, and the crowd of unemployed, at least 95 per cent youthful blacks, was thoroughly soaked and chilled when the doors to the civic center were opened at 8:30 this morning.

There was an immediate surge. Plate glass door panels gave way. At least three persons were cut, one seriously enough to require emergency room treatment. Others in the crowd were bruised in the crush.

"What's happening? I'm a veteran!" one job-seeker cried out. His leg had been cut.

Under the terms of the employment act, hiring priority must be given veterans and persons out of work more than 30 days.

DOUBTFUL JOB-SEEKER

Another job-seeker, 23-year-old Willie Reed, told newsmen that he had lost his warehouse job six months ago and was doubtful that he would be one of the 225 persons awarded jobs once officials had studied all the applications.

"But I had to come," he added "We've got to eat. Yesterday, I went to 10 different places looking for a job."

Sherrie Stroud, 21, another applicant, said she had been out of work for more than three months.

"I never expected to see this many people down here," she added. "I kind of doubt my chances now."

Mayor Jackson urged the job-seekers to write their Congressmen to let them know that Atlanta needs more jobs.

"I'm sorry if any of you got caught in the door," he said, "but please bear with us. We're doing our dead-level best."

MEMBERS' OFFICE ALLOWANCES
AND FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation to provide for full House review and debate on any future increases in Members' allowances.

In 1973 and 1974, Members of the House of Representatives received increases in several of the allowances they are given for the operation of their Washington and district offices. These included accounts for stationery, telephones and district office space rentals. Many Members, particularly new Members such as myself, may not have been aware of these increases or how they had come about. Some may have assumed that they had been voted on in the previous Congress. Actually, however, that Congress had passed legislation placing the full responsibility for reviewing and authorizing such increases on a small portion of their Members, the House Administration Committee. When the increases were approved, the remainder of the House membership was simply notified through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These accounts, of course, are used to communicate with and provide services to congressional constituents and increases may indeed have been needed in order to maintain the level of services. The fact remains, however, that while much was being said about controlling and cutting Federal spending, we were resorting to a "back door" method of increasing our own demands on the Federal tax dollar. While the programs and budgets of executive agencies were being carefully scrutinized on the House floor, we were sidestepping responsibility for our own costs.

We should hardly be surprised therefore at the public anger and cynicism which has greeted the disclosure in the media of how increases in accounts were obtained. The people's confidence has been severely tested by Watergate, the energy crisis, and the worsening economic situation. They are looking desperately to their elected officials for open and responsible leadership and they have a right to be disappointed when they find it lacking.

During the 93d Congress we enacted the Budget Control and Impoundment Act to enable the Congress to reassume and exercise proper authority over the fiscal policies of this Nation. However, simply gaining the means of handling these responsibilities is not enough. We must also show the American people that we have the will to shoulder the burdens. And I can think of no better place to begin than in the area of our own expenses. In this difficult economic period, there should be no increases in either the legislative appropriations or any other segment of the Federal budget without full justification and debate. If increases in Members' allowances are indeed necessary, then we should let the American

people know why and should fully and openly accept the responsibility for them.

As Members of Congress today, we hold far more than a public office; we hold a public trust. In my opinion it is imperative for us to do all in our power to restore and maintain that trust and that is the reason I am introducing legislation today to return the decisionmaking power on Members' allowances to the full House membership where it belongs and to assure in the future full debate on any increases. The legislation follows, and I hope that my colleagues will join in sponsoring and supporting it.

MARITIME AUTHORIZATION BILL
VETO

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1975, the President vetoed H.R. 13296, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration. This is the first time that I can remember in all these years that the Maritime Administration authorization bill has been vetoed. The President vetoed it because he found unacceptable the amendment insisted upon by the Senate which would require the Federal Government to reimburse U.S.-flag fishing vessel owners for damage to their equipment by foreign-flag vessels. This amendment, of course, is nongermane and was not supported by any hearing record.

The House passed H.R. 13296 on June 5, 1974. For reasons unknown to me, the Senate withheld action on the bill until the closing moments of the 93d Congress and sent the bill back to the House festooned with nongermane amendments which had not been subject to the hearing process. Two of these three amendments were clearly nongermane, the other amendment was arguably germane. Thus, we found ourselves in conference the last week of the session, at which time we reluctantly agreed to the arguable germane amendment and the so-called fishing gear amendment. The Senate was adamant on this fishing gear amendment so we accepted it with several modifications. The other nongermane amendment was dropped.

The House conferees argued vigorously against the practice of encumbering simple bills with nongermane amendments unsupported by hearing records. However, the Senate was adamant on this fishing gear amendment. As a consequence, I found myself on the floor of the House, in practically the closing hour of the 93d Congress, explaining and arguing in favor of this nongermane amendment. This whole practice of encumbering our bills with nongermane amendments puts the House Members in a very difficult position, especially in the closing days of a Congress. It seems to me that this is the type of

congressional legislative practice which is in crying need of reform. In this case, the addition of this nongermane amendment resulted in a Presidential veto, which means that both the House and Senate have to push the fiscal year 1975 authorization for maritime programs through the entire legislative process once again.

At the time of the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 13296, I discussed this matter at some length. My remarks in this regard are set out below:

STATEMENT OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 13296, AFTER ALL NONGERMANE ISSUES
HAVE BEEN RESOLVED

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the conference report on H.R. 13296.

On June 4, 1974, the House passed H.R. 13296, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1975 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. The bill has long since been approved by the House of Representatives and these maritime authorization items are meritorious, so I will not attempt to justify them again now.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise one very important point concerning this whole process which I think at least needs comment. The House sent H.R. 13296 to the Senate on June 4, 1974. For whatever reasons, the Senate did not act on this until last week, when it was then sent back to us on Friday last. This simple authorization of appropriations bill was festooned with three amendments by the Senate—two were clearly nongermane and the third was at least arguably germane. This latter amendment also was valid on its merits. The other two amendments raised many questions in our minds with respect to their substance—and mind you, Mr. Speaker, there was no hearing record to support any of these three amendments.

As a consequence, I was forced to ask for a conference with the Senate—so we found ourselves the last several days of the Congress sitting down trying to puzzle out the substantive merits of several of these amendments with no hearing record to aid us. Naturally, the Senators resented our questioning their amendments, and we resented being faced with these issues at the very end of the Congress—and being faced with the further embarrassment of probably being called to task on the House Floor when we presented the conference report with nongermane amendments.

In conference, the Senate finally agreed to recede from one nongermane amendment; we agreed with their amendment which we considered to be germane; and we modified the substance of the other amendment.

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that I consider this whole procedure a very poor way to legislate. This whole authorization process should have been completed and enacted at least by July. Hopefully, under the new budget procedures, this will be so. The House was in ferment for almost the entire 93d Congress with respect to House reform, and never once did any of the reformers, or the House itself, address itself to such important matters as this. This whole business of holding bills and draping them with nongermane amendments which create problems over here, is in crying need of reform. I would hope that we can address ourselves to this very poor procedural process in hopes of improving it.

As I just mentioned, the authorization bill itself is meritorious and the amendment to establish a Great Lakes regional office, and the amendment to provide loans for recompensing fishing gear damaged by foreign vessels is meritorious. Thus, I strongly urge the House to support the conference report on H.R. 13296.

U.S. GUARANTEES IN THE
MIDDLE EAST

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, almost a decade ago I suggested that consideration might be given to providing Israel with a formal treaty guarantee of Israel's borders by the United States, possibly within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Israel's spectacular successes in the 1967 war rendered any discussion of such U.S. treaty obligations unrealistic because there was no way to answer the question of what Israeli borders the United States would be guaranteeing.

Recently there has been renewed discussion of the possibility of American security guarantees in the Middle East. In a Time magazine interview President Ford was quoted as saying that such a commitment could not be seriously considered unless there was some further progress toward peace. For this statement he was criticized in some quarters. Other observers recognized the fact that Israel has made no request for such a guarantee and that the question is therefore not a live one.

Nonetheless, the question of whether a treaty relationship between the United States and Israel might at some point be a major factor in assuring peace in the Middle East will continue to arise. A most intelligent and interesting discussion of this question appears in today's Washington Post, written by Dr. John Lawrence Hargrove, director of studies of the American Society of International Law. The article follows:

GUARANTEERING ISRAEL'S BORDERS

(By John Lawrence Hargrove)

Three years ago, Sen. Fulbright proposed a U.S. security guarantee for Israel. Over a year ago, Secretary Kissinger was willing to entertain the possibility of a formal treaty for this purpose. Thereafter this newspaper endorsed the idea of a U.S. guarantee. It has been the subject of congressional hearings, and is now under public discussion again. It is an idea with an honored place in the history of talk about a Mideast settlement.

The question is: could a U.S. guarantee of Israel's borders have any useful role to play in a settlement itself? And could we afford the cost?

The answer, in my view, is "yes, if"—with the stress on both syllables: if we know what kind of guarantee we are talking about, the conditions under which it would be given, what we would be getting ourselves into, and what the Israelis would be getting out of it. The country is in no mood or position to return to the glory days when, as it now somewhat inaccurately seems, we went about the world passing out military commitments like Hershey bars.

In the overall scheme of a settlement, the intended role of any U.S. guarantee of Israel's borders is clear: to enable Israel to give up Arab territory without giving up military security. Instead of the forcible occupation of Arab lands which Israel has been using since 1967 in an effort to protect her own territory and compel a settlement, the idea would be to substitute a "collective self-defense" arrangement with the United

States. Now, to many Israelis it is not clear that such a substitution would, in fact, render them any more secure than the present arrangement, despite the latter's terrible dangers. "So," they ask, "why take the risk?"

The answer at bottom is that "collective self-defense" against armed attack is a concept sanctified by the U.N. Charter and in principle legally and politically unassailable, even if now somewhat unfashionable. The Charter was seen by its framers as an effort to apply lessons learned from the catastrophic territorial aggressions of the interwar period and World War II. By the same token, governments (whatever may be their own conduct records) and almost unanimously profess to regard the Charter as having ruled out seizure of the other fellow's territory as a means of settling even the gravest of disputes.

It is true that governments (as distinguished from government speech writers) are not thought to be really much moved on matters like the Middle East by such high flown considerations of legal rights and wrongs. Yet the widespread perception of Israel as on the wrong side of this fundamental issue of principle—territorial integrity—has been an important catalyst in the steady decline of her global political position as the years since 1967 dragged by without settlement. This deterioration was well advanced, among developing countries even before the threat of a cutoff of Arab oil in 1973 made latter-day true believers in the Charter out of some of the Europeans. And it continued despite the fact that Security Council Resolution 242 (a 1967 achievement of American diplomacy which could hardly be duplicated today) makes Israel's obligation to withdraw conditional upon Arab respect for her sovereignty and territory. This same perception of Israel, as in continuing violation of literally the basic ground-rule of international life, has been used to great political advantage by the Soviet Union since 1967, notwithstanding its own brutal invasion of a small and weak neighbor during the same period. And it was an axiom of the anti-Israel, pro-PLO advocacy in the recent U.N. General Assembly which, along with the Arab deliberations at Rabat, produced a further erosion of Israel's political position.

So there is every reason why we as Israel's chief protagonist should be thinking harder about ways to place Israel's security on a legally and politically, as well as militarily, more tenable footing—even without our own addiction to oil and the twin spectres of Soviet aggrandizement and possible great-power confrontation to goad us toward a settlement. For this purpose a U.S.-Israel security guarantee may indeed be useful.

But an American guarantee must be of the right kind.

First, since the *sine qua non* is inducing Israel to withdraw, it must give Israel reliable assurance of physical security. This means that it must commit the United States to act alone if necessary, without either the approval or participation of other countries, if any, that might join in the guarantee. It means also that the guarantee must be in the form of a treaty obligation, for any legally weaker undertaking on our part would not be sufficiently attractive to the Israelis. Israel has had enough experience with tough-talking but non-binding multilateral declarations to know not to trust them any farther than she can throw the Egyptian army. The United States and a number of Europeans made such a declaration in 1957, in the aftermath of the Suez crisis, with respect to maintaining freedom of passage through the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba. Nasser's ineffectually challenged closure of the Straits 10 years later precipitated the June War.

Further, a U.S.-Israel treaty must be precisely tailored to the job at hand: protecting Israel against armed attack. A commitment

to intervene militarily to enforce aspects of a Middle East settlement not directly related to territorial security from external threat—such as agreed arrangements respecting the Palestinian population, or obligations to refrain from bellicose propaganda—would be legally wrong and politically foolish. The British learned this lesson in the 1960 London-Zurich agreements setting up an independent Cyprus, which appeared (to Turkey at least) to give the latter a right to use force to maintain internal constitutional arrangements regulating relations between the Turkish minority and the Greek majority on the island. Those arrangements broke down, and Turkey's lonely assertion of a right of forcible intervention was an important component of the recurrent Cyprus crises of the ensuing period. It culminated in last year's Turkish invasion and a major debacle for U.S. policy.

Nevertheless, the treaty should be concluded only as part of a comprehensive peace settlement, not as an interim measure. This is mainly because we must know in precise geographic terms what we are committed to defend—and there will be no accepted definition of borders for Israel except as a part of a settlement. It is unthinkable that the United States would agree now to assist Israel in defending against an attack on her forces wherever they may be, making us a co-participant in the occupation. And to agree, in advance of a settlement, to defend Israel behind the pre-June-War lines established in 1949 would be equally untenable. For one thing, this would amount to throwing away a major chip in the bargaining for a settlement. More fundamentally, it would commit the United States to involvement in an anti-guerrilla operation in the Middle East, since it is only through a general settlement that the underlying causes of the sporadic acts of paramilitary violence that Israel has suffered since 1949 will be dealt with, if at all. We should know by now—and Israel presumably does know—that for some time to come we would be hard put to sustain another open-ended limited war to defend someone else's territory.

Moreover, we should insist, if we are to become involved in guaranteeing a settlement, that it be put in effect under the aegis of the United Nations and that it wisely exploit the resources of that surprisingly resilient organization. For thereby a measurably greater likelihood of stability can be achieved: Through Security Council enactment a settlement can be raised to the level of an obligation under the U.N. Charter, less easily reneged on than a mere contract between Israel and the Arabs. It can be guaranteed by U.N. forces such as those now patrolling the cease-fire. By these and other measures, responsibility for the settlement can to some degree be distributed among the world community rather than the superpowers alone. And at the same time, Security Council enactment of a settlement provides the most acceptable vehicle for joint participation by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in a settlement guarantee, which is by no means inconsistent with a bi-lateral U.S.-Israel treaty.

Finally, a guarantee treaty should not contribute to setting in concrete any U.S.-Soviet polarity in the Middle East. Even after a peace settlement, the area may tend to become carved up between two complexes of military alliances—one involving Israel and the United States, the other the Soviet Union and some of Israel's Arab neighbors. An outright U.S.-Israel mutual defense treaty might tempt the Soviets, for example, with their traditional dream of permanent establishment in the Middle East, to look for a propitious moment to press for escalation of their present vague "treaty of friendship and cooperation" with Egypt to the same level. Accordingly, an American guarantee to Israel might well be accompanied by a declaration of intention to defend the territory of her

Arab neighbors against the unlawful use of force, at their request, and an offer to conclude treaties with them to that effect.

In sum, a U.S.-Israel security treaty should be seriously considered as a useful component of a Middle East peace. But the wrong treaty could well be worse than no treaty at all.

A CHEERFUL NOTE

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, in these times when there is so little good news, it was refreshing to read the editorial "A Cheerful Note" in the Danville Register on January 3.

The points covered in the editorial are self-explanatory, but the prospects to which it refers are encouraging to those who recognize the tremendous problems involved in feeding not only our people, but those in other nations of the world.

I commend the reading of this editorial to the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

A CHEERFUL NOTE

Looking for some good news amid too much that is bad? Well, take a look at the crop report for winter wheat planting. It's up six per cent to 55 million acres, the most since 1953.

The Crop Reporting Board of the U.S. Department of Agriculture said in December that this planting could produce a record 1.6 billion bushels, which would be an increase of 15 per cent over the 1974 peak of 1.3 billion bushels.

Winter wheat accounts for about three-fourths of the U.S. bread grain. If it is planted in the fall, lies mostly dormant in winter and then matures for harvesting in the spring and summer. It grows mostly in the Great Plains area and give that part of the country the name of America's breadbasket.

The total wheat crop has not been estimated. The 1974 production of spring wheat—the kind grown in our part of the country—was about 402 million bushels. Thus, if the 1975 crop holds about the same, total wheat production this year would be about two billion bushels.

Official estimates of the harvest forecast an average 28.8 bushels an acre, compared to 26.5 bushels an acre for the 1974 crop.

The significance—and the good news—in the prospects for the wheat crop this year—is that the harvest will enable the U.S. to rebuild its reserves to a safe margin to see us over the rough spots in meeting domestic needs and filling current commitments abroad.

American grain has been one of our major exports. It has helped our economy, even though sales and giveaways abroad raised the price of bread too fast and too high to suit consumers.

Those sales to the Soviet Union were far from the only drain on our grain crops. It is worth noting that the U.S. provided 84 per cent of all food contributed to needy nations and peoples over the past 8 years.

Since India shot Bangladesh out of Pakistan in 1972, our own nation has provided a third of the food sent in to avert famine. And another 250,000 tons of wheat and rice were committed to Bangladesh last year.

India, sometimes scornful of U.S. assistance, has received more help from us than from any other nation since it became independent. India still looks to the U.S. for

donations of grain and other supplies to the amount of nearly \$100 million a year.

Along with our grains and other foods, the American people and their government have given vast quantities of fertilizer where most needed. In the crop year that will end with the mid-year, the U.S. will have given 329,000 tons of fertilizer to help grow crops in food-short nations even while experiencing shortages of certain fertilizers in our own corn belt.

Our grain crops and our record of helping food-short nations even when they bite the hand that feeds them is one that will stand unchallenged by any other nation on earth. It is and should be a source of some satisfaction and a justification for confidence in ourselves and the future.

THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker in recent weeks the New York Times has printed two very thoughtful letters concerning the United Nations. The first appeared December 28, 1974, and was written by Roger N. Baldwin. The letter was headed "The U.N. Approaches Its Goal," and Mr. Baldwin points out that:

The Assembly was never intended to have other but the moral force of its recommendations; they are deliberately unenforceable, and should be if such a world forum is to operate freely with nobody compelled to follow its advice. . . . It can fairly be asserted that only by satisfying the claims of national identity can the United Nations function as a universal agency for mankind. For the first time the General Assembly is close to that goal; it is stronger for it. Any hope for disarmament, the surrender of sovereignty for common services and law to settle conflicts or assure human rights depends on the freedom of states and their sense of security. Only as the smaller states get that sense will they make common cause with the powers who with their allies so long controlled them.

The second letter, authored by Edward Ramberg, Secretary of the U.N. Subcommittee of the Friends Peace Committee appeared in the Times January 6, 1975. He, too, commented on Ambassador Scall's December 6 U.N. speech critical of General Assembly action. Mr. Ramberg's letter is printed below, immediately after the text of Mr. Baldwin's letter:

THE U.N. APPROACHES ITS GOAL

TO THE EDITOR: Your editorial of Dec. 13 on the erosion of the United Nations by the "irresponsible behavior" in the General Assembly of an "automatic majority" of the new African-Asian states, assisted by the Communist bloc, suggests its survival is at stake.

Permit an old hand around the United Nations, since its origin to dissent. I submit that the new "automatic majority" far better fits the concept of what the U.N. was intended to be than its previous character when the Western states played so dominant a role in half the present membership and with racist tones of white supremacy. Human rights in the U.N., however defined, rest on equality.

What should the General Assembly be unless an association of equal sovereign states now for the first time representing the whole

world? How else can it function except by majority vote? The Assembly was never intended to have other but the moral force of its recommendations; they are deliberately unenforceable, and should be if such a world forum is to operate freely with nobody compelled to follow its advice.

Of course it was wrong for the "automatic majority" to limit debate and suspend South Africa; but good sense does not prevail over such passions as our nationalist era arouses. Recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the voice of the stateless Palestinians, however lawless its character, was inescapable after its recognition by every Arab state. It was the U.N. itself that created a Palestinian state which the Arab states blocked by their war on Israel. Was the Assembly irresponsible?

It can fairly be asserted that only by satisfying the claims of national identity can the United Nations function as a universal agency for mankind. For the first time the General Assembly is close to that goal; it is stronger for it. Any hope for disarmament, the surrender of sovereignty for common services and law to settle conflicts or assure human rights depends on the freedom of states and their sense of security. Only as the smaller states get that sense will they make common cause with the powers who with their allies so long controlled them.

Mark Twain once observed that few things in history happen at the right time. Plainly it has been the wrong time for a dis-United Nations to unite the world in the face of an unchecked arms race, a divisive cold war, a colonial revolution and fear for national security. It is a miracle we have got so far.

ROGER N. BALDWIN,
New York, Dec. 18, 1974.

THE U.N.: MORE REPRESENTATIVE TODAY

TO THE EDITOR: The address of Mr. Scall, the chief United States delegate to the U.N., on Dec. 6 to the General Assembly of the U.N. criticized what he deems ill-considered and one-sided actions by the voting majority of the General Assembly, made up primarily by the developing nations. He would rather—who would not?—have the statements issuing from the General Assembly represent true expressions of consensus of the entire world.

This would demand, however, a degree of restraint by the present majority which, Mr. Scall chooses to forget, the United States failed to exercise when it controlled a majority of United Nations votes. When we regret actions excluding South Africa from effective participation, we must remember the decades during which the United States successfully maneuvered to exclude the most populous country in the world, mainland China, from the U.N. When we object to unilateral actions by the present Assembly, can we forget that, in 1950, the United Nations were made a party to the war against North Korea, clearly in direct opposition to the Soviet Union and its partners?

Mr. Scall regrets particularly that the present unilateral actions tend to erode the support for the United Nations in the United States. While this is true, it is even more true that the unfortunate emphasis placed in the American press on his criticism is likely to serve as justification for a further withdrawal of support.

This would be most regrettable. The United Nations today is far more representative of the world's people than it was when it could be counted on to do the bidding of the United States Government. As the British delegate pointed out in the Assembly debate, the majorities which backed the actions of the Assembly arousing Mr. Scall's displeasure are in fact enormous. They do represent large majorities, of populations as well as of states, and it is proper and desirable that we should listen to these majorities. Our great comparative wealth must not delude us that we

can make "Projects Independence" viable in the field of food and environmental conservation any more than in the field of energy, even if we disregard the ethical demands which the brotherhood of mankind makes on us.

All of us are, in effect, interdependent inhabitants of a common spaceship, and must be prepared to adjust our wants and needs to those of our fellow travelers. Furthermore, as believers in democracy at home we should be ready to recognize the extensive rights which democracy yields to the majority at the global level. If we can achieve this degree of objectivity we shall support the U.N. and utilize its great potential in dealing with the major problems faced by the world.

EDWARD RAMBERG.

PHILADELPHIA, December 18, 1974.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSERVING FUEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's energy problems are a source of concern to all of us in Government and in private lives and we have heard many suggestions for dealing with this situation.

I recently received letters from young people in my district which contain their suggestions for solving the energy problem and at this time I enter into the RECORD four of them:

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I am writing this letter to you because we were assigned by Social Studies teacher to write our Congressman a letter.

I am thinking about a suggestion about the energy crisis. I think that if you have a check like every month on how much people use up of their electricity, heat, gas, etc. . . . and find out like who goes over their limit of gas, etc. . . . and let them know that they have done a bad thing. You can also maybe start an ad in the paper and have their name in the paper under "energy wasters."

Sincerely yours,

GWEN ROSEMAN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In relation to the oil-gas shortage, I think we should start rationing gasoline. After all there are other ways of transportation. We have buses or should I say trolleys that are run with electricity, and there are now nuclear power plants to make the electricity.

I think it is time we stop letting the Arabs get away with so much before they "have us over a barrel."

Yours truly,

MIKE ANGERT.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you for a homework assignment. The assignment is to write to my Congressman about any issue pertinent to present day.

I have decided to make a suggestion about the energy crisis. Find, every month, the people who have exceeded a certain amount of gas, electricity, etc. and print their names in one or more newspapers labeling them as "energy hogs."

Incidentally thank you for the flag that flew over the Capitol Building that you presented to my Scout Troop 53.

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY McHALE.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I am an eighth grade student at Fel's Junior High School. In So-

cial Studies we had an assignment to write a letter to our Congressman, Senator or President, and to write about a problem that we don't like. I chose the problem about the government complaining about conserving energy when they are letting stores open on Sunday. Stores use a lot of electricity and open 7 days a week isn't helping the matter. I would like to know your opinion on this subject if you have time. I would really appreciate it. So thank you for reading this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CAROL SAMPSON.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR R. DOUGLAS STUART

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most respected citizens, my constituent, R. Douglas Stuart, passed on recently in Lake Forest, Ill., at the age of 88.

Doug Stuart's business career was with the Quaker Oats Co., where he served during his younger years as a laborer and in many training positions, later rising to become chairman of this large and public-oriented company.

In addition to his highly successful business career, Doug Stuart participated in the civic, political, and public life of our Nation. His special interest in young people resulted in outstanding service to the Boy Scouts of America, where he served on the national executive committee and as president of its Chicago council.

Doug Stuart participated actively in the Republican Party at virtually all levels, and his political activity culminated in service as Treasurer of the Republican National Committee from 1948 to 1953.

Mr. Speaker, R. Douglas Stuart attained his most honored role in our Nation as our U.S. Ambassador to Canada following his appointment by President Eisenhower in 1953, and continuing until he resigned the post in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to Ambassador Stuart's great public, civic, and business attainments, he was most importantly an exemplary citizen of our great Nation. He set a standard which all Americans admire—and which many will strive to emulate.

Faithful and devoted to his wife, Harriet, to whom he was married for more than 50 years, Doug Stuart loved and nurtured his son and daughters. The effect of this attention to home and family is evidenced by the successful careers of his children: his son, Robert D. Stuart, Jr., now serves as chairman and chief executive officer of the Quaker Oats Co., and until recently represented the State of Illinois on the Republican National Committee; his daughter, Margaret—Mrs. Augustin S. Hart, Jr.—of Lake Forest, serves as president of the Lake County Republican Federation; his daughter, Anne—Mrs. C. B. Batchelder—of Omaha, Nebr., has been Republican national committeewoman for the State of Nebraska, and was recently

the unsuccessful Republican candidate for Lieutenant governor. His daughter, Harriet, of Minneapolis, Minn., is the wife of Edson W. Spencer, president and chief executive officer of Honeywell, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his children, Ambassador Stuart leaves 17 grandchildren and 5 great-grandchildren, all of whom contribute to the prestige of the Stuart family.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to know that in addition to his long and successful life, R. Douglas Stuart continued in an active physical role and enjoyed excellent health until the final hours of his earthly life.

At the funeral services held in the First Presbyterian Church of Lake Forest on Tuesday, January 7, 1975, there were gathered together many of the leading figures of our national, political and economic life. I was privileged to attend the services as a friend of Doug Stuart and his family, as well as his Representative in the U.S. Congress. Also present were our former Congresswoman Marguerite Stitt Church and representatives from Canada and several other foreign nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that we should pause at this period and pay due honor to one of our Nation's great citizens, Ambassador R. Douglas Stuart, and to extend our respect and sympathy to his widow, Harriet, and to all members of his family.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S CONTRIBUTION TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in the 93d Congress, the House approved legislation which would have gradually increased the Government's share of contributions to premium charges under the Federal employees health benefits program to 75 percent. In conference with the Senate, such contributions were reduced to the current 60 percent level.

I am today introducing legislation to accomplish the objective of the original House bill. My bill proposes to increase the Government's contribution to 65 percent in January 1976, to 70 percent in January 1977, and to 75 percent in January 1978.

In addition, the bill also proposes to increase the Government's contributions to premium charges under the Federal employees group life insurance program which has remained unchanged since the insurance law's inception 20 years ago. It proposes to increase the employer's share of premium from one-third to one-half of the charges, thereby sharing equally with the employee the costs of his group life insurance coverage.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will consider the relative merits of this legislation at the earliest practicable date.

INTRODUCTION OF EMERGENCY
HOMEOWNERS' RELIEF ACT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce today a proposed Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act of 1975. Basically, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to enter into assistance agreements with homeowners having difficulty making their mortgage payments under current economic conditions due either to recent unemployment or to a reduction or shift in employment which results in a serious drop in income.

I believe that a review of the following facts will demonstrate that there is a need to activate such an emergency program as soon as possible.

GNP declined by an estimated 2 percent in 1974 compared with 1973—in dollars of constant purchasing power. The economy is now in a recession of unpredictable depth and duration. The unemployment rate has already risen from its 1973 low point of 4.5 to 7.1 percent in December 1974, and it is expected to rise to higher levels as we feel the adverse effects of sharp declines in residential construction, automobile manufacturing, and other activities.

Mortgage payments are relatively high in relation to income and savings for millions of homeowner families. This burden is felt particularly by young workers who acquired their homes in recent years at high prices with mortgages at high interest rates. Unemployment rates among this group will be above average, and their savings are too small to permit them to keep up their mortgage payments for any extended period of unemployment. Heating and other utility costs rose by 19 percent in the Consumer Price Index between November 1973 and November 1974, further adding to the burden of moderate-income homeowners.

For millions of homeowners of all ages the equity in their homes represents their greatest asset. Furthermore, many of them would have to pay more for housing at today's inflated prices and rents if they were forced to live elsewhere. Although many mortgages are insured today, they are insured to protect the lender-mortgagee against loss, not the homeowner mortgagor.

In addition, to the losses incurred by individual homeowners if massive foreclosures take place, you must add the losses to lenders and to the entire economy which are likely if an attempt is made to liquidate literally hundreds of thousands of mortgages in the current depressed housing market.

There are some 45 million owner-occupied homes, including about 35 million on which mortgage loans are outstanding. The mortgage foreclosure rate on all properties for the first three-quarters of 1974 was only about 0.4 of 1 percent, according to a quarterly index published by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This rate was essentially unchanged from 1973. The delinquency rate on 1-to-4

family properties, which indicates the movement of further foreclosure rates, however, rose significantly in the third quarter of 1974. It increased from 4.01 percent on June 30 to 4.23 percent on September 30.

The rate for seriously delinquent loans, those with two or more payments past due, was at a near-record high of 1.2 percent. The number of seriously delinquent loans in September 1974 was approximately 420,000. Since delinquency rate increases tend to lag behind unemployment increases by one to two quarters, a big jump can be expected by mid-1975. If the rate rises to 1.5 percent, about 525,000 families would be in peril of losing their homes.

The mortgage foreclosure rate published quarterly by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board reflects foreclosures of all types of mortgaged properties, but is bound to reflect the movement of 1-to-4 family residential property foreclosures, since such properties represent by far the majority of mortgaged properties. Starting with 1970, the FHLBB foreclosure rate has been as follows:

Foreclosure rate in percent of mortgaged properties	
Period:	
1970	0.344
1971	0.380
1972	0.411
1973	0.405
1974, 1st quarter	0.397
1974, 2d quarter	0.421
1974, 3d quarter (preliminary)	0.400

If the percentage should rise to 0.5 percent, as it is likely to do if current trends continue unabated, it would probably reflect 175,000 foreclosures of homes. A strong case then can be made for providing an emergency program to counteract this trend toward an increasing number of foreclosed property sales in an already depressed housing market.

The text of the bill is attached:

H.R. —

A bill to authorize temporary assistance to help defray mortgage payments on homes owned by persons who are temporarily unemployed or whose incomes have been significantly reduced as the result of adverse economic conditions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Homeowners' Relief Act."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Nation is in a severe recession and that the sharp downturn in economic activity has driven large numbers of workers into unemployment and has reduced the incomes of many others;

(2) as a result of these adverse economic conditions the capacity of many homeowners to continue to make mortgage payments has deteriorated and the delinquency rate on home mortgages is increasing rapidly; and

(3) many of these homeowners can retain their homes with temporary financial assistance until economic conditions improve.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to prevent widespread mortgage defaults and the distress-sale of homes resulting from the temporary loss of employment and income by authorizing emergency advances to distressed homeowners to defray mortgage expenses.

EMERGENCY MORTGAGE RELIEF PAYMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to

as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to make repayable emergency mortgage relief payments on behalf of distressed homeowners in accordance with the provisions of this Act when he determines that such action is necessary to avoid foreclosure and that there is a reasonable prospect that the homeowner, with the assistance authorized under this Act, will be able to make the adjustments necessary for a full resumption of mortgage payments. Mortgage relief payments on behalf of any homeowner may be in an amount up to the amount of the principal, interest, taxes, hazard insurance, and mortgage insurance premiums due under a mortgage or mortgages covering a dwelling owned and occupied by the homeowner as his principal residence, but such payments shall not exceed \$375 per month. Mortgage relief payments may be applied toward any unpaid amounts due under the mortgage or mortgages and may be paid in a lump sum, applying the restrictions in the preceding sentence to each month's unpaid amount.

(b) As used in this Act the term "distressed home owner" means one or more individuals who own and occupy a dwelling as a principal residence and whose income has declined by more than 20 percent because of unemployment or other adverse economic conditions.

(c) Mortgage relief payments may be made by the Secretary for a period not exceeding two years, but may be terminated by the Secretary at any time if he determines that the homeowner can resume making mortgage payments in full. The amount of the payments to any distressed homeowner may be increased or decreased during this period to the extent deemed appropriate by the Secretary, subject to the limitations prescribed in subsection (a).

(d) Mortgage relief payments made under this Act shall be repayable by the homeowner upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine and the Secretary may require such security for such repayment as he deems appropriate.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this Act to such other federal agencies, public bodies or agencies, and private entities as he deems appropriate to ensure prompt and efficient implementation of the assistance program authorized by this Act. The Secretary may make payments to cover the administrative costs incurred by any such delegates and by mortgagees holding mortgages with respect to which mortgage relief payments are made. The Secretary may waive any of the requirements and limitations of this Act in cases of extreme hardship.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to establish a revolving fund to provide for (1) mortgage relief payments authorized under this Act; (2) payment of obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (c) of this section; and (3) any other program expenditures, including administrative and nonadministrative expenses. Such revolving fund shall be comprised of (1) repayments, interest income, and any other receipts obtained in connection with mortgage relief payments made under this Act; (2) recoveries under security, subrogation, and other rights; (3) proceeds of the obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsection (c) of this section; and (4) such sums, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated, as may be needed from time to time for the payment of the obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury. Money in the revolving fund not currently needed for the purpose of this Act shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in obligations of the United States or any agency thereof or guaranteed thereby.

(c) The Secretary may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury his obligations in an

amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Secretary to carry out his functions under this Act. Each such obligation shall mature at such time and be redeemable at the option of the Secretary in such manner as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Secretary issued under this Act, and for such purposes the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchase of the Secretary's obligations hereunder.

(d) The Secretary shall issue guidelines for the implementation of this Act which will facilitate the making of an expeditious determination as to the eligibility of a homeowner and the amount of mortgage relief payments to be made.

EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 5. Mortgage relief payments shall not be made after July 1, 1976, except to homeowners receiving payments on such date.

FORD TRYING TO BRING BUDGET UNDER CONTROL

HON PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the current economic difficulties facing the Nation make it imperative that Government spending reflect the fact that funds are not unlimited and that a policy of continuing to spend more money than is produced by tax revenues simply fuels an inflation rate which is already out of real control. For Members of Congress and others to discuss grandiose spending plans such as national health insurance at a time when we are unable to pay for programs already in existence is the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Given the state of our economy, it is essential that President Ford be supported in his efforts to cut nonessential spending from this year's budget and, as a result, lower the Federal deficit. There are those who criticize every cut in domestic spending, while urging cuts only in spending for national defense. Such a view ignores the fact that it is domestic spending which is the major culprit in our mounting deficits.

Spending on domestic social and economic programs already accounts for more than 25 percent of the gross national product and is growing at a rate of 13.1 percent per year. Outlays in non-defense areas have skyrocketed from \$72.8 billion in 1968 to \$194.6 billion in 1976 at the Federal level alone. Defense spending, to the contrary, is now allocated at slightly less than 5.9 percent of the GNP.

Discussing the plans for budget cuts of the Ford administration, columnist John D. Lofton, Jr., notes that:

What President Ford is trying to do is bring into line a federal budget that is out of control. The present budget of about \$300 billion, in a stack of \$1 bills, would make a pile 20,360 miles high . . . what President Ford is attempting to do in reducing federal spending for social programs, is decrease government spending in those areas in which it has risen most rapidly.

I wish to share Mr. Lofton's column as it appeared in the Orlando, Fla., Sentinel, with my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

FORD TRYING TO BRING BUDGET UNDER CONTROL (By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—President Ford's decision to include certain social programs in his recommended \$4.6 billion cut in the federal budget, has predictably drawn screams of anguish and howls of outrage.

Nelson Cruikshank, head of the National Council of Senior Citizens, has accused the President of using "political chicanery" to "rob the sick and old." And Sen. Hubert Humphrey—who once said that between the platforms of Santa Claus and Scrooge he would "stick with Jolly Santa"—has likewise blasted Mr. Ford for "pennypinching short cuts" which take money out of the pockets of veterans, the elderly and the poor.

Humphrey says he finds the President's budget cuts "incomprehensible," and does not understand why, when military spending accounts for about a third of the budget, we can't significantly delay or even cancel some of our weapons systems.

Now, the reality of the situation is that over the years the social program portion of the federal budget has steadily increased while the defense budget has decreased.

And evidence to back up this assertion is all over the place.

Writing in the November issue of "Government Executive," C. W. Borklund says that defense spending is no longer, or at least shouldn't be, the central issue in government fiscal problems.

What should be, he says, is the almost uncontrolled growth in spending on domestic social and economic programs, already more than 25 percent of the GNP in federal moneys alone and growing at a rate of 13.1 percent per year.

Outlays in this nondefense area have skyrocketed from \$72.8 billion in 1968 to \$194.6 billion by 1976 just at the federal level alone.

As for defense spending, it is now allocated at slightly less than 5.9 percent of the GNP and its buying power is somewhere between its previous low since World War II in President Truman's pre-Korea days and its next lowest, in the immediate post-Korean war era of President Eisenhower. Compared to the 5.9 percent of the GNP going to defense, 5.8 percent of the GNP goes for Social Security.

In other words, we are spending almost as much for Social Security as for national security.

"The fact is," says Borklund, "defense critics, out of design or ignorance, have perpetuated a myth. Since 1968, when their attack on military spending first gained notable force, defense outlays have shown an average annual increase of 2 percent."

In another article on this same subject in the fall issue of the publication "Foreign Policy," Philip Odeen points out that defense "has a smaller impact on U.S. economic performance today than it has had at any time since the 1940s." Odeen cites such things as the following:

The Pentagon uses only about 3 percent of goods and services produced by the private sector of our economy, whereas defense accounted for twice this amount in the 1960s.

During the 1950s, half of this country's research and development effort was defense-related. In the early '60s, that percentage dropped to 40 percent, and today is only about 25 percent.

Defense-related employment comprises only 5.3 percent of today's labor force, compared to 7.9 percent 10 years ago and more than 10 percent in the 1950s.

What President Ford is trying to do is bring into line a federal budget that is out of control. The present budget of about \$300 billion, in a stack of 1 dollar bills, would make a pile 20,360 miles high. Laid end to end, the bills would stretch 29.1 million miles, enough to circle the earth 1,170 times.

To store this much dough in 1 dollar bills would require a warehouse two miles long 20 feet high and 37 feet wide.

If you started spending the present budget at the rate of \$10,000 a minute from the time you were born, you would be 57 years old before it was gone.

So, what President Ford is attempting to do in reducing federal spending for social programs, is decrease government spending in those areas in which it has risen most rapidly. This is some simile and seems so fundamentally correct that it ought to be comprehensible even to Hubert Humphrey.

POLITICIANS AND EDUCATORS

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Ms. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, communication between politicians and educators is often frustrated by deep-seated animosities on both sides. The following article by Samuel Halperin, director of the Institute for Educational Leadership, which appeared in the Phi Delta Kappan in November, presents a basis for better understanding.

Mr. Halperin was deputy assistant secretary for legislation in HEW from 1966 to 1969. Prior to that he was assistant U.S. Commissioner for legislation in the Office of Education. As you can see, Mr. Halperin knows whereof he speaks.

The article follows:

POLITICIANS AND EDUCATORS: TWO WORLD VIEWS

For over five years George Washington University's Educational Staff Seminar (and, more recently, related programs in the Institute for Educational Leadership) has been building bridges of communication and understanding between educators and political decision makers. Through a variety of educational formats—field trips, seminars, dinner/discussion meetings, etc.—we have brought these two groups of professionals together. We have done so in the belief that better educational policies for the nation hinge upon the ability of politicians to comprehend and to utilize the expertise of educational practitioners, while at the same time all kinds of educators must understand the political context in which major educational decisions are shaped.

We soon discovered that effective communication and understanding were generally frustrated by deep-seated animosities on both sides of the professional Mason-Dixon line.*

* There is probably nothing unique here to the field of education. I believe similar gulfs exist between politicians and other professional groups—scientists, physicians, etc.—and the language of their discord is not too dissimilar to that reported here.

While this finding is hardly novel, what did prove surprising was the intensity of feeling and the variety of allegations surrounding these animosities.

What follows is an attempt to detail the varied perceptions which are held by educators and politicians. Rather than report that "they don't think too much of each other," let us look at the actual language they employ to justify their shared disdain. The quotations which follow are composites I have experienced in various encounters with educators and politicians. Studying them, putting ourselves in "the other guy's shoes," and modifying our respective behavior patterns may help narrow the chasm between these key actors, whose fullest talents are necessary in order for our educational system to operate with a reasonable expectation of success.

THE EDUCATOR'S VIEW OF POLITICIANS

Here are the most commonly expressed complaints of educators:

1. Politicians have a short-term view of the world. They seldom deal with the broader picture, the longer range, the sophisticated interplay of social forces. Moreover, politicians are too pragmatic and too quick to compromise issues of great importance when they ought to stand on principle. They shoot from the hip when they ought to take time for careful analysis and reflection. Their narrow vision doesn't let them see the implications of their acts nor the interdependence of their decisions. Such behavior isn't unethical, but it certainly is unwise and, often, disastrous for education.

2. There's also an unethical or, at least, less ethical side to politicians' involvement with education. Politicians politicize everything they touch and view education only in terms of political fortunes and outcomes. They won't help education because it's right to do so, but only if they can get some political advantage out of it.

3. The politicians' primary interest is in their own constituencies and their narrow sectional, ethnic, regional, or economic interests. When do they consider the welfare of all the people in this country?

4. Politicians are poorly informed on educational issues. They seldom take the trouble to master the complex issues we have to deal with. Some of them think that just because they went to school themselves or have kids in school, they automatically possess educational expertise.

5. There isn't any continuity in the political process. Legislators pass a law and proclaim a policy. But we educators can't count on it because, in another year, the legislature forgets about last year's favored programs and passes on to new fads. Or else legislators don't fund the programs they've enacted. Or they move off the education committees to more attractive committee assignments. Or the understandings we reached with members and committee chairmen are forgotten when the new legislature convenes. Whatever the case, dealing with legislatures lacking an institutional memory or substantive commitment is like building a castle with dry sand.

6. Politicians tend to be arrogant and often show contempt for anyone who is not a political peer. Instead of acting as if public office is a public trust, to be exercised with humility, politicians seem to delight in throwing their weight around and in humiliating educators. Indeed, many politicians go out of their way to make us feel that we educators are the enemy of education.

THE POLITICIAN'S VIEW OF EDUCATORS

1. Educators are seen by many politicians as arrogant and, worse yet, sanctimonious. Educators act as if they are the only ones who have high standards and any sincere commitment to decent public service. They act as if educators have all the answers and frequently treat us as petty creatures, not

very bright, not very honest. Educators see themselves as responsible professionals but view us as political hacks.

2. In order to frame social policy, we need facts, not generalities. We also need practical responses to immediate problems. Yet rarely do educators have the information we need to make sound policy. Sometimes we suspect that they withhold information we are entitled to.

3. Educators ought to know how to communicate, but there are few groups that speak less clearly, less concisely, and with more obfuscation. Instead of precise, comprehensible, here-and-now language, what we get is usually too Olympian, too utopian, too abstract, or too fuzzy to be helpful. The other side of this talking over our heads in jargon and verbiage is a tendency of many educators to talk down to us. In either case, real understanding is seldom advanced by the way educators communicate with us.

4. Particularly at the federal level, there is practically no continuity among the educational policy makers with whom we have to deal. Most of us on the congressional education committees have been around 10 to 15 years; in that time we have seen a new commissioner of education and a new secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare every two years or less. Under such circumstances it is hard to take them or their promises very seriously.

5. Educators have little understanding of the legitimacy and importance of the political process. This ignorance is expressed in many ways:

Educators view our difficult work of negotiating, compromising, balancing interests, and refining or fine tuning public policies as dirty, underhanded, or even immoral. If we don't give educators everything they want when they want it, they act as if incrementalism is evil, show little appreciation for the progress made, and damn us for letting the kids of America down.

Educators also run counter to sound political practice by splitting, that is, by playing off their part of education (higher, elementary/secondary, libraries, etc.) against other educational interests. Instead of a united educational front, we are faced with warring factions, a situation in which almost everyone loses.

If politicians suggest that educators build coalitions with powerful noneducator groups, educators respond with righteous indignation that they are above politics. The fact is that some of the most effective lobbyists for education are not educators but groups like organized labor, civil rights and church groups, and general citizens associations, depending on the issue.

Educators often play up to the executive branch bureaucrats and policy makers and even take sides against the legislatures. They seem oblivious to the fact that our various constitutions provide for coequal branches of government with basic policy supposedly being forged in the legislative bodies.

6. Educators only want more money. They seldom consider how to raise public revenues nor do they recognize that we live in a tough world with many competing priorities.

7. Educators give lip service to accountability but fail to do anything to bring it about. They are afraid to tell the taxpaying public what it gets for its huge investments in education. They agree with the need for accountability, but then they tell us they are professional people and that we don't have to worry about their acting in a responsible manner.

8. Educators refuse to admit that, just like other groups, they are promoting their own interests, economic and professional. Sometimes it is hard for politicians to know whether what educators propose is good for education or merely good for them. They spend so much energy talking about the profession—when was the last time you heard them talk about what was good for kids?

A START TOWARD BRIDGE BUILDING

As we have seen, the grievances and gulfs separating educators and politicians are many. While it is neither feasible nor desirable to work things out by enrolling all of these combatants in encounter groups and other forms of interpersonal therapy, a start can be made if sincere attention is given to the troublesome world views which prevail today. Reaching out with some understanding of how "the other side" might view the meeting can't hurt. It might even help to forge a much-needed bridge over the troubled waters of contemporary educational policymaking.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE NEW YEAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during my years in public office I have attempted to address fundamental questions and contribute to the social changes that I perceived were necessary for enhancing the quality of life.

As the world population has grown, and the demands of our modern, technological society have increased, I have gradually shifted my attention to global environmental problems. The limits to growth, which we all know exist, are rapidly being reached. There are no technological fixes that will eliminate the need to change our life-styles. We must shift from a worship of the god of economic growth to an acceptance of the limits of the natural system.

The San Bernardino Sun-Telegram, which is one of the newspapers in my congressional district, addressed this important issue in an unusual New Year's Day editorial. This paper should be commended for its thoughtful and courageous presentation of the issue of destructive, short-term, economic growth.

I strongly urge my colleagues to review this editorial, which I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

The editorial follows:

REFLECTIONS FOR NEW YEAR

Having drunk so deep and so long the promises of technology finds us today in a state of inebriation. The inevitable hangover, if not already being suffered, may not be far off in coming.

We have committed ourselves to economic growth at all costs. In our euphoric intoxication with the belief that technology can solve everything and meet all wants, the cry for true social progress has not been heard.

In this commitment to economic growth, we have allowed ourselves little time to reflect upon the kind of a world in which we best can happily survive.

Do we need to live in overpopulated cities? Do we need to soar between continents in supersonic aircraft? Do we need to rob the earth of its finite resources? Do we need to continually search for new ways to dispose of our wastes?

For how many more years can our oceans and rivers, earth, and atmosphere absorb the pollutants with which we are poisoning them?

In his long progress through history man has suffered much. But he has never suffered because he did not wear a digital watch on his wrist, own a television set, drive a car

that can go 90 miles an hour or possess a shirt-pocket calculator.

A car, for example, is good for three things: to go to and from work and shopping, to visit relatives and friends or take a vacation, or to show off.

All these amenities of civilization and manifestations of economic growth are fine and pleasant. But they solve no basic human problems, contribute nothing to a grand plan for survival.

So far, technology has been frequently justified on grounds that it can eliminate poverty. Yet it has not. Even in our own country, the richest in the world, 21 million remain officially classified as poor.

And we are aware that poverty elsewhere, particularly in the developing nations, defies elimination despite attempts through the application of technology.

Where no public transport is available, two or three cars to a family are often considered a necessity, and lack of them a form of deprivation. This reflects a saying that economic growth does not eliminate poverty, it merely modernizes it.

Unemployment resists solution. In the U.S. it is growing more severe daily. Technology systematically has reduced the number of jobs which can be provided, although far-sighted firms do not fire but retain workers for other jobs. And the development of new technology and the manufacturing of new products do not appear able to absorb all persons in or entering the job market.

Prospects of achieving a balance are dim. One solution is either to replace machines by men or employ simpler machines which do not replace so many workers. Perhaps other solutions may be advanced.

Then we have crime, mostly absent in traditional older societies. Many of us can remember when, in smaller communities, no one thought of locking the house.

Disintegration of the family, slum cores of cities, the turning to drugs amid the pressures of urban living, poverty, simple greed—these spawn crime. Conventional solutions have not been effective. The crime rate has followed economic growth rate; in fact, it has surpassed it.

While there has been a massive investment in health services in our country and throughout the world, disease has not been conquered. In addition, we have a new set of so-called "diseases of civilization": cancer, heart disease, diabetes, mental illnesses, to name a few.

These are largely unknown in primitive civilizations and reflect the stresses on our bodies and minds by an environment far different than that to which we had become adapted through the years of evolution.

We are not physically equipped to breathe polluted air, eat chemical foods, live a sedentary life, drink contaminated or chemically treated water, mass together in cities.

In short, we are maladjusted to the world that technology, industrialization and ever faster economic growth have created. If all signs are correct, at some point the commitment to growth could bring us to collapse of the industrial society.

The most ominous predictions are that this could be at the end of the century.

To cure all these ills, a long-term "Blueprint For Survival" has been proposed. It appeared in January 1972 in the London magazine, "Ecologist."

It suggests de-industrialization and decentralization of society to attain a "stable society." Says the "Blueprint":

"A society made up of decentralized, self-sufficient communities, in which people work near their homes, have the responsibility of governing themselves, of running their schools, hospitals and welfare services, in fact of constituting real communities, should, we feel, be a much happier place.

"Its members . . . would tend once more

to find an aim in life, develop a set of values, and take pride in their achievements as well as in those of their communities."

Many ecologists and environmentalists and sociologists are thinking such possibilities today, and they merit attention. Perhaps we again can reach an accommodation with the natural world which we have been destroying through worshipping the god of economic growth, and still provide ourselves with the good, the essential things of life.

At least we should be keeping this in mind as we search for answers to what should be the ultimate goal of existence for ourselves and all humanity in the years before us.

WILLIAM J. HYLAND ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, a gracious friend from Freeport, N.Y., Mr. William Hyland, has been thoughtful enough to send me a copy of a poem written by his father, William J. Hyland, at the turn of the century. The poem is dated January 10, 1900, and eloquently reflects on the state of the woman suffrage movement as it stood at that time.

As early as 1878, a constitutional amendment was introduced in the Senate guaranteeing women's right to vote and was designated as the "16th amendment" by Miss Susan B. Anthony and Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the authors of the amendment. Due to an unfavorable report by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, women in this Nation had to wait another 40 years and 6 months for favorable congressional action.

It was about midway in this long, fallow period that William J. Hyland took time to consider this dilemma and to record his thoughts on the inequity of the situation.

I submit his poem for the attention of my colleagues. I feel it appropriate at the beginning of this 94th Congress to reflect on where we have been and how much work still needs to be accomplished:

THE WOMAN

See the Woman, Lovely Woman

She's a college graduate,

She can translate Greek and Latin

She can make a speech that's great

She can bake bread like your Mother

Used to make in olden days,

She in fact has won distinction

In a dozen different ways:

She has studied law, and though she

Has a kind of girlish face

She can hold her own and more when

She's arguing a case

She has brains and she's respected

She is sweet and she is fair

And no trust has ever suffered

That's been put into her care

She's earth's most lovely creature

But kind reader, please to note

That the Senate has decided

That she isn't fit to vote

THE MAN

See the poor old ragged loafer,

With his poor old heels run down,

See the poor old nose upon him

It's the reddest nose in town

He would sell his soul for whiskey

He would do the deepest crime,

If he happened to be thirsty

For the small sum of a dime.

He is ignorant of Statecraft

And if he ever went to school

It was not for gaining knowledge,

He's as learned as a mule.

He was never known to pay a

cent of taxes in his life.

And the neighbors have suspicions

that he beats his luck-less wife

He could hardly gain the friendship

of a self-respecting goat.

But he still enjoys the sacred right

To boldly cast his vote

—WILLIAM J. HYLAND.

January 10, 1900

PRESIDENT AND THE NATION'S ECONOMIC TROUBLES

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the President has finally taken some firm and resourceful steps toward facing up to the Nation's economic troubles. Moreover, he has done it in a style that is courageous and unquestionably his own. It was so refreshing to see the White House Library as a backdrop behind Mr. Ford, when we all have such unpleasant memories of the things that were said by his predecessor from the oval office. Last night it was so much easier for Americans to believe their President and to take heart as they did so.

Mr. Ford's tax package is the most encouraging part of his program. It closely resembles that introduced by the Democratic leadership in Congress earlier yesterday. I myself favor a larger overall tax rebate, but I am encouraged by Mr. Ford's proposal to lower tax rates in 1975. I feel that the Congress and he can reach accommodation in this area.

It goes without saying that my opposition to the oil tax which the President will impose is total. In addition, speaking as cochairman of the New England Congressional Caucus, I can say that this sentiment is shared by my fellow Members of the New England Delegation. Mr. Ford himself admitted in his speech that this tax will impinge most heavily on New Englanders. Our near total reliance on imported residual and heating oil is going to cost us dearly. And clearly, no amount of adjustment that this administration can offer will undo the harm that an oil excise tax will create.

This tax will also increase the cost of gasoline at the pumps. As I and others have pointed out only too often, this will mean a greater hardship for those least able to bear it. More expensive oil will not only mean higher heating and power bills, it will also greatly affect our fuel consumptive leisure and tourist industries.

I will oppose this tax on imported oil. If the Congress cannot revise it, then immediate and significant relief for New Englanders must be obtained. I am hope-

ful a special oil rebate or additional oil entitlements can be extended so as to put our region on an even par with other parts of the country less dependent on refined petroleum products.

The last principal element of the President's speech proposes an absolute ceiling on increased spending for the next fiscal year. While such a goal may be necessary, I can foresee significant rearrangement among new and existing programs that may change the focus of Government spending yet stay under Mr. Ford's limit. Thus, the Nation can look forward to some sort of national health insurance, which admittedly will be costly, but its costs can largely be absorbed by cuts in other areas, notably in defense spending. For, though Mr. Ford did not say so, it is nonetheless true that his priorities remain the same, a call for a halt on spending notwithstanding.

The Congress also has its priorities—ones which it received from the voters this past November. Their mandate—mine also—is for human resource needs. I intend to insist on these changes, and to retain programs Mr. Ford would cut, it is here that the Congress differences with the President will express themselves mostly, where economic reality and the needs of citizens meet the administration's hopeful plans for a solution to recession, unemployment and inflation.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is time for parents to choose a summer camp for their children. An estimated 10,000,000 children will attend camp this summer.

Millions of parents must decide, based on inadequate information, which camps their children should attend. In many instances, camps are located far from the family home, in other States, making thorough parental inspection impractical or impossible. Even when a camp inspection is possible there are many latent dangers which are impossible to identify on a trip to a camp.

Only 7 States, New York, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Texas and my own State of New Jersey, have comprehensive youth camp safety laws. Only 28 States currently have some regulations dealing with youth camp safety.

The HEW study of last year showed that 45 States have no regulations applicable to camp personnel; 17 States have no regulations pertaining to program safety; 24 States have no regulations concerning personal health, first aid and medical services; 45 States have no regulations applicable to the transportation of children while in summer camp; 39 States have no regulations over out-of-camp trips and primitive outpost camping; 35 States do not regulate day camping; and 46 States have no regulations over travel camps.

This HEW report, inadequate as it was, showed that 25 deaths, 1,223 "serious" illnesses, and 1,448 injuries were associated with camping in 1972. And while these figures are bad enough, they hardly show the full picture. To attain these figures HEW attempted nothing more than a literature search and a mail questionnaire to camp operators. Only 3,343 of the 7,861 camps queried even bothered to reply to the questionnaires.

It is also ironic that we have Federal laws to protect animals used in research, laws, to protect our wildlife and yet no Federal law is on the books to protect our children in summer camps.

The Select Subcommittee on Labor has held hearings in the 90th, 91st, 92d, and 93d Congresses on youth camp safety. During these hearings we have heard of so many shocking incidents, tragedies which never should have happened.

Among the appalling stories we heard were:

In California one camp operator rented an open flatbed tractor trailer truck for 1 day, 200-mile round trip to the beach. It overturned on an eight-lane high-speed expressway, killing 8 and injuring 62 children and 8 counselors.

A group of children were led on a canoe trip on rough waters with no life jackets, one child drowned.

Three Boy Scouts and their leader were drowned after being warned not to go out on Yellowstone Lake.

In another instance, a counselor ignored warning that their craft were too small and fragile for Desolation Canyon of the Green River in Utah. One camper drowned.

We have a responsibility to the children of America and for that reason I have long been a supporter of youth camp safety legislation.

Critics of the legislation have maintained that this is a State matter and that there should be no Federal intervention. I am not in disagreement with that idea. Three years ago, I wrote to every Governor pointing out the need for action and offering them technical assistance and any information which they might need to enact a youth camp safety law. Not only did I receive only a small amount of replies, today there are still only seven States with adequate legislation in existence.

I propose that States shall continue to enforce their own laws provided they are as effective as the Federal law. This bill rewards States which have exemplary comprehensive programs or States which have every intention of adopting their own youth camp safety programs.

Today, with many cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, I am introducing the Youth Camp Safety Act of 1975. This bill will establish minimum mandatory Federal standards for the safe operation of youth camps. It would provide Federal assistance to the State for developing and implementing their own youth camp safety programs.

This legislation has the support of the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, American Camping Association, National Park and Recreation Association, the National Safety Council and many other camping organizations. These organizations

have long operated safe camps under their own high standards for health and safety; however, they recognize the real need for health standards to govern the hundreds of thousands of camps that operate independently without any standards requirements.

Specifically, this bill provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appoint a director of youth camp safety who will promulgate minimum standards in consultation with representatives of organized camping and other interested groups. Standards shall be effective in those States which do not submit plans meeting the requirements established by the Director. States which wish to administer their own plans must designate an agency responsible for the plan and develop and enforce standards at least as effective as the minimum Federal standards.

In addition, this bill provides for a "general duty" and procedures to counteract imminent dangers modeled after other health and safety legislation.

It also provides consultative services to camps. This is not a punitive bill. There are no penalties for a first offense. If serious violations are found and subsequent notifications given, a reasonable period of time will be allowed for camps to come into compliance. There are, however, civil penalties for serious, repeated and willful violations. The bill also affords due process by establishing hearing procedures and court appeal.

This legislation authorizes \$7½ million annually for its purpose—primarily to encourage the States themselves through grants of Federal money and technical assistance to draft and implement strong youth camp safety programs.

A more detailed section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

THE YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT OF 1975

Short title.—The first section provides that the Act may be cited as the "Youth Camp Safety Act."

Section 2. Statement of purpose.—Section 2 states that it is the purpose of the Act to protect and safeguard the health and well-being of youth attending day camps, residential camps, troop camps, travel camps, trip camps, primitive or outpost camps, and Federal recreational youth camps by providing for Federal standards for safe operation of such camps; to provide financial and technical assistance to the States in order to encourage them to implement youth camp safety standards; and to provide for Federal implementation of youth camp safety standards in States which do not implement such standards and in Federal recreational youth camps.

Section 3. General duty.—Section 3 requires each youth camp operator to provide each camper safe and healthful conditions, facilities, and equipment which are free from recognized hazards which cause or are likely to cause death, serious illness, or serious physical harm, and adequate and qualified instruction and supervision of youth camp activities at all times, with due consideration of conditions existing in nature.

Section 4. Director of Youth Camp Safety.—Section 4 establishes in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare an office of youth camp safety to be headed by a Director of Youth Camp Safety, who shall be appointed by the Secretary. Under this section, the Director is required to make an annual report to the President and to the Congress.

Section 5. Promulgation of youth camp safety standards.—Section 5 provides that the Director shall develop, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and promulgate youth camp safety standards. In so doing, the Director is to consult with the Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety established under section 13 of the Act, with State officials, and with representatives of appropriate organizations, and is to consider existing State or private regulations and standards applicable to youth camp safety. The youth camp safety standards promulgated under this section shall make suitable distinctions in order to recognize differences in conditions and operations between the various types of camps covered by the Act. The Director must promulgate standards under this section within six months after enactment of the Act. In order to allow States time to develop their own youth camp safety plan, such standards take effect one year after promulgation thereof.

Section 6. State jurisdiction and State plans.—Section 6 provides that any State may at any time assume responsibility for developing and enforcing comprehensive youth camp safety standards by submitting a State plan for such development and enforcement to the Director, who shall approve such plan if it conforms with certain requirements. These requirements are that the State plan designate a State agency to administer the plan, provide that each youth camp operator shall have the same general duty under State law as under section 3 of the Act, provide for the development and enforcement of comprehensive youth camp safety standards at least as effective as the Federal standards, provide that where penalties are not employed as a method of enforcement, there is a system of certification which is as effective as penalties, and provide for the enforcement of the standards in all youth camps operated by the State. These requirements also include requirements that the State plan provide for consultative services to youth camps, provide for inspection of each youth camp at least once a year, provide for an advisory committee which is representative of public and private agencies, organizations, or groups concerned with camping, experienced campers, and members of the public having a special interest in youth camps, provide for right of entry and inspection as effective as that provided in section 9 of the Act, provide for coordination of inspection efforts so as to avoid undue burdens on camp operators, provide that reports be made to the Director, and contain certain assurances related to administration and enforcement of youth camp safety standards and to administration of funds.

Section 6 also provides for a hearing for the State agency before final disapproval of any State plan, or any modification thereof, provides that the Director shall annually review each approved State plan, and provides that where the Director withdraws approval of a State plan and withholds payments to the State under the Act, the State may obtain review of the decision in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located.

Under section 6, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make personnel from the Department available to the States to assist in developing State plans in training State youth camp safety personnel, and the Director is directed to call upon the expertise of national or organized camping groups in order to provide such assistance to Federal and State personnel.

Section 7. Grants to States.—Section 7 provides for grants to States which have approved State plans in effect, which shall be based on objective criteria established under regulations of the Secretary in order to achieve equitable distribution.

Section 8. Consultative Services and Enforcement.—Subsection (a) of section 8 di-

rects the Director to provide consultative services to youth camps in States which do not have an approved State plan. No citation shall be issued, nor shall any civil penalties (except those for repeated violations) be proposed upon any inspection or visit at which consultative services are rendered. If an apparent serious violation is discovered during such inspection or visit, a notice shall be issued specifying the violation and the action which must be taken within a specified reasonable time in order to abate such violation. If such abatement does not take place, citations may be issued or civil penalties assessed.

Subsection (b) of section 8 provides that the Director shall provide for issuing citations to youth camp operators, in States which do not have an approved plan in effect, for violations of the Act, and provides that notices in lieu of citations may be issued for minor violations having no direct or immediate or serious relationship to safety or health.

Subsection (c) of section 8 provides for a hearing for any youth camp director issued a citation under subsection (b) or subject to penalties under the Act, and for review of the decision of the Director after such hearing in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the youth camp is located or in which the youth camp director has his principal office.

Section 9. Inspections, Investigations, and Records.—Subsection (a) of section 9 gives the Director the right to enter and inspect any youth camp and its records, question employees, and investigate facts, conditions, practices, or matters to the extent he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out his duties under the Act.

Subsection (b) of section 9 gives the Director the power to require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence under oath, and gives any district court of the United States jurisdiction to order, in cases of failure to obey such an order of the Director, such witness to appear to produce evidence and give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt of such court.

Subsection (c) of section 9 requires that camps subject to the provisions of the Act shall report annually all accidents resulting in death, injury, and serious illness, except those which result in minor injuries. If a camp operates in a State which has an approved plan in effect, such report shall be filed with that State, which shall forward such reports to the Director. All other such camps shall file their reports to the Director, who shall compile the statistics so reported and include summaries thereof in his annual report to the President and to the Congress.

Section 10. Penalties.—Section 10 provides for civil penalties for violations of the Act, which may be recovered in a civil action in the name of the United States brought in the United States district court for the district in which the violation is alleged to have occurred or in which the operator has his principal office. The penalty for a violation for which a citation or notice has been issued and which has not been corrected within the period permitted is not more than \$500 for each day during which such failure or violation continues, until the camp closes in the normal course of business. The penalty for willfully or repeatedly violating the Act is up to \$1,000 for each day during which such violation continues, until such closing of the camp.

Section 11. Procedures to Counteract Imminent Dangers.—Section 11 gives United States district courts jurisdiction, on petition of the Director, to restrain conditions or practices in youth camps or in places where youth camp activities are conducted which are such that a danger exists which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical

harm immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated through the enforcement procedures otherwise provided by the Act. If an inspector concludes that such conditions or practices exist, he shall inform the affected camp owners, campers, and camp supervisory personnel of the danger, and that he is recommending to the Director that relief be sought.

Section 12. Variations.—Section 12 provides that the Director may, upon application showing extraordinary circumstances or undue hardship, and if inspection shows that the conditions, practices, or activities proposed to be used are as healthful and safe as those which would prevail if the standard were complied with, exempt a camp or activity from a specific requirement of the Act. If such an exemption is made, appropriate notice of such exemption shall be given to parents or other relatives of affected campers, at least annually.

Section 13. Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety.—Section 13 directs that the Director shall establish an Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety to advise and consult on policy matters relating to youth camp safety. Such Council shall consist of the Director, and 15 members appointed by him from specially qualified persons, who shall include one representative from each of the Departments of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Labor, respectively, and who shall include at least 8, but no more than 8 members from appropriate associations representing organized camping.

Section 14. Administration.—Section 14 authorizes the Director to request directly from any department or agency of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics to assist him in carrying out his functions under the Act, and authorizes such department or agency to furnish such assistance directly to the Director.

Section 15. Noninterference.—Section 15 provides that nothing in the Act or regulations under the Act authorizes the Director, a State agency, or any official acting under the Act to restrict, determine, or influence the curriculum, program, or ministry of any youth camp, and provides that nothing in the Act authorizes or requires medical examination, immunization, or treatment for those who object on religious grounds, except where necessary for the protection of the health or safety of others.

Section 16. Authorization.—This section authorizes appropriations to carry out the Act of \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 1976 and for each of the fiscal years thereafter.

Section 17. Definitions.—This section contains definitions for certain terms used for purposes of the Act.

CONSUMER LEGISLATION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing at this time six separate consumer bills designed to end certain abuses in the marketplace, fight inflation and expand State and local consumer protection programs.

The American consumer is lost in a commercial jungle without weapons and without a guide. He faces the slickest combination of technology and Madison Avenue ingenuity. He is matched against whirling computers and motivational experts.

The free enterprise system with its give and take in the marketplace is essentially healthy and constructive. But it sometimes appears to me that businessmen at all levels—from producers to retailers—are involved in a gigantic bait and switch scheme; today's typical consumer is tempted into the marketplace by promises of product perfection. But the system that produces, promotes, sells, and services that product is characterized by planned obsolescence and poor quality control; by the fanciful, frivolous, or deceptive advertising it permits; by the withholding of unfavorable performance data from the public; by the absence of meaningful and understandable warranties and guarantees, by the use of irrelevant product endorsements; by the existence of underpaid and underinformed salesmen on the showroom floor; by the omnipresence of unreliable auto, TV, or appliance repairmen.

The result is that the great free enterprise promise too often proves an illusion.

The American consumer is without the kind of help he needs and deserves from his Government. If this administration, and this Congress, really intend to stop inflation, we had better become concerned about proper consumer representation in Washington because that is where many price increases either begin or fail to be halted.

Following are the bills I am introducing today, along with a brief explanation of the purpose and need for each:

First. Intergovernmental Consumer Assistance Act. This legislation would provide Federal grants and technical assistance for the establishment and strengthening of State and local consumer protection offices. Consumer protection must be a joint effort at all levels of government. Some excellent work is being done by State and local consumer offices, but funds and technical assistance are desperately needed—was H.R. 1672, 1673, 3714, 12086 in the last Congress.

Second. Meat import quota repeal.

This repeals the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 in order to increase the supply and reduce the price of lower cost meats, such as hamburgers, hot dogs, and cold cuts. Retail meat prices may presently be under their recent record levels but they still are too high. The quotas were suspended in 1972, but President Ford is known to be considering reimposition. A permanent repeal would help foreign suppliers plan better to meet American market needs and the competition would help fight our raging domestic inflation—was H.R. 1664, 1665, 3710, 12088.

Third. Consumer Price Information Act. Retailers would be required to post in their stores a box score of recent price increases for all their products. This detailed point-of-sale information will help consumers keep track of and judge the reasonableness of price increases on an item-by-item basis. Exemptions are made for small businesses and most perishables—was H.R. 14665.

Fourth. Performance Life Disclosure Act. This bill requires manufacturers of durable consumer products, including appliances and electronic items, to disclose on a label or tag affixed to each item sold at retail, the performance life, under normal operating conditions, of each product or its major components. It also requires that such products as film and batteries be labeled with the date beyond which they should not be sold because of significant loss of performance life—was H.R. 1666, 1667, 3711, 12087.

Fifth. Appliance Dating Act. It requires that any appliance, TV or other durable product whose design is changed or performance capabilities altered on a periodic basis shall have its date of manufacture permanently affixed to the product. This will prevent the sale of older models as "new," something now done with relative ease because the consumer does not have an effective method of checking model data for himself prior to purchase—was H.R. 1668, 1669, 3712, 12092.

Sixth. Sales Promotion Game Act. This legislation prohibits manufacturers, producers or distributors from requiring or encouraging any retail seller to participate in promotional games; it also prohibits a retailer from engaging on his own in a promotional game in connection with the sale of any item. Sales promotional games perform no useful function in the marketplace. Instead, they serve to entice the consumer into basing his purchases on the contest with the most lucrative prize rather than on the more relevant concerns of the best price and the best quality. Moreover, the cost of such games is passed on to the consumer whether he enters the contest or not—was H.R. 1670, 1671, 3713.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES OFFERS SEMINARS FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in order to offer opportunities for faculty members of undergraduate and 2-year colleges to work with distinguished scholars in their fields at institutions across the country, the National Endowment for the Humanities will offer 62 seminars for college teachers during the summer of 1975.

Twelve teachers will be selected for each seminar, each receiving a stipend of \$2,000 for the 2-month period and an additional housing and travel allowance of \$250. Applications must be submitted by February 18, 1975. Information concerning seminar directors, locations, and topics can be obtained from the Division of Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 15, 1975

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.—Ephesians 6:10.

Eternal God, whose mercies are new every morning and fresh every day, through sleep and darkness we have been brought safely to this hour restored to life and power and thought.

Remove from within us all pride and prejudice, all bitterness that blights our beings and all resentments that ruin our relationship with others. Give us a willingness to walk worthily, strength to lift the fallen, confidence to seek peace and pursue it, courage to face life steadily and to see it whole, and a desire to labor faithfully for the good of all.

Make us as a people strong in Thee and in the power of Thy might that our Nation, renewed in mind and spirit, may be a channel for love and truth in our world.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution extending the time within which the President may transmit the budget message and the economic report to the Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to receive a message from the President.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until approximately 12:50 p.m. this afternoon.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until approximately 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.).

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper (Hon. James T. Molloy) announced the Vice President and