

PRICES VERSUS WAGE INCREASES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1975

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Illinois State Journal-Register recently wrote a perceptive column on the relationship between prices and wage increases over the past 20 years. The text of his comment appears below:

PRICES VERSUS WAGE INCREASES
(By Ed Armstrong)

One of our readers sent me a letter a few days ago about what she considered irresponsible or incomplete reporting. It referred to a chart in Parade Magazine, the newspaper supplement produced by Parade Publications and distributed as part of the Sunday State Journal-Register.

I hope she will forgive me for using her letter here instead of in our letter column. I'm doing so because it includes some things that I believe deserve discussion and the making of some points beyond the valid point she makes.

Here is what she wrote:

Error: We know there is inflation but it isn't as bad as it is printed by a chart in your Parade Magazine on Jan. 5, which purported to reflect the purchasing power of the dollar from 1944 to 1974.

What the chart left out was the wage increases people have received during the same period.

We are just an ordinary family. My husband works in public utilities. I do not have available exact figures for 1944, but based on 1954, 1964 and 1974 figures, his hourly wage was \$3.13 in 1954, \$5.07 in 1964 and \$8.10 in 1974.

Based on those hourly rates and using the Parade chart, here's what our hour's pay would buy of each of these items in the three comparable years:

Steak—3 lbs. in '54, 4 lbs. in '64 and 4 lbs. in '74.

Sugar—6 lbs. in '54, 8 lbs. in '64 and 3 lbs. in '74. (This one's a baddie).

Bread—19 loaves in '54, 24 loaves in '64 and 22 loaves in '74.

Coffee—2 lbs. in '54, 6 lbs. in '64 and 6 lbs. in '74.

Eggs—5 dozen in '54, 8 dozen in '64 and 9 dozen in '74.

Milk—3 gallons in '54, 5 gallons in '64 and 5 gallons in '74.

Lettuce—15 heads in '54, 20 heads in '64 and 18 heads in '74.

Butter—4 lbs. in '54, 6 lbs. in '64 and 8 lbs. in '74.

Postage Stamps (for ordinary first class letter)—101 in '54, 101 in '64 and 81 in '74.

Gasoline—10 gallons in '54, 16 gallons in '64 and 15 gallons in '74.

Most people want to go back to 1954 prices but they would not go back to 1954 wages! So, when reading charts such as this, take into consideration the rise in wages during the same period.

NAME WITHHELD.

She accompanied it with a signed note saying, "It always irks me to see only one side of the coin," and requesting that her name be withheld because she thinks it shouldn't be everyone's business how much her husband earns.

She's right that just telling how much prices have gone up in dollar terms without reflecting how many more dollars wage earners are receiving is telling only half the story. And she's right that most of us would like to have 20-year-ago prices but we wouldn't settle also for 20-year-ago wages. It's human nature to want more and better than what we have, and that's what we'd have if we had '54 prices and '74 wages.

But while the Parade chart showed one side of the coin, and this reader's letter pre-

sented the other side, I suggest that the coin also has some edges.

Her figures put the situation in perspective so far as the salaried person is concerned, the one whose hourly pay has steadily increased along with inflation.

But let's take the guy or gal who retired on a fixed dollar pension around 1964. Where does this leave that person? Hungry, maybe? The list of commodities on the chart has gone up 80 percent in 10 years. Social Security and some other pensions have been increased during that 10 years, but many have not. And a lot of retirees who thought they had it pretty well made now find out they don't.

There's something else the letter writer's figures show that affects millions of Americans and is the source of much of the concern and pessimism today.

Between 1954 and 1964, her husband's wages went up about 62 percent. Of the 10 commodities on the chart, his wages would buy more of nine of them and the same of one—stamps—in 1964. He could buy far more coffee, eggs, milk and gasoline with an hour's pay in 1964 than he could buy 10 years earlier. There was not a single item on the list that he'd have to work longer to buy.

Clearly living standards of people as measured in consumer goods were going up in that decade.

Now, what happened between 1964 and 1974?

Although her husband's salary went up another 60 percent, almost as much as it did the previous decade, his salary would buy more of only two commodities of the 10 on the chart. It would buy the same amount of three and less of five.

This is the essence of today's inflationary economy: more salary is buying less goods.

Thus, a people who were accustomed to a long period of steadily growing affluence now find themselves having to fight to stay even.

This is the situation the leaders of our country are trying to turn around, but the question is: Do any of them really know how to do it?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 20, 1975

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.—Matthew 5: 16.

O Lord, our God, as in reverence we bow before Thee, breathe upon us Thy Spirit that with honor bright, hearts pure, and hands clean we may face the duties of this demanding day. Send us forth into these hours ready to do the right, without fear or favor, firm in the conviction that at the heart of the universe goodness reigns and truth will ultimately prevail.

We pray for our country. May ill will, greed, and all selfish endeavors be swept away by the power of Thy Spirit and may honor, justice, cooperation in service, and self-sacrifice for the good of all flourish abundantly among us.

Make us one in spirit as we give ourselves in deep devotion to the welfare of our beloved Nation.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO
SUBMITTING EXTENSIONS FOR
RECORD SHOULD BE CHANGED
BACK

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, late last summer, because of the most misguided humor of some unknown individuals, presumably interns, a very stringent rule was announced with regard to placing material in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems to me that this rule should now be reexamined, particularly since we have short sessions in this period of the Congress. We should not be limited to 15 minutes after the session ends within which to place material in the Extensions of the RECORD.

I would earnestly suggest that, if the Member signs the document that is to be placed in the Extensions of the RECORD, we could safely go back to the old

system, which was most convenient for the Members, of placing the material in the various boxes.

If for some reason that is not feasible, then I would urge that at least we be given until 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock in the afternoon or within 15 minutes after the session ends, whichever is later, to submit our insertions.

W. R. "BOB" POAGE MOST COMPLETELY QUALIFIED MEMBER OF
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE TO
SERVE AS CHAIRMAN

(Mr. SEBELIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the comments I am about to make are based upon the fact that I have the responsibility of representing as best I can the citizens within my congressional district and our Nation.

I realize many may think my remarks uncalled for as well as an intrusion into a political matter that I have no business discussing. I can only say I am speaking from the heart. I would feel negligent if I did not speak out.

The best friend that the American consumer—and I want to stress that, the

American consumer—and the farmer and stockman has had during the 6 years I have had the privilege of serving in this body has been W. R. "Bob" POAGE. He is also the most knowledgeable, best informed, and most completely qualified member of the Agriculture Committee to serve as chairman.

I want to stress that I say this with high personal regard and great respect for the fine ability of others on the committee who are eligible for consideration as chairman.

As a member of the minority in this legislative body, I want to go on record as pleading with the majority Members to reconsider their action of last week. Decisions within the House Agriculture Committee affect not only our farmers but also such issues as our Nation's food supply and the humanitarian fight against hunger and malnutrition worldwide.

In the interest of finding workable answers to these problems and assuring the American people adequate supplies of food and fiber at a reasonable cost, I plead with my colleagues to let the most sincere, qualified, and experienced member of the committee continue to serve as its leader for the next 2 difficult years.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. The Chair has been advised that the electronic voting system is at the present time not operable. Until further notice, therefore, all votes and quorum calls will be made by standby procedures which are provided in the rule.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Abdnor	Davis	Kindness
Addabbo	de la Garza	Kluczynski
Anderson, Ill.	Dent	Krueger
Andrews, N.C.	Diggs	LaFalce
Andrews,	Downing	Lent
N. Dak.	Duncan,	McCloskey
Archer	Tenn.	McEwen
Badillo	Du Pont	McKinney
Bafalls	Edgar	Macdonald
Baldus	Eilberg	Madigan
Barrett	Erlenborn	Mann
Bell	Esch	Matsunaga
Biaggi	Eshleman	Melcher
Bieber	Evans, Ind.	Milford
Boggs	Florio	Mills
Brinkley	Flowers	Mitchell, Md.
Brown, Mich.	Flynt	Moffett
Burgener	Ford, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.
Burke, Calif.	Frey	Murphy, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Gibbons	Myers, Ind.
Burlison, Mo.	Gilman	Nix
Butler	Harkin	Obey
Chisholm	Harsha	Patten
Clancy	Hawkins	Pattison, N.Y.
Clay	Hébert	Pettis
Cleveland	Hefner	Peyster
Cochran	Helstoski	Preyer
Collins, Ill.	Holland	Rallsback
Conte	Holtzman	Richmond
Conyers	Hutchinson	Riegle
Crane	Johnson, Colo.	Runnels
D'Amours	Ketchum	Schroeder

Shuster	Studds	Wiggins
Sisk	Symms	Wilson, Bob
Snyder	Teague	Wilson,
Solarz	Udall	Charles, Tex.
Staggers	Vander Jagt	Wolf
Stanton,	Walsh	Wydlar
James V.	Whalen	Young, Ga.
Steiger, Ariz.	Whitehurst	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELECTION TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 76) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 76

Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House

Resolved, That the following-named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioner be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: George H. Mahon (chairman), Texas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; George E. Shipley, Illinois; John M. Slack, West Virginia; John J. Flynt, Junior, Georgia; Neal Smith, Iowa; Robert N. Glaimo, Connecticut; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; John J. McFall, California; Edward J. Patten, New Jersey; Clarence D. Long, Maryland; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Bob Casey, Texas; Frank E. Evans, Colorado; David R. Obey, Wisconsin; Edward R. Roybal, California; Louis Stokes, Ohio; J. Edward Roush, Indiana; Gunn McKay, Utah; Tom Bevill, Alabama; Bill Chappell, Junior, Florida; Bill D. Burlison, Missouri; Bill Alexander, Arkansas; Edward I. Koch, New York; Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, California; John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania; Bob Traxler, Michigan; Robert Duncan, Oregon; Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts; Max Baucus, Montana.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Charles C. Diggs, Junior (chairman), Michigan; Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota; W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Junior, Georgia; Ronald V. Dellums, California; Thomas M. Rees, California; Walter E. Fauntroy, District of Columbia; James J. Howard, New Jersey; James R. Mann, South Carolina; Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky; Les Aspin, Wisconsin; Herbert E. Harris, II, Virginia; Dan Daniel, Virginia; Jerry Litton, Missouri; Helen S. Meyner, New Jersey; Henry J. Nowak, New York; Philip R. Sharp, Indiana; James J. Florio, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: Carl D. Perkins (chairman), Kentucky; Frank Thompson, Junior, New Jersey; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; John Brademas, Indiana; James G. O'Hara, Michigan; Augustus F. Hawkins, California; William D. Ford, Michigan; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii; Lloyd Meeds, Washington; Phillip Burton, California; Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania; William (Bill) Clay, Missouri; Shirley Chisholm, New York; Mario Biaggi, New York; Ike F. Andrews, North Carolina; William Lehman, Florida; Jaime Benitez, Puerto Rico; Michael T. Blouin, Iowa; Robert J. Cornell, Wisconsin; Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover, Oklahoma; Paul Simon, Illinois; Edward P. Beard, Rhode Island; Leo C. Zeferetti, New York; George Miller, California; Ronald M. Mottl, Ohio; Tim L. Hall, Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Thomas E. Morgan (chairman), Pennsylvania; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Charles C. Diggs, Junior, Michigan; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota; Benjamin R. Rosenthal, New York; Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana; Lester L. Wolff, New York; Jonathan B. Bingham, New York; Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania; Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina; Michael Harrington, Massachusetts; Leo J. Ryan, California; Charles Wilson, Texas; Donald W. Riegle, Junior, Michigan; Cardiss Collins, Illinois; Stephen J. Solarz, New York; Helen S. Meyner, New Jersey; Don Bonker, Washington.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS: Jack Brooks (chairman), Texas; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; John E. Moss, California; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York; Jim Wright, Texas; Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island; Floyd V. Hicks, Washington; Don Fuqua, Florida; John Conyers, Junior, Michigan; Bella S. Abzug, New York; James V. Stanton, Ohio; Leo J. Ryan, California; Cardiss Collins, Illinois; John L. Burton, California; Richardson Preyer, North Carolina; Michael Harrington, Massachusetts; Robert F. Drinan, Massachusetts; Edward Meznivsky, Iowa; Barbara Jordan, Texas; Glenn English, Oklahoma; Elliott H. Levitas, Georgia; David W. Evans, Indiana; Anthony Toby Moffett, Connecticut; Andrew Maguire, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS: James A. Haley (chairman), Florida; Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina; Harold T. Johnson, California; Morris K. Udall, Arizona; Phillip Burton, California; Thomas S. Foley, Washington; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii; Lloyd Meeds, Washington; Abraham Kazen, Junior, Texas; Robert G. Stephens, Junior, Georgia; Joseph P. Vigorito, Pennsylvania; John Melcher, Montana; Teno Roncallo, Wyoming; Jonathan B. Bingham, New York; John F. Seiberling, Ohio; Harold Runnels, New Mexico; Antonio Borja Won Pat, Guam; Ron de Lugo, Virgin Islands; Bob Eckhardt, Texas; Goodloe E. Byron, Maryland; Jaime Benitez, Puerto Rico; Jim Santini, Nevada; Paul E. Tsongas, Massachusetts; Allan T. Howe, Utah; James Weaver, Oregon; Bob Carr, Michigan; George Miller, California; Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover, Oklahoma.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE: Harley O. Staggers (chairman), West Virginia; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; John Jarman, Oklahoma; John E. Moss, California; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Lionel Van Deerlin, California; Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania; John M. Murphy, New York; David E. Satterfield III, Virginia; Brock Adams, Washington; W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Junior, Georgia; Bob Eckhardt, Texas; Richardson Preyer, North Carolina; James W. Symington, Missouri; Charles J. Carney, Ohio; Ralph H. Metcalfe, Illinois; Goodloe E. Byron, Maryland; James H. Scheuer, New York; Richard L. Ottinger, New York; Henry A. Waxman, California; Robert (Bob) Krueger, Texas; Timothy E. Wirth, Colorado; Philip R. Sharp, Indiana; William M. Brodhead, Michigan; W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina; James J. Florio, New Jersey; Anthony Toby Moffett, Connecticut; Jim Santini, Nevada.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Peter W. Rodino, Junior (chairman), New Jersey; Jack Brooks, Texas; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin; Don Edwards, California; William L. Hungate, Missouri; John Conyers, Junior, Michigan; Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania; Walter Flowers, Alabama; James R. Mann, South Carolina; Paul S. Sarbanes, Maryland; John F. Seiberling, Ohio; George E. Danielson, California; Robert F. Drinan, Massachusetts; Barbara Jordan, Texas; Ray Thornton,

Arkansas; Elizabeth Holtzman, New York; Edward Mezvinsky, Iowa; Herman Badillo, New York; Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky; Edward W. Pattison, New York; Christopher J. Dodd, Connecticut; William J. Hughes, New Jersey; Martin A. Russo, Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES: Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan (chairman), Missouri; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; John M. Murphy, New York; Walter B. Jones, North Carolina; Robert L. Leggett, California; Mario Biaggi, New York; Glenn M. Anderson, California; E. de la Garza, Texas; Ralph H. Metcalfe, Illinois; John B. Breaux, Louisiana; Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania; Paul S. Sarbanes, Maryland; Bo Ginn, Georgia; Gerry E. Studds, Massachusetts; David R. Bowen, Mississippi; Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania; Ron de Lugo, Virgin Islands; Carroll Hubbard, Junior, Kentucky; Don Bonker, Washington; Les AuCoin, Oregon; Norman E. D'Amours, New Hampshire; Jerry M. Patterson, California; Leo C. Zeferetti, New York; James L. Oberstar, Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE: David N. Henderson (chairman), North Carolina; Morris K. Udall, Arizona; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; James M. Hanley, New York; Charles H. Wilson, California; Richard C. White, Texas; William D. Ford, Michigan; William (Bill) Clay, Missouri; Patricia Schroeder, Colorado; William Lehman, Florida; Gladys Noon Spellman, Maryland; Stephen L. Neal, North Carolina; Herbert E. Harris, II, Virginia; William M. Brodhead, Michigan; Paul Simon, Illinois; Norman Y. Mineta, California; John W. Jenrette, Junior, South Carolina; Stephen J. Solarz, New York.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION: Robert E. Jones (chairman), Alabama; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; Jim Wright, Texas; Harold T. Johnson, California; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Ray Roberts, Texas; James J. Howard, New Jersey; Glenn M. Anderson, California; Robert A. Roe, New Jersey; Teno Roncallo, Wyoming; Mike McCormack, Washington; James V. Stanton, Ohio; Bella S. Abzug, New York; John B. Breaux, Louisiana; Gerry E. Studds, Massachusetts; Bo Ginn, Georgia; Dale Milford, Texas; Norman Y. Mineta, California; Kenneth L. Holland, South Carolina; Allan T. Howe, Utah; Elliott H. Levitas, Georgia; James L. Oberstar, Minnesota; Jerome Ambro, Junior, New York; Henry J. Nowak, New York; Robert W. Edgar, Pennsylvania; Marilyn Lloyd, Tennessee.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: Ray J. Madden (chairman), Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; Richard Bolling, Missouri; B. F. Sisk, California; John Young, Texas; Claude Pepper, Florida; Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii; Morgan F. Murphy, Illinois; Gillis W. Long, Louisiana; Joseph Moakley, Massachusetts; Andrew Young, Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; Ken Heckler, West Virginia; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Don Fuqua, Florida; James W. Symington, Missouri; Walter Flowers, Alabama; Robert A. Roe, New Jersey; Mike McCormack, Washington; Bob Bergland, Minnesota; George E. Brown, Junior, California; Dale Milford, Texas; Ray Thornton, Arkansas; James H. Scheuer, New York; Richard L. Ottinger, New York; Henry A. Waxman, California; Phillip H. Hayes, Indiana; Tom Harkin, Iowa; Jim Lloyd, California; Jerome Ambro, Junior, New York; Christopher J. Dodd, Connecticut; Michael T. Blouin, Iowa; Tim L. Hall, Illinois; Robert (Bob) Krueger, Texas; Marilyn Lloyd, Tennessee; James J. Blanchard, Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Joe L. Evins (chairman), Tennessee; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Neal Smith, Iowa;

James C. Corman, California; Joseph P. Abbado, New York; William L. Hungate, Missouri; Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island; Charles J. Carney, Ohio; Parren J. Mitchell, Maryland; Bob Bergland, Minnesota; Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas; James M. Hanley, New York; Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania; John Breckinridge, Kentucky; John J. LaFalce, New York; John Krebs, California; Berkley Bedell, Iowa; Frederick W. Richmond, New York; David W. Evans, Indiana; Martin A. Russo, Illinois; Alvin Baldus, Wisconsin; Richard Nolan, Minnesota; Butler Derrick, South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT: Melvin Price (chairman), Illinois; Olin E. Teague, Texas; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; John J. Flynt, Junior, Georgia; Thomas S. Foley, Washington; Charles E. Bennett, Florida.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Ray Roberts (chairman), Texas; Olin E. Teague, Texas; David E. Satterfield, III, Virginia; Don Edwards, California; G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Mississippi; Charles J. Carney, Ohio; George E. Danielson, California; Lester L. Wolff, New York; Jack Brinkley, Georgia; Charles Wilson, Texas; Ronald M. Mottl, Ohio; Robert J. Cornell, Wisconsin; W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina; Mark W. Hannaford, California; Harold E. Ford, Tennessee; Edward P. Beard, Rhode Island; Robert W. Edgar, Pennsylvania; Timothy E. Wirth, Colorado; Kenneth L. Holland, South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Al Ullman (chairman), Oregon; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; James A. Burke, Massachusetts; Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio; Richard H. Fulton, Tennessee; Omar Burleson, Texas; James C. Corman, California; William J. Green, Pennsylvania; Sam M. Gibbons, Florida; Joe D. Waggoner, Junior, Louisiana; Joseph E. Karth, Minnesota; Otis G. Pike, New York; Richard F. Vander Veen, Michigan; J. J. Pickle, Texas; Henry Helstoski, New Jersey; Charles B. Rangel, New York; William R. Cotter, Connecticut; Fortney H. (Pete) Stark, California; James R. Jones, Oklahoma; Andrew Jacobs, Junior, Indiana; Abner J. Mikva, Illinois; Martha Keys, Kansas; Joseph L. Fisher, Virginia.

Mr. O'NEILL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that copies of the resolution are available and that this is simply the names of the chairman and members of all committees except four on the Democratic side, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could tell us what Members are not included?

Mr. O'NEILL. The committees not included are the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND BALANCE OF THE WEEK

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, and I address my remarks to the minority leader also, that this is the conclusion of the program of the day. There is no session scheduled for either Tuesday or Wednesday. The Democrats will meet in caucus at 9 o'clock Wednesday to complete their committee assignments and will report back to the House on Thursday, at which time it is my understanding that the Republicans will come in with a resolution concerning their Members.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman from Massachusetts is precisely correct. The work on this side is waiting for the Committee on Committees on tomorrow and, hopefully, we will have our conference on Wednesday and be ready to submit the resolution for our ranking minority member and committee members on Thursday.

Mr. O'NEILL. I do hope that we will be able to get some kind of business on the schedule for next week, but at this particular time it is really hard to say. We will have to await further developments.

There will be a session on Thursday at 12 o'clock.

ISSUES FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 94th Congress, we are faced with the need for a program of action against inflation and recession. President Ford outlined his recommendations last week. Today, I would like to add some specific suggestions for a positive economic growth program for America.

Congressional overspending is a primary cause of our inflation and has accentuated our recession. With a probable \$50 billion deficit facing America, we need some solid, progressive legislation.

We need to rechannel the money presently going to the Federal Government and direct it to private industry to provide working capital for more jobs.

America today has more government than it wants—we have more government than we need—and we most obviously have more government than we can afford.

Here are 22 basic issues that I recommend for immediate consideration:

1. Congressional Responsibility—Let's make it clear to the Nation that the responsibility for our economic future rests with Congress. Congress wrote the poor laws and now Congress must pass good laws to correct our present situation. The President can veto, but the responsibility for action is with Congress.

2. No New Taxes—As a measure to restore

the confidence of the American people in our economy, Congress should clearly affirm that there will be no new taxes or tax increases in the next five years.

3. Welfare Rollback—Congress should roll back Federal Spending for Relief and Welfare programs to its 1970 level. With our present economic situation, this government cannot afford to be as generous as it was during our boom years. Recipients of government largess will also have to be asked to sacrifice.

4. Effective Balance—Let us call for a 10% cut in the salaries of the President, Vice-President, and Cabinet Members. Congressional salaries should be dependent on the balance of the budget. If there is a deficit, Congressmen would take a 10% cut in salary, but for every \$2 billion surplus, Congressmen would receive a 1% salary increase. Hopefully, this would provide the liberal spenders in Congress with enough incentive to keep the budget in the black.

5. Trim the Federal Payroll—Congress should order the reduction of the Washington bureaucracy. It has been proven that the Regional Offices management, such as we have in Dallas, is more effective than Washington control. We should reduce the high-paying supergrade jobs in Washington by at least 20% and the rest of the Washington bureaucracy by 15%.

6. Auto Seatbelts, Interlocks and Buzzers—Federal automobile regulations have increased the sticker price of cars in America by hundreds of dollars. Let's transfer the bureaucrat in the Department of Transportation who dreams up these regulations to a permanent position in Timbuktu.

7. Discourage Welfare—It should be national policy that any welfare recipient who is offered a job paying the subsistence level has the right to refuse that job. However, such refusal will immediately result in their removal from the welfare rolls.

8. Tithing vs. Federal Subsidies—Let's encourage all Americans to practice tithing. Private contributions to churches, universities, United Funds, and foreign missions are the most effective method to finance charity. The U.S. has a trillion dollar gross national product, 35% of which is returned to governments in taxes, leaving \$650 billion in income. A 10% tithe would provide \$65 billion for charitable purposes. Private charity is the responsibility of individuals—the government cannot take the place of the church, nor should it try to do so.

9. The Media—During the past few years the press has been accused of biased reporting and overt distortions of the news. Their negativism has been a big influence in discouraging America. Let's encourage more balanced news coverage and find reporters who can see the brighter side of life.

10. Reduce Civilians in the Pentagon—We need to reduce the number of civilians who work in the Pentagon to previous peace-time levels. There is no need to keep a staff large enough to man a war-time Pentagon Headquarters. Reducing excessive civilian manpower will help us to stabilize the Defense budget, while maintaining or increasing the funds available for research, development, and procurement.

11. Foreign Aid—We need to eliminate excessive foreign aid. The U.S. Government has to borrow the money it gives away and pay added interest on these loans. There is no justification for America, in her present economic situation, to dig herself any deeper into debt to give foreign aid.

12. Amtrak—Let's continue profitable Amtrak operations such as those in the Washington to Boston corridor. However, Amtrak has been facing operating losses of about \$150 million per year because ridership on other routes has been too low to reach a break-even level: We must close down all of Amtrak's losing runs.

13. Bring Congress Closer to the People—

Congress should be in Session half of the time and spend the other half of the time working in their Districts. If each Representative spent more time in his home District, he would be better able to develop a realistic approach to the needs of his Constituents. We spend too much time in Washington and pass too many laws. We pass more laws than the country can afford and give America more government than the people want.

14. No New Construction in Washington—Congress should enact a moratorium on new construction of federal buildings within a 50 mile radius of the Washington area. There are already too many bureaucrats taking up space in our Capital.

15. Service to America—We should establish a mandatory period of service for all young men and women at age 18, or immediately following high school. They would spend one year of service in the military, or fifteen months in essential work, such as in hospitals, parks, or public works projects. They would be provided room and board, as well as \$40 salary per month.

16. Earn Your Way Through College—All colleges in the U.S. that receive any type of federal funding should change to the Quarter System. This would provide students with an opportunity to work a term and go to school the next term. Two students could alternate at the same job and go through school in six years.

17. Business Incentives—In order to get our economy moving and reduce the unemployment rate, Congress should provide additional deductions for depreciation, depletion, and investment credit. With business moving forward again, economic prosperity will return to America.

18. Busing—For the conservation of energy, we should eliminate the busing of any student beyond his closest school, unless that student is in a special training program which is located beyond his neighborhood school.

19. Moratorium on pollution controls—Let's ease pollution control requirements and place a moratorium on new pollution control laws until energy needs are satisfied in this country and the inflated Middle East prices are reduced. The high cost of pollution control devices has contributed to the severe problems of the automobile industry and the increased consumption of fuel necessitated by these devices has aggravated the energy crisis.

20. Revenue sharing—With the Federal Government already in debt over \$486 billion, there is no Federal money to share. Revenue sharing to the tune of over \$30 billion in 5 years causes an expanded Federal budget through deficit spending.

21. Dead railroad freight tracks—Railroads should be required to terminate all dead and unprofitable trackage if they are to participate in or receive any type of Federal assistance.

22. Reduction in Government paper requirements—Excessive paperwork is an expensive part of operations in business. Unnecessary requirements should be eliminated. For instance, I would require that business no longer keep any type of record to classify any person by sex, race, color, religion or creed. This unnecessary statistical data should be completely eliminated, as America needs no quotas. The Constitution is very clear on the fact that there will be equal opportunities for all.

THE LATE JOE W. ANDERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow and a profound sense of loss that I announce the passing of my long-

time friend and former administrative assistant, Joe W. Anderson. During his years on the Hill, Joe made many friends. He was an outstanding servant, not only of my office but of the House.

Joe died suddenly on January 10 of an apparent heart attack in Teheran, Iran, where he was visiting his daughter, Mrs. Frances C. McLellan.

Joe was a native of my hometown, McAlester, and later lived for many years in Hugo, which is in the southern part of my congressional district near the Oklahoma-Texas border.

From the beginning of his distinguished service with the 1st Infantry Division in World War II until his retirement as regional director of the Veterans' Administration in 1973, Joe devoted his life to serving his country. A disabled combat veteran himself, Joe joined the Veterans' Administration as a contact representative in 1946. He was my administrative assistant from 1957 to 1959, when I was majority whip. Joe subsequently returned to the Veterans' Administration and became head of the Muskogee regional office on April 1, 1966, a post he held with distinction until his retirement on June 30, 1973.

Joe earned numerous honors throughout his life, including the Distinguished Career Service Award for "outstanding efficiency, integrity, dedication, and loyalty." Those of us who knew Joe were always aware of these qualities. He was a great friend and a great American, an original American, a proud member of the Chickasaw Indian Tribe. My whole family dearly loved him. He was one of the best friends we ever had. We shall miss him. We extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, Bernice, and to his daughter, Frances Claire, and her two children. May God comfort them in their sorrow. I include the following material at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Muskogee (Okla.) Daily Phoenix and Times-Democrat, Jan. 11, 1975]

FORMER VA DIRECTOR, JOE ANDERSON, DIES

Former director of the Muskogee Veterans Administration Regional Office, Joe W. Anderson, died of an apparent heart attack Friday in Teheran, Iran. Anderson was in Teheran on a business and visiting trip. He was visiting his daughter, Frances C. McLellan when he was stricken.

Anderson served the Muskogee office for seven years before resigning June 30, 1973. He moved to Hugo after his resignation where he had ranching interests.

He was succeeded at the VA Regional Office by W. Troy Baker, present director.

A native of McAlester, Anderson, 57, was a Chickasaw and had served in World War Two. He served in the First Infantry Division and was awarded the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart and Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Anderson joined the Muskogee Regional Office in 1946 as contact officer and prior to his appointment as director was assistant Area Field Director of the VA in Washington, D.C. He also served as administrative assistant to Carl Albert, speaker of the House of Representatives. He formerly was a consultant of the Division of Indian Health in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He also was a member of the Inter-Tribal Council of Five Civilized Tribes and Chickasaw Advisory Council.

A member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and Disabled American Veterans, Anderson was presented with awards for outstanding service to veterans by

these three veterans groups. He also received a certificate of recognition for his service and dedication to veterans by the director of the National Committee on Jobs for Veterans.

Anderson served as chairman of the Interagency Board of U.S. Civil Service Examiners for Oklahoma, United States Civil Commission and was chairman of the Muskogee Mail Users Council. He was a member of the Governor's Committee on Jobs for Veterans and was appointed chairman of the Muskogee Jobs for Veterans.

He also was a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and a member of the Executive Committee of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Anderson, who received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Kansas, was president of the board of directors of Muskogee Community Chest while in Muskogee. In addition he was past chairman and member of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Federal Combined Campaign in Muskogee.

Arrangements have not been announced.

Survivors include his wife, Bernice, of the home in Hugo; a daughter and two grandchildren, Stacey and Mike, all of Teheran; his mother, Mrs. Ghaska Rogers of Hugo, and two sisters, Mrs. Robert N. Welch of Hampton, Virginia, and Mrs. Tom Phillip of Oklahoma City.

NARRATIVE APPRAISAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CAREER SERVICE AWARD, JOE W. ANDERSON, DIRECTOR, VA REGIONAL OFFICE, MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Mr. Anderson began his career with the VA as a Contact Representative on May 14, 1946. He worked at the regional office in Muskogee until February 1, 1947, when he was promoted and transferred to Hugo, Oklahoma, as Chief of Hugo Contact Section. Mr. Anderson remained in this position until he was selected as Assistant Contact Officer on May 6, 1956, and returned to Muskogee. On September 30, 1957, he left the VA to become Administrative Assistant for Congressman Carl Albert and then to spend several years in private enterprise. Mr. Anderson returned to the VA on February 14, 1966, as a Program Management Officer in the Area Field Director's Office, Area 4. On April 1, 1966, he was appointed as Manager, VARO, Muskogee, a position he held until his retirement on June 30, 1973.

Throughout his distinguished career with the VA Mr. Anderson continually displayed the characteristics of outstanding leadership and dedication to his work. This performance of duty earned him the following recognition from Central Office:

1. Area Field Director's Commendation—1969—in recognition of dedication and exceptional service.
2. Chief Benefits Director's Performance Award—1970.
3. Chief Benefits Director's Performance Award—1971.
4. Chief Benefits Director's Performance Award—1972.

Mr. Anderson's exceptional work did not go unnoticed by the service organizations in Oklahoma and nationally. The esteem of these organizations is reflected in the awards they presented to him:

1. VFW—1968—Special Award (Plaque) for Outstanding Service Rendered to Oklahoma Veterans and Their Dependents.
2. VFW—1972—Recognition Award from Patrick E. Carr, Commander-in-Chief of VFW.
3. American Legion—1971—Special Award (Plaque) for Dedicated Service to Oklahoma Veterans.
4. American Legion—1968—Special Award, American Legion of Oklahoma, in Appreciation for Services to Oklahoma Veterans.
5. DAV—1970—National Citation for Distinguished Service.
6. DAV—1971—Special Award (Plaque)

reading: "In recognition of the dedication to his work, the performance of his duties, his sympathy and understanding of the problems of the veterans and his dependents, presents to Joe W. Anderson, Director, VA Regional Office, Muskogee, this reminder of our appreciation of his work with us as a friend, fellow veteran and humanitarian."

7. Award by Resolution—State: American Legion—1969, 1970, 1971. VFW—1970, 1971, 1972. DAV—1972—Entered in Congressional Record, Volume 118, No. 104, dated June 26, 1972, by Congressman Ed Edmondson.

Mr. Anderson's talents and leadership have prompted numerous other organizations nationally, as well as at the state and local levels, to seek his participation in their endeavors. Without fail, Mr. Anderson has given freely of his time and actively participated in these groups:

1. President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.
2. National Committee—Jobs for Veterans.
3. Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.
4. Governor's Committee—Jobs for Veterans.
5. Chairman, Muskogee Postal Customers' Council for 7 years—Appointed by Postmaster General.
6. Member, Interagency Board U. S. Civil Service Examiners.
7. Member, Intertribal Council of 5 Civilized Tribes.
8. Member, Chickasaw Advisory Council.
9. Consultant—Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Indian Health.

In recognition of his outstanding work in these organizations, Mr. Anderson has received the following special awards:

1. Award 1973—For outstanding service and dedication to America's veterans in support of the President's Job for Veterans Program—James F. Oates for The National Committee—Jobs for Veterans.
2. Ambassador of Goodwill Award, 1973—from Oklahoma Governor David Hall.

Additionally, he has served for many years as:

1. Member, Board of Directors, Muskogee Chamber of Commerce.
2. Member, Human Relations Committee, Muskogee Chamber of Commerce.
3. Member, Congressional Action Committee, Muskogee Chamber of Commerce.
4. Co-Chairman, Long Range Planning Committee, Eastern Oklahoma Council of Boy Scouts of America.
5. Member, Board of Directors, Choctaw County (Hugo) Chamber of Commerce.
6. Member, Board of Directors, Choctaw County (Hugo) Memorial Hospital.
7. Chairman, Muskogee Combined Federal Campaign Coordinating Committee.

Mr. Anderson continually demonstrated the ultimate in leadership excellence. His established reputation for leadership within the VA as well as outside is unquestionable. In day-to-day dealings with subordinates, Mr. Anderson used sound, effective principles of leadership. He fully realized the drives, motivations, and ambitions which affect attitudes and performances.

He inspired his co-workers to react with a team spirit which resulted in the production of high quality work throughout the regional office. He was quick to recognize and develop the talents of his co-workers. A testament of this ability is the enviable record he compiled the last 14 months of his directorship. In that period 20 of his co-workers were promoted and transferred to other VA stations. These included in part: 1 Assistant Director, 2 Loan Guaranty Officers, 1 Adjudication Officer, 1 Assistant Adjudication Officer, 1 Personnel Officer, 1 Assistant Personnel Officer, 2 to Central Office, and 1 Secretary to Director.

Mr. Anderson possessed to a high degree

and used with effectiveness all those qualities which inspired affection and respect. He knew all the employees of the regional office by name and something of their background. He frequently visited them on the job and displayed the active interest he had in them and their job performance. His comprehensive knowledge of the various programs enabled him to "talk shop" as he visited different areas. Those who worked under him believed in his ability as a leader. They rated him knowledgeable, resourceful, and committed. He had an eager and curious mind which was constantly alert for innovations and improvements in approaches and methods. His continuing "in touch" relation with office conditions enabled him to identify and correct incipient irritations and problems. He applied sound reasoning to the solution of the instant problem in such a way as to prevent its recurrence.

His personal example was a constant reminder to his employees of the need for a conscious effort to maintain a favorable public image. He instilled in his staff a sincere concern and a deep sense of dedication and personal commitment to the accomplishments of the station's mission to serve the veteran, his widow, and orphan.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, It was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of Joe W. Anderson, a devoted and effective public servant as well as a friend.

I first became well acquainted with him in the late 1950's when he served here as administrative assistant to Congressman ALBERT. His roots were in Oklahoma, to which he contributed a great deal, and he soon returned there.

As manager of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Muskogee, Okla., Joe Anderson brought a warm-hearted concern to the problems of veterans with which he dealt. No problem was too small for him to give it due attention.

He helped to make certain that veterans received prompt consideration of their problems. He made it easier for them to reach Veterans' Administration personnel. When he retired because of ill health some 2 years ago an entire generation of veterans in Oklahoma had reason to be grateful for his services. I have never known anyone with more expertise in and devotion to the welfare of veterans.

Our sympathy goes to his family at this untimely loss.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of personal loss that I heard your announcement this morning at our Oklahoma congressional delegation breakfast of the untimely passing of our good and mutual friend, Joe Anderson of Muskogee.

Joe will long be remembered by the members of the Oklahoma delegation and their staff members as one of the most able public servants our State of Oklahoma has ever produced. As a member of your staff and as director of the Muskogee Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration, Joe worked diligently to provide personal service to our fellow Oklahomans.

I offer my condolences to the Anderson family.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma and America have truly lost a good man. It was with great sorrow that I learned that Joe Anderson, an Oklahoman of diverse and impressive talents, had passed away in Iran.

Although I did not have the privilege of working directly with Mr. Anderson, I know him well through his dedicated work with the office of my distinguished colleague, Speaker ALBERT, and with the Veterans' Administration in Muskogee.

Few Oklahomans in recent years have earned and deserved the respect of their contemporaries as much as did Joe Anderson. His death is truly a loss to ourselves, our State, and our Nation.

Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, among the great people who have served this country is numbered Joe W. Anderson. For many years, he was administrative assistant to our colleague, Mr. ALBERT, but later he was head of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Muskogee in the Second District of Oklahoma.

With sorrow, we note that Mr. Anderson died recently while visiting his daughter in Iran. While the loss will be felt most directly by his family and his old friend, Speaker ALBERT, I would like to add that I counted Joe as a friend and respected him as a citizen.

Joe Anderson was a disabled veteran who most humanly understood the role and mission of the Veterans' Administration. He added warmth and care to a tough administrative job. He was a good man, a patriotic American, and a loving father who will be missed by all who enjoyed the goodness of his life.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the news of Joe Anderson's untimely death was indeed a sad moment for those of us who had the good fortune to know and work with him during his distinguished career on Capitol Hill and in the Veterans' Administration.

As a former member of your Washington staff, Joe earned the very highest respect of all Oklahomans who came in contact with him. He showed a unique dedication to the needs of your constituents, and the problems of all Oklahomans as well.

After leaving Washington in 1966 to become Administrator of the Muskogee Regional Veterans' Administration Office, Joe became known as both a friend of every GI, and a competent and able Administrator. During Joe's tenure, the Muskogee VA hospital received badly needed improvements, largely as a result of his tireless efforts within the VA, and before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Joe fulfilled the pledge he had made to bring top-grade medical care to the veterans in his region.

Even after his retirement from Federal service in 1973, Joe continued to assist needy veterans on a volunteer basis, and through his frequent visits, we in the Oklahoma congressional delegation were kept informed of his activities and the major problems and needs of ex-servicemen within our State.

Joe Anderson was both my own friend, and a friend of my family. We will all deeply miss him, and to his family I extend my heartfelt sympathies. Joe was a dedicated servant of the people, and a man whose concern for others should be an example for us all.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks on the passing of a fine servant of the House and official of the Veterans' Administration, a man who was highly decorated, wounded, and disabled, Joe W. Anderson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO BAR IMPORT FEE ON PETROLEUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to provide for congressional disapproval of Presidential increases in import fees on imported petroleum products such as were proposed by President Ford to dampen consumption.

My bill would amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that no Presidential action taken under the national security section (19 U.S.C. 1862), such as the proposed import fees, would become effective until submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress. The submission would be in the form of a report stating both the nature of the action to be taken and the reasons underlying the President's decision.

Following the Presidential submission the Congress would have 60 legislative days to disapprove by concurrent resolution, the contemplated or initiated action. The procedure for disapproval is modeled after the process employed in the war powers legislation enacted by the 93d Congress.

The President's ability to act during a genuine national emergency would not be impaired. There is nothing in my bill that would prevent the President from taking those steps contemplated by section 232, such as raising import fees. Under my bill, the action could have been initiated by the time the Congress begins deliberations on the concurrent resolution. Indeed, the President would still be able to go forward with his petroleum import fee plan as before, pending congressional action. All that would be required is the submission to the Congress of the required report at the time the proposed action is to be implemented.

My proposal would further safeguard the intent of the 1962 trade laws against abuse or improper use by the President. Under existing law there is no recourse. In my view this is too important an oversight not to remedy.

My proposed course of action is dictated by several factors. First, the President's proposed import fee on petroleum under section 232 appears to violate the notice and hearings requirements established by the Trade Reform Act of 1974. That section was designed to afford interested parties time to present evidence on both sides of the question to give the

President a broad and detailed picture of the problem and the need to utilize extraordinary Presidential power to protect the Nation's security. In my view, the action contemplated by the White House is entirely outside the parameters of the Trade Reform Act, violates the intent of the 1962 provisions, and is a Presidential attempt to legislate by Executive fiat—a usurpation of the Congress prerogative to which I object.

Second, if indeed the action is only temporary, designed to implement a policy of fostering a decline in energy consumption, the method is one which is doomed to failure.

Oil experts believe that less than 800,000 barrels of oil a day will be saved under the Ford plan, and that foreign oil consumption would decline by an even slower rate than overall demand. Further, it now appears that gasoline, which comprises approximately 45.8 percent of all petroleum consumption and where our greatest reduction in usage could occur would be the least heavily taxed form of energy.

Raising import fees would do little more than continue the ill-advised pricing policies of the Nixon-Ford administrations which resulted in smaller rises in the price of gasoline—37 percent—than for diesel fuel—49 percent—home heating oil—66 percent—residual oil burned by electric utilities—143 percent—and aviation fuel—100 percent—over the last 18 months.

According to one recently published article on the President's proposed oil program, a gallon of fuel will cost an additional 10 cents. Given the exigencies of the oil industry, it means that on a percentage basis, the cost of a gallon of gasoline will rise less than a gallon of diesel or aviation fuel, or home heating oil. Gasoline prices would increase 19.2 percent while heating oil jumped by 28 percent and aviation fuel spurted upwards by 42 percent.

Aside from the questionable legality of the import-fee proposal, commonsense dictates that curtailing unnecessary driving would be the least painful way to reduce oil consumption. It would be anti-inflationary, and would, on the whole, be fairer than making changes in the American lifestyle dependent upon the inability to pay.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States outlined to this Congress an energy program which he hoped would correct many of the imbalances which now exist. He stated that this energy program was designed to make the United States invulnerable to the actions of foreign powers, especially those from whom we import large amounts of oil. In implementing the program, two vital stages are envisioned. First, the President proposed a \$3 tariff on crude imports and a \$2 tariff on

oil imports. Second, oil prices would be decontrolled, and a \$2 tax would be put on domestic oil, while the tariff on imported oil would drop to \$2.

I do not question the integrity of the President in proposing such an energy package, Mr. Speaker, but I do strenuously object to the makeup of the program and to the impact which it will have on certain regions of the country. If this program is adopted, it will deal a devastating blow to New England, and in particular, to my State of Massachusetts. Quite candidly, I cannot imagine any set of proposals which would strike at the economy and the consumer of New England quite as much as this package, and I am awestruck when I read of the devastation which these proposals would bring about on my constituents.

The main portion of the President's energy program is of course the \$3 a barrel fee on imported oil. Since New England is 75 percent dependent on oil for its energy needs and almost totally dependent upon imported residual fuel oil for generating its electrical power, our region is affected much more heavily than other regions in the United States. This 75 percent figure stands in stark contrast to other sections of the country, many of which are only 30 and 40 percent dependent on oil in their energy consumption. But the \$3 tariff is only the first step in the President's program. If oil prices were also decontrolled, as the President has requested, New England would be adversely affected even more. If we were to follow Mr. Ford's solution to the energy crisis, we would be helping to turn New England into a disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, talk of New England as an economically depressed area is not idle speculation in view of these most recent developments. Already, unemployment in Massachusetts has risen to a record high of over 9 percent. At the same time, our State is experiencing the worst rash of plant shutdowns and layoffs in more than 20 years. The tariff and the other oil proposals would grievously hurt the New England competitive situation, and might put us on the road to becoming the new Appalachia of America.

Let us look at the actual figures which point to the dreary conclusions which I have drawn above. Just taking the \$3 tariff on crude imports, it can be seen that the President's plan would increase by \$442 million a year the cost that New England pays for residual oil. Ninety-one percent of this oil is imported, and half of the cost will be directly borne by the electric utilities. This would, of course, be reflected in the consumer's higher electric bills in the coming year. In addition, New Englanders will be paying approximately \$300 million more for the 4.4 billion gallons of gasoline which they consume, each gallon of gas rising in price by about 7 cents.

We then turn to heating costs, which will rise by some \$75 million a year. This means another annual \$45 million in fuel adjustment charges for the consumer, and this will add at least \$30 more to each family's heating bills. Heating oil, which went from 22 cents per gallon in mid-1973 to 35 cents and more last sum-

mer, will probably go up to 50 cents and more per gallon. The implications of this price rise are genuinely fearsome.

In adding up all of these grim statistics, we find that the total cost of the first phase of the Ford oil program would be about \$823 million for New England alone. If we then proceed on to phase 2 of the President's energy program, we find an additional staggering figure of \$1.357 billion for New England, or a total of \$2.18 billion for the cost of the two phases together. This compares to the national cost of \$30 billion. It is not difficult to see that New England is being unjustly discriminated against, and that our region would bear an unnecessarily heavy burden. Indeed, with only 5:8 percent of the Nation's population, we would be asked to bear 10.5 percent of the newly imposed energy cost increases. In view of our region's already high unemployment rate and its future economic prospects, I think it is evidently clear that New England is not crying "stop" for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that insofar as the energy crisis, our region is well ahead of the rest of the country in promoting energy conservation. We are doing our share, and this is reflected in the energy savings which have been brought about. Industrial companies in Massachusetts have cut fuel consumption from 20 to 35 percent, and residential consumers have realized up to 20 percent savings in heating oil. However, there is a practical limit to the conservation measures which can be taken by industries and companies, and I fear that the only way to further reduce oil consumption would be to actually close the doors of our businesses. Therefore, instead of having the effect of conserving energy, the oil tariff would only force these companies to pay a higher price for what they must have. In some cases, companies may be forced to close, further adding to the already high amount of unemployment.

I have noted in recent days articles which have called attention to the thousands of Americans, very probably hundreds of thousands, who are losing the heat in their homes as winter and economic recession close in. Their problem is that they simply cannot pay their bloated fuel bills, and as a result, fuel distributors are just cutting off these people in sharply increasing numbers. One major New York oil distributor said last week that if the weather really turns cold in the Northeast, that perhaps between 20 and 40 percent of his customers would be unable to meet their fuel bills. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if this was the situation before any increased energy prices were implemented, what kind of situation might we be creating after the cost increases go into effect. We simply cannot allow this situation to occur in a country which has long been noted for its humanity and compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to allow the President to blithely implement an energy program which would bring about such economic chaos for New England. I am taking legal action against the President of the United States in an attempt to enjoin the imposition of the \$3 per barrel oil tariff. I will argue to the

courts that the President does not have the authority to impose such a duty, as under article I, section 8 of the Constitution, Congress is given the exclusive power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises." The President has cited the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as his legal authority, but that act only allows the President to "adjust the imports" of articles such as oil. While the President might have the power to restrict oil imports, he does not have the power to impose such a heavy tariff, whether that tariff is called a "tariff" or "license" as the President prefers to call it.

I am hopeful that my suit, which will be joined by a number of New England utilities, will be successful on the merits. While I do agree with the President that strong energy policies must be taken in the near future, I feel that it is incumbent upon the President to carefully regard all interests of the country in making such energy decisions. In the meantime, I feel it is important for us to file an action against the President's program.

A second action which I am taking in order to stop the implementation of this dangerous energy program is to file legislation requiring Congress approval of any tariff imposed by the President. In the bill that I have cosponsored, it is specified that—

After January 14, 1975, no tariff, fee, or quota may be imposed by the President pursuant to this section with respect to imported petroleum or petroleum products unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, first approves the imposition of such tariff, fee, or quota.

If this legislation is enacted, the President will not be granted the power to unilaterally impose such a program on the country and its consumers without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly fear for the economic prospects of my State of Massachusetts and for the New England region as a whole should the President's energy program be implemented. In view of this potentially disastrous situation, I feel it is incumbent upon the Congress to act speedily in insuring that the President's program is in the best interests of the entire country. I am sure that my colleagues would not want to see one region of our Nation sacrificed by the energy decision of our President. We must undertake positive actions in the energy field, but let us insure that Massachusetts and New England as a whole can survive the impact of these policies.

AUTO PRICES: PROFITS AND INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Friday, the Ford Motor Co., following the lead of Chrysler, announced a plan to rebate up to \$500 to the purchasers of new cars.

I share the hope of Detroit's auto manufacturers that this dramatic move will help encourage car sales, thus improving the economy and putting employees back to work.

But why was this not done earlier? Better yet, why did Detroit insist on such big price increases last fall that the American consumer was forced out of the automobile market?

There is no indication that by offering these rebates that these cars are going to be sold at a loss. Indeed, it now appears that in some models there is considerably more than \$500 profit or "leeway" per auto. But last September, Ford President Lee A. Iacocca said that because of rising costs, the company wanted to lift prices by \$500. The New York Times of September 13, 1974 reported:

The company said the increase included \$269, or 5.3 per cent, to cover part of its increased costs for labor, material and parts; \$104, or 2.1 per cent, to cover the basic cost of Government-mandated equipment on the 1975 models, and \$18, or 0.3 per cent, to cover previously optional equipment made standard.

Ford said that from Oct. 1, 1972 to Oct. 1, 1974, costs increased \$950 per vehicle, of which \$400 had been recovered by higher prices up to now, "leaving unrecovered costs of about \$550."

The 1975 model increase of \$391 would reduce the unrecovered costs to \$159.

Something is strange here, Mr. Speaker. Either the September statement of Ford Motor Co. was in "error" about unrecovered costs or, if unrecovered costs reduced the profit margin per car, then profits had been running at least as high as \$700 per car.

The rebates also reveal the utter failure of the administration's jawboning efforts. When the 1975 model year price increases were announced last summer, the administration made a "big" effort to reduce the level of these increases and was satisfied by a miniscule reduction.

Our country and its workers are going through a hard and frightening winter—a time of troubles which could have been largely avoided by either price restraint or tougher Government action last fall.

THE NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON has announced that his Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will conduct an inquiry into the effectiveness of Drug Enforcement Administration's efforts to stem the flow of heroin into the United States.

I applaud this initiative. But, I also believe that an examination must be conducted concurrently into the effectiveness of the National Institute of Drug Abuse's administration of millions of dollars in Federal funds for the treatment of drug users. Last year I had some correspondence with Dr. Robert DuPont, Director of the National Institute of Drug Abuse, concerning the controversy that has arisen in New York City over the effectiveness of both the privately operated treatment programs supported by public funds and the city's administering agency, the addiction services administration. In October, I asked that Dr.

DuPont's institute make a programmatic review of the city's treatment programs to determine if HRA's charges of ineffectiveness and incompetence were justified or whether the charges of incompetence levied against HRA's Administrator by the program director were justified. In short, I felt that if either were true, the Federal Government should find out about it, since approximately millions of dollars in Federal funds are being spent annually by the Institute of Drug Abuse in New York City.

By letter of December 10, Dr. DuPont declined my request protesting that he had "neither the legislative mandate nor sufficient staff to investigate and determine the accuracy of the allegations."

If this is true, this signals a significant weakness in our Federal drug program—one which should be examined by the Jackson subcommittee. Should the distinguished Senator review the effectiveness of the Government's administration of treatment dollars, I have requested permission to testify before the subcommittee.

The interception of heroin's flow into this country is certainly important. But, we also must be sure that we are doing the best we can to allay the demand for heroin generated in this country by those already addicted to the drug.

Attached is my letter to Senator JACKSON:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1975.

HON. HENRY JACKSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read in today's New York Times that you plan an inquiry into the Administration of the Drug Enforcement Administration to determine its effectiveness in stemming the flow of heroin into the United States. I would like to suggest that you broaden that hearing to include its effectiveness in administering the millions of dollars spent in the treatment of drug users.

I made this suggestion because of what is happening in New York City. Addiction Services Administrator Jerome Hornbliss is responsible for spending over \$80 million in drug control funds, \$8 million of which comes directly from the federal government. In addition, the N.Y. State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission receives another \$47 million in federal funds and allocates much of that amount to the City as well. The city agencies conducting the treatment programs have been criticized by Administrator Hornbliss as being inept and ineffective. In turn, the program directors have charged Mr. Hornbliss with incompetence.

I brought this matter to the attention of Dr. Robert DuPont, Director of the National Institute of Drug Abuse, asking him to investigate the charges and counter-charges since federal funds are involved. By letter of December 10th, DuPont advised me, however, that the National Institute of Drug Abuse has "neither the legislative mandate nor sufficient staff to investigate and determine the accuracy of the allegations." In short, he declined to undertake an investigation and effectively turned his back on the potential squandering of millions of dollars.

Enclosed you will find a recent statement I made on this subject together with several of the letters that I have inserted in the *Congressional Record* setting forth the matter in more detail. In the event that you broaden the scope of the hearings to include this aspect, I would very much ap-

preciate the opportunity to appear before your committee to provide them with the background information.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

EDITORIALS IN SUPPORT OF REPEALING TRUCK WEIGHT INCREASES

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week, together with a number of cosponsors, I will be introducing legislation to repeal Interstate Highway truck weight increases that were voted late in the last Congress as part of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1974, a multipurpose highway bill that could not be amended under suspension of the rules.

Because of safety hazards caused by the increased weight, and an estimated multibillion-dollar cost the weight increase will mean in highway maintenance, the increase is opposed by the American Automobile Association, the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee—chartered by Congress to advise the Secretary of Transportation—the National Association of Counties, the Professional Drivers' Council, the Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this legislation to repeal the dangerous and costly truck weight increases. A sampling of editorial opinion from throughout the country is appended.

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Morning Journal, Jan. 9, 1975]

THE 55-MILE-PER-HOUR LIMIT IS FINE—BUT NOT HEAVIER TRUCKS

Did President Ford give thought to the idea that when he signed the bill that raises the maximum weight limit for highway monsters, he also may have been signing the death warrant for many Americans?

The new law permits trucks plying interstate roads to carry 80,000 pounds, up from the 73,230 pounds set by Congress in 1956. In the intervening 13 years, the public, as represented by the American Automobile Assn. and other safety advocates, successfully has fought off the trucking industry's campaign to get the limit raised.

But in 1974, the clout of AAA was dwarfed by last minute feeding of contributions to candidates for the 94th Congress by the industry's well heeled political arm. An industry spokesman says the contributions came from the Teamsters—a claim hard to imagine. Surely heavier loads increase the responsibility of the truck driver and add to the fatigue factor that is always a highway danger.

Safety experts say that the heavier the truck, the greater are the hazards. Such trucks climb hills more slowly and stop more slowly than automobiles. With greater weight, obviously, the more likely it is that the truck would kill the occupants of an automobile in a collision.

Indeed, the heavier the truck, the more likely it is to have accidents. The U.S. Transportation Dept. explains that the larger loads will add to the strain on big rig braking systems which are none too efficient now.

There is, too, the certainty that these more heavily laden trucks will chew up the highways more than they do now, requiring extra millions of dollars in repairs. Before Transportation Depts. catch up with the potholes

and ruts, there is the increased danger to motorists who follow in the wake of the 40 ton destroyers.

Then there is the psychological danger to the driving public that the tonnage increase will augment. Big trucks now can unnerve drivers as they roar by—too many do not observe the speed limit—with ear shattering noise. They can make small cars actually swerve from the rush of wind.

The bill does have a good feature. It makes the 55 mile an hour speed limit permanent—a limit that has proved to be a leading factor in lowering the nation's highway death rate.

But such a measure should not have been saddled with the specter of death that the clause allowing heavier trucks represents. Ford should have considered this and used the veto he likes to exercise.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Dec. 23, 1974]

FORTY-TON MONSTERS

Bigger is better, according to the oil companies and tanker-builders who are forever endangering the oceans with ever larger ships, collisions and spills. In trucks, you can't go wider because of laning or higher because of bridging, but longer and heavier is better, according to the American Trucking Association, an owner group. The association is very happy right now, following congressional approval of a bill raising the weight limit on the Interstate network from 36-plus tons to 40.

What do 80,000-pound truck loads mean? Some reduction in unit-cost shipping expenses, when a monster truck happens to have a full load. Second, the effect is greater pounding on road surfaces—they wear out sooner—though it's the public's fares and taxes, not the fleet owner's, which are billed for the repaving. Third, driving becomes that much more dangerous. Not just for the fellow behind the truck wheel, but for whoever in an ordinary-size vehicle is in his path in the event of a skid, wobble or sudden stop. As the American Automobile Association points out, the fatality rate for big rigs is already almost double that for ordinary traffic.

It isn't always the driver and passenger in the small foreign car who get expunged when some truck highballing on past, on a downgrade well above the speed limit, veers in a high wind or hits a patch of ice. Sometimes the monster tries to stop in a hurry and jackknives, and it is the driver who gets mashed or incinerated. There is an effort on to make President Ford realize that this bill is business as unusual, and bad business—a bill calling for veto. Maybe individual truck drivers, facing these increased threats to their own lives and to their friends' and neighbors' lives will sound off loud enough for the White House to hear. Somebody ought to be blowing the horn on this bad bill.

[From the Detroit News, Dec. 27, 1974]

THE TRUCK TALKS—AND CONGRESS OBEYS

The 93rd Congress authored an outrage against the public highway system. Bending like a willow in the wind to the truckers, the lawmakers passed a bill which would permit 80,000-pound trucks to roll down the interstate highways.

The previous limit of 73,280 pounds was attacked by the strong and wealthy truck lobby. Truckers argued they couldn't make money because they lost too much time traveling at the new fuel-conserving 55 m.p.h. speed limit.

The argument is phony because the truckers have not sacrificed profits to the lower limit. It is well known that truckers are not observing the 55 m.p.h. speed limit. Using citizen band radios illegally to inform one another about location of radar units, the

trucks are rolling at the same old speeds, slowing down only when approaching police cars.

Even if the truckers were observing the 55 m.p.h. speed limit, the difference in time over the 70 m.p.h. limit on interstates is hardly great enough to interfere with their coffee breaks. A 55 m.p.h. speed limit does not alter time required to get to and from freeways and to load the trucks. It applies only to the running times at full speed which are a portion of the trip.

The interstate highways were paid for out of a trust fund bankrolled by the gasoline tax. The automobile owner pays far more than his share for this system. This is especially true when you consider how much less such highways would cost if they were engineered to stand up only to the strain of a 4,000-pound car. Pavements have to be much thicker and contain steel reinforcing to accommodate 80,000-pound trucks.

In effect, the congressional action permits the trucks to go out and break up by their tremendous weights the pavements that in the main have been paid for by car owners. Those who argue that trucks pay their way on the public highways ought to go back to the studies of the American Association of State Highway Officials which compare the wear and tear imposed on a highway by a truck and a car. Engineers have established how enormous that difference is. There is no trucking firm in this country paying fees equal to the wear and tear factors plotted in these studies.

The House did not advocate weight increases but in a conference committee on highway legislation, House conferees went along with the senators who had been so well and thoroughly wooed by the trucking lobby. The truckers won. The public will suffer another abuse of its highway trust funds.

The next assault on legislators will be to increase widths and lengths of trucks, to make absolutely certain that truck traffic entirely destroys the small amount of pleasure enjoyed by the public traveling interstate highways.

If Congress feels bound to salve the whimperings of a coddled trucking industry, let them change the Interstate Commerce Commission rules so that unnecessary empty runs of trucks will be eliminated. There would be more profit in that for the truckers and more efficiency in the use of fuel.

Congress needs to be sharply reminded that interstate highways belong to the people and not to the trucking industry. Or at least they did. The trouble is, as the muscle of the truckers is felt in Washington, the people who paid the major share of the highway bill are pushed farther into the background.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Dec. 24, 1974]

THE M-60 TRUCKS

Look out! Here come the 40-ton monsters down the expressways!

Congress is in the process of passing a bill to increase the maximum truck weight limits on interstate highways from 73,280 pounds to 80,000 pounds. That's only 10 tons or so lighter than an M-60 tank, the kind the Army runs through or over trees with.

The weight increase, the first allowed in 18 years (a long time for congressional sanity), was strongly opposed by the American Automobile Association and other groups. The weight boost was part of a \$752.8 million federal aid highway bill which has been worked out in conference by the House and Senate.

The bill concerns several other highway matters, such as banning certain large billboard signs and ordering the states to enforce the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit on the interstates—both of which sound great. But

the monster trucks don't sound so good (if you can hear anything after they go by).

Trucking interests have been trying for years to get truck weights increased with no success. But now they have succeeded with that jazz about America's needs moving by truck and patriotic talk about saving fuel in the energy crisis. And there might even be some truth to that.

But what will all that weight do to our interstates? And what happens to the little bitty two- and three-ton cars as those giant trucks go zooming down the expressways, drawing a small hurricane along with them? Driving the expressways is already the most daredevil act this side of skydiving.

Maybe the heavier trucks won't be too much of a problem on the interstates, but for the safety and sanity of us all, keep them off the regular highways. Can you imagine getting behind (or even worse, in front of) one of those 40-ton behemoths on a hilly, curvy, narrow highway?

The original bill passed by the House had no truck-weight provisions, but the Senate bill did. And then in conference a clause was added that those states which already have truck weight limits higher than 80,000 pounds on non-interstate highways may extend that higher limit to the interstates.

"The Senate bill was an assault on the motorist, but the conference bill was a rape," said James J. Gudinas, assistant highway director of the AAA. Can you imagine? Before you know it, they'll be letting 'em move the whole store down the highway.

But maybe Congress hasn't lost its senses completely in authorizing the heavier trucks. It did talk mean about enforcing the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. And in case you state patrolmen don't understand, that means the big trucks too.

[From the Sarasota (Fla.) Journal, Dec. 20, 1974]

BIGGER TRUCKS LIKELY

Congress has voted to allow heavier trucks on the nation's interstate highways. The American Automobile Association calls it a "rape of the motorist." We applaud the AAA and hope that President Ford may choose to veto the bill.

The basic increase in weight—the first allowed in 18 years—would be from 73,280 pounds to 80,000 pounds.

It is interesting to note that the bill also orders that the states enforce the 55-mile an-hour speed limit under penalty of losing federal highway funds.

We can just see the present big trucks zooming along above 55 and the prospect of them weighing 40 tons instead of a paltry 36 makes a return to the days of shank's mare or the Old Grey Mare worth consideration. For shame, Congressmen!

[From the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News, Dec. 26, 1974]

BILL TO INCREASE TRUCK LOAD IS A STEP BACKWARD

Taking a big step backward, the Congress sent to the President last week a bill that will allow increased truck weights on interstate highways. The bill, which has been pushed by trucking interests, means that the maximum weight for trucks using interstate highways will be upped from 73,280 to 80,000 pounds gross weight.

In Alabama the new law will be a defeat for state forces who last year fought off an attempt by truckers to increase allowable weights on the state's highways. Attorney Gen. Bill Baxley won an agreement from the state highway department to begin construction of permanent weighing scales to enforce the laws, after the state highway department had indicated it did not like the idea of permanent scales. The highway department has preferred the use of portable scales to

the permanent types that truckers can easily evade.

The Congressional action was vigorously opposed by the American Automobile Association and other groups but received overwhelming approval from both houses of Congress. Even worse, the House-Senate conference committee came out with an amendment that could add additional weights to interstate highways in some states. That provision calls for interstate highway weight limits to match those of intrastate highways within a state. In some states, the non-interstate limit is much greater, thus in those states, the maximum weights allowable will be applicable.

Alabama officials concerned with the weights of big trucks on roads and bridges other than interstates are fearful that some of the roads and bridges are not suitable for such heavy loads. Now, with the federal action, the state may have to allow up to the maximum 80,000 pound limit authorized by the new bill on state highways. Another provision of the bill may mean more traffic tickets. The bill calls for strict enforcement of the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit or else loss of state highway funds.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Indicator, Dec. 26, 1974]

SNEAKING UP ON THE ROADS

With little or no advance mention, both houses of the Congress quickly approved a compromise highway bill that increases the weight limits on trucks by about 8 per cent. The American Automobile Association termed the bill "the rape of the motorists." The language may have been a little strong, but the protest was justified.

Truck weight limits on interstate highways generally are to rise from 73,280 pounds to 80,000 pounds, and 20,000 pounds instead of 18,000 may be carried on one axle. In states which already have weight limits higher than these, the state limit will be accepted for interstate highways.

The action was taken to mollify truck drivers, who have been talking about another strike at the end of January to demand higher weight limits and increased limits on length of rigs.

Since the new legislation makes no concessions on length, it is hard to tell whether it will satisfy the truckers, even with the new weight limits. The fact is, of course, that many trucks already have been violating the weight limits (along with speed limits), and the new legislation will benefit only those who have been observing the old ones. These operators probably are in the majority, as they should be, but violations have been common enough that our highways have suffered.

The interstate highways have been engineered to handle heavy loads; yet it is obvious to any motorist that these superhighways are taking a pounding. The principal problem, however, is that the 40-ton burden of the trucks has to travel over other roads to get on and off the interstates. Many roads and bridges that are below modern standards have load limits posted, but other highways, as well as city streets, were not built for such loads, and they are likely to be abused even more than before.

The higher weight limits were in the bill when it passed the Senate last September, but for some reason got little attention amid the discussions of mass transit. They were not in the bill as it first passed the House, but House members of the conference committee yielded on this point and the House, abandoning its long resistance to higher load limits, quickly passed the bill.

The bill provides \$753 million for road construction, mainly in rural areas, puts new limits on "jumbo" billboards near interstate highways, and permits cities to use additional funds for urban mass transit instead of highways. For these reasons, along with

the practical policies of pleasing the truckers, President Ford may approve the bill.

The truck operators pay heavy taxes toward highway construction and maintenance. It is undeniable, however, that much of that maintenance is necessary only because of the heavy trucks. The other taxpayers, and especially motorists, should make it plain to the Congress that these new weight limits, if they become law, should be permanent. The states and the nation cannot afford to rebuild their highway systems in order to make one industry more profitable.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Dec. 19, 1974]

THE BIG-TRUCK LOBBY

Once those big-truck lobbyists get rolling, stopping them is akin to braking a tractor-trailer with a stick spragged into the ground.

It ain't easy. And even when you think you've got them slowed they somehow generate more momentum; and then they try to ram bigger-than-ever trucks, carrying heavier-than-ever cargoes, down the public's highways.

Right now, for instance, the truck lobby—realizing the rush as Congress moves toward adjournment—is trying to cloak in the legislation crowd a proposal to allow heavier trucks on federal highways and major state highways. In terms of weight, the lobby wants the maximum increased from the current 73,000 pounds to 80,000 pounds—a weight New York Democrat Rep. Edward Koch says will require millions more dollars for road maintenance.

Highway damage is not the only item to be guarded against as the truck lobby presses for bigger trucks and heavier loads; there's a little matter of safety on the highways. And that aspect was mentioned the other day in a Wall Street Journal column., to wit:

"Big, heavy trucks are a safety hazard on the open road because they travel in a 'mix' with passenger cars; chances of fatalities are considerably greater, for example, when a big truck and a car collide than when two cars collide. Now, as Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr., the Tennessee Republican puts it, 'Increased truck sizes and weights could present substantial threats to the safety of smaller passenger vehicles sharing the highways. . . .'"

That, of course, is nothing that we haven't editorially stated before; and the problem of big trucks and heavy loads is naturally compounded when the trucks are traveling terrain such as Pennsylvania and other mountainous states contain; the Johnstown district can attest, tragically, to too many instances of death caused by runaway trucks.

To allow even bigger trucks would, therefore, constitute a daring of fate so far as safety is concerned and a don't care attitude in regard to highway maintenance.

We don't expect that admonition to worry the truck lobbyists; however, they should not expect us and others who are worried about highway safety and upkeep to back off in attempts to keep truck sizes and cargo weights from getting out of hand.

[From the Madison (Wis.) State Journal, Dec. 27, 1974]

TRUCK WEIGHT INCREASE

Tucked in between provisions for highway safety and beautification in the highway aid bill which recently cleared Congress is a section which would permit a 10 per cent increase in weights trucks can carry on Interstate and federal highways.

The move was seen as a sop to the trucking industry which failed to defeat the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit measure enacted earlier, a measure which reduced fuel consumption and cut down on traffic fatalities.

The truckers argued that with the slower speeds the heavier trucks would not inflict

significant damage to the roads. This would be a questionable position even if it could be demonstrated that truckers are religiously observing the lower speed limit, an assumption that is even more questionable.

By permitting truck weights to increase from 73,280 to 80,000 pounds, roads and bridges are bound to come under heavier stress, which will result in more repairs at taxpayers' expense.

While the federal action is only permissive requiring state legislative approval to go into effect within the various jurisdictions, it will add emphasis to the truckers' continuing efforts to permit bigger and heavier trucks, which further endanger and inconvenience automobile drivers.

The Wisconsin Legislature beat back a strong attempt by the Wisconsin Motor Carriers Assn. to change the state law to permit 65-foot, double-bottom trucks on Wisconsin's four-lane highways.

Many legislative surveys showed overwhelming public opposition to the larger trucks. A Wisconsin American Automobile Assn. poll showed that 86 per cent of those polled were in opposition.

The congressional action to increase the weights was slipped into a conference committee report with insufficient debate as Congress raced to adjourn for the holidays.

If President Ford does not veto the highway bill because of the weight inclusion, the next session of Congress should act promptly to delete it from the law. And if that doesn't happen, Wisconsin lawmakers should reject it.

[From the Los Angeles Times Dec. 25, 1974]

KEEP ON TRUCKIN', BUT—

President Ford should veto the federal highway authorization legislation sent to him by Congress. He should do so because of a rider attached to the measure that would increase federal weight limits on trucks traveling interstate highways.

That amendment represents the initial victory for truckers in their years-long battle. If it is approved it may well lead to further demands from truck operators for longer and wider rigs than presently allowed. That may become necessary, but the government lacks a coherent transportation policy, of which so substantial a change should be a part.

Maximum permissible gross weight for trucks is now 73,280 pounds and the single-axle weight limit is 18,000 pounds. The new bill would increase the gross to 80,000 pounds and the single-axle weight to 20,000 pounds.

During debate in the Senate, Sen. Robert T. Stafford of Vermont, ranking Republican on the transportation subcommittee, emphasized that existing limitations are "the primary inhibition against a new generation of longer, heavier trucks."

In earlier testimony before the committee, a spokesman for the American Automobile Assn. stressed the fact that an increase in axle loadings "will not only reduce the life of present pavements but will also require billions of dollars for reconstruction of older pavements." He added that interstate bridges have been, and are still being designed and constructed on the basis of 18,000 pound axle loads.

The weight limitations would apply only to federal interstate highways. But those heavier rigs would have to travel county roads and city streets when they go off the federal system. Those local thoroughfares and bridges are often less able to stand the impact than the superhighways. That is why auto clubs in both Northern and Southern California, the County Supervisors Assn., and the League of California Cities have opposed relaxation of existing limitations.

Mr. Ford may be inclined to sign the bill because it contains a clause making permanent the 55-m.p.h. speed limit which will otherwise expire June 30. He strongly favors

such a proviso and so do we. But the wiser course would be to withhold approval of this legislation and start anew when the Congress reconvenes next year.

No substantial change in truck weights or sizes should be made until the government develops a national transportation policy that weights the advantages of the several kinds of transportation and attempts rationally to allocate to each of them the open and hidden tax subsidies all of them require.

ART ROONEY AND STEELER FEVER

(Mr. GAYDOS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1975, millions of Americans, through television, became acquainted with a man who is a legend in his time; beloved in his hometown like no other man I know. The stories written and told about this remarkable gentleman are like something from a Damon Runyon novel.

This affable, white-thatched Irishman with a penchant for cigars, who prefers the warm company of friends to the hot glare of publicity, is Mr. Arthur J. Rooney, the proud, respected, and widely admired owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers, winners of the 1975 Super Bowl and champions of the National Football League.

Art Rooney, one of the Nation's most prominent sports figures, is a millionaire. In addition to his Steelers, he owns a 300-acre horse breeding farm and has an interest in several race tracks. He has also been highly successful in other ventures not directly connected with sports.

But, Art Rooney has not always been wealthy and he has never lost touch with those "who knew him when." He still lives in the same house where he and his wife, Kathleen, raised five sons. He still is called "Art" by his friends, who are legion; "The Prez" by his employees and "The Grand Old Man of the NFL" by sportswriters.

Mr. Rooney came into this world in a small coal mining community located in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. His father, Dan, was the sole innkeeper in Coulterville, now known as Coulter, and Art was the first of six boys and two girls due to arrive in the Rooney family.

While Art was still very young, Mr. Rooney moved the family to Pittsburgh where he opened the still-remembered "Rooney Saloon," famous for nickel beers, free lunches, and sports talk. The home was located near the point where the Monongahela River collides with the Allegheny and gushes onward as the Ohio. The area was subject to flooding and on more than one occasion, Art and his brothers paddled their way to school.

The Rooneys all were athletic. Knute Rockne tried to lure Art to Notre Dame to play football; the Boston Red Sox and Chicago Cubs wanted him to play baseball and the professional boxing world beckoned after he won the international lightweight and welterweight championships.

Art never pursued a career but later in

life organized a semipro football team which ultimately led him into the National Football League in 1933. In the meantime, he had acquired a reputation as a horseplayer and won immortality in 1936 when, during a 2-day weekend in New York, he parlayed a \$20 bet into winnings estimated between \$250,000 and \$350,000.

His career in professional football was not so spectacular. In 1933 when he entered his Pittsburgh Pirates in the NFL, the team finished last. It was the first of many defeats, humiliations, and frustrations Art was to experience over the next four decades. On a few occasions, he came close to grabbing pro football's brass ring but, somehow, it always eluded him—until 1974, the year of the Super Steelers.

Steeler fever, dormant for 42 years, ran rampant last season in western Pennsylvania. The "carriers" were easily recognized: Joe Greene, Dwight White, L. C. Greenwood, Ernie Holmes, Franco Harris, Rocky Bleir, Terry Bradshaw, Roy Gerella, Ray Mansfield, Jim Clack, Gerry Mullins, John Kolb, Jack Ham, Mike Wagner, Glen Edwards, Mel Blount, Lynn Swann, Jim Stallworth, Andy Russell, Jack Lambert, Gordon Gravelle, Bob Walden, Joe Gilliam, Terry Hanratty, and head coach Chuck Noll, who turned the cliché "Whatever it takes" into a battlecry.

Mr. Speaker, Art Rooney is one of those rare individuals blessed with the gift to love and be loved. We in the Pittsburgh area are extremely fond of this grand old man. We doubt if there is another like him—anywhere.

STEELER FEVER BOWLS 'EM OVER

(Mr. GAYDOS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our new colleagues in the 94th Congress and to offer whatever assistance I can in helping them serve their Government and its people.

I apologize if I appear somewhat haggard and hoarse but I have not yet recovered from the effects of a fever which began sweeping western Pennsylvania a few months ago. I, along with hundreds of thousands, including some Members of the Pennsylvania delegation in the House, fell victim to super Steeler fever, which reached epidemic proportions Sunday when the sensational Pittsburgh Steelers bowled over the Vikings of Minnesota in New Orleans.

There is no cure for Steeler fever, which lay dormant in our part of the country for 42 years, although it is easily diagnosed. Its victims grow progressively excited and wild-eyed. They are apt, on the spur of the moment, to suddenly explode into a roar, shouting incantations such as "Dee-fense. Dee-fense," or "Dobre Schunka. Dobre Schunka."

The stricken ones can be heard muttering among themselves about a "steel curtain" rung down on Steeler foes by the likes of men such as "Mad Dog,"

"Mean Joe," "Golden Shoes" or "Arrow-head." They rave about mighty forces: "Franco's Italian Army," "Rocky's Rangers" or "Gerella's Gorillas."

The victims have an almost irresistible urge to carve, stitch, sew, or stamp the names of the carriers of Steeler fever on anything available. Hats, cars, sweaters, banners all bear the names of Mansfield, Clack, Mullins, Kolb, Ham, Wagner, Edwards, Blount, Thomas, Swann, Stallworth, Russell, Lambert, and others.

They sing the praises of a Bradshaw and shout the creed of the man who converted the cliché, "Whatever it takes," into a battle cry, Chuck Noll. And they speak in reverence of an affable Irishman addicted to unlit cigars, Mr. Art Rooney, who, after 40 years of draining the dregs of defeat, now sips the sweet wine of supervictory.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not profess to practice medicine, I believe Steeler fever is a chronic virus, diminishing in intensity during the spring and summer, only to flare up anew in the fall. Those of us afflicted with it can be expected to suffer the symptoms for some time, perhaps years.

Consequently, while I do not propose to set a bad example for my new colleagues by engaging in wagering on the floor of the House, I have a proposition for my friends from Minnesota, or anywhere else. A dozen stuffed cabbages and a pound of kielbasa says with Super Bowl 10, Steeler fever strikes again.

THE HATCH ACT: NEED FOR REPEAL

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to guarantee the civilian employees of the executive branch of the United States the right to have counsel or representatives of their choice present during interrogations which may lead to disciplinary actions and to prevent unwarranted reports from employees concerning their private life.

Federal employees need and deserve the legal safeguards contained in my bill, in order that they may render devoted and wholehearted service without the threat of unreasonable or capricious discipline. There is no greater impediment to job commitment than the threat of arbitrary suspension or firing. At a time in this Nation's economic history when the Government is calling upon all workers to increase productivity and have pride in their work, it is imperative that this appropriate legal safeguard be guaranteed to those who carry on the vital day-to-day work of this Nation's business.

Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history when great concern is being voiced about the reduced participation of the general public in the elective process, it is almost ironic that a Federal mandate precludes such political involvement by a group of

people who have a great appreciation and understanding of the workings of the political process. I refer, of course, to Federal employees. And, of course, the mandate to which I refer is the Hatch Act.

The Hatch Act is a classic example of a piece of legislation which has served its intended and useful purpose, and which now serves only to impede one of the most important functions in our democratic process—the right to engage in political activity. The merit principles which the Hatch Act was designed to protect are, for the most part, functioning smoothly. The political pressures of the 1920's and 1930's that led to the passage of the Hatch Act are not an important factor in the 1970's. Other safeguards already in place within the civil service system, together with an alert media and a responsive public, have eliminated the need for the protection extended under the Hatch Act.

It is time to extend the right to participate in the workings of our democratic way of life to Federal employees.

Therefore, I am introducing today legislation to repeal the Hatch Act—legislation which will restore the full rights of citizenship to the Federal employee, rather than placing him in the category of a second-class citizen.

Included among the political activities a Federal employee may enjoy under my bill are:

First, candidacy for or service as delegate, alternate, or proxy in any political convention or service as an officer or employee thereof;

Second, participation in the deliberations of any primary meeting, mass convention or caucus, addressing the meeting, making motions, preparing or assisting in preparing resolutions before the meeting, or taking a prominent part therein;

Third, preparing for, or organizing or conducting a political meeting or rally, addressing such a meeting on any partisan political matter, or taking any part therein;

Fourth, membership in political clubs and organizing of such a club;

Fifth, distributing campaign literature and distributing or wearing campaign badges and buttons;

Sixth, publishing or having editorial or managerial connection with any newspaper, including those generally known as partisan from a political standpoint, and writing for publication or publishing any letter or article, signed or unsigned, soliciting votes in favor of or against any political party, candidate, or faction, except that no such editorial, letter, or article shall make reference to the writer's official employment or authority;

Seventh, organizing or participating in any political parade;

Eighth, initiating or signing nominating petitions on behalf of a partisan candidate, including canvassing for signatures of others; and

Ninth, candidacy for nomination or election to any National, State, county, or municipal office.

In addition, the bill prohibits the use

of official authority for the purpose of affecting the results of elections.

The legislation I propose will amend an outdated and outmoded law so that Federal employees can enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of a participatory democracy.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in working toward early consideration during this Congress.

FOOD STAMP AMENDMENTS

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the first week of December seems to have some attraction for those who wish to commit infamous acts. We are all familiar with the significance of December 7, "a day that will live in infamy," in the classic words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

December 6 now has special significance for those of us who are concerned with the plight of the poor and the elderly. This is the day that the Ford administration decided to launch its surprise attack against those Americans least able to defend themselves against the twin ravages of inflation and recession. The target of opportunity seized upon by the Ford administration in its ill-conceived strategy to cut Federal spending is the food stamp program, which in the past few years has become one of the most important assistance programs available to low-income persons in this country.

In a report issued December 23, 1974, the Joint Economic Committee referred to the food stamp program as—

The income support program reaching the greatest number of people; it focuses on the necessity which has risen most rapidly in price and is a program that can be made more effective with a few simple administrative changes.

In the same report, the committee acknowledges that—

The poor have been the hardest hit by changing economic conditions in 1974. The combination of inflation, recession, and rising unemployment has been catastrophic for the poor and the near-poor.

President Ford's food stamp proposals, if implemented, would be an unconscionable assault upon the already-decimated purchasing power of low-income Americans.

Under the President's proposal, all recipients would be required to pay 30 percent of their income for food stamps. Currently, the poorest recipients pay as little as 5 percent of their modest incomes; they stand to have a 500 percent increase in the cost of food stamps on March 1. The average food stamp recipient who currently pays 23 percent of his income for stamps will have a 30 percent increase in the cost of stamps. There will be no increase at all in the amount of food stamps that would be provided for this increased price.

The new plan would hit hardest at food stamp recipients living in one and

two person households, the majority of whom are elderly. Most single persons would be hit with increases of 35 to 100 percent in the price of their food stamps. For a few individuals and couples, the increase would run as high as 800 percent. Currently, one out of every four food stamp recipients lives in a one or two person household, and the Department of Agriculture has estimated that 95 percent of the 15 million Americans currently participating in the food stamp program will be affected by these proposed changes.

These hard economic facts certainly do not square with the President's cavalier pronouncement that this budget-cutting move would affect only certain individuals who would have to pay only slightly more in cash to obtain the stamps. The Community Nutrition Institute has estimated that at least 1.5 million Americans would find the benefits of food stamps to be so small under the proposed program that they would simply drop out of the program. For example, an elderly couple with \$270 in adjusted monthly income can now pay \$64 and receive \$84 in food stamps. Under the proposed plan, they would be required to pay \$81 for the same \$84 worth of stamps. The \$3 savings under the proposed program would hardly justify standing in long lines for hours to fill out a six-page food stamp application form, and then, once inside a supermarket, to separate all qualifying items from nonqualifying items.

Mr. Speaker, there are many areas in the Federal budget where spending cuts can and should be made. But these excisions must not be made without some sense of logic and compassion. This budget-cutting venture proposed by the President would accomplish a very cruel objective—it would institutionalize hunger in America.

I, for one, do not believe that a balanced budget can only be built upon the misery and hunger of millions of low-income Americans. Must we starve our own people to feed our Treasury?

I think not, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that many of my colleagues will join with me in this viewpoint.

It is clear to me that this Congress must exercise special responsibilities in the coming year. This Congress must be the voice of conscience that reminds the administration about the importance of priorities. The well-being of the American people must be the priority that guides the administration in drawing proposals to restore balance to our national economy. We will not gain much as a society by relegating millions of less-fortunate Americans to hunger and misery in our zeal to produce a balanced budget. The President's energy proposals already threaten to take heat and light out of the homes of the elderly and poor, as well as taking gasoline out of their cars, by making these products much more expensive. This Congress must not allow the President to also take food off the tables of the poor and the elderly by increasing the cost of food stamps.

The legislation I am introducing today

would amend the Food Stamp Act to prevent the proposed regulation change from going into effect. The amendment continues the concept that food stamps should represent a reasonable investment on the part of the household, but provides that in no event can that investment be more than the percent charged under the current schedule.

The amendment would also reduce the maximum charge from 30 percent of net food income to 25 percent. In other words, those recipients who are now paying 10 and 20 percent of their incomes for food stamps would continue to pay that amount, while those paying 26 to 30 percent would have the price reduced to 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, a section-by-section analysis of my bill, together with a portion of the Joint Economic Committee print concerning the plight of the poor and elderly follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

Section one would amend the food stamp act to prevent the recently announced regulation change increasing the cost of food stamps to 30% for all participants from going into effect. The amendment continues the concept that the cost of food stamps should represent a reasonable investment on the part of a household but provides that in no event can that investment be more than the *per centum* charged a household with the same income under the current schedule.

The amendment would also reduce the maximum charge from 30% of net food stamp income to 25%. In other words, those recipients now paying 10% and 20% of their incomes for stamps would continue to pay that amount while those paying 26-30% would have the price reduced to 25%.

The estimated cost of this provision at current participation levels is \$450 million.

SECTION 2

This section of the bill amends Section 3 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, which defines the terms used in the Act.

Subsection (e) which defines the term "household" is amended to delete the requirement that household members under age 60 be related in order to qualify for the food stamp program. This requirement was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in its decision in the case of *Moreno v. USDA*, 413 U.S. 528. The amendment will bring the Act into conformance with the Supreme Court decision.

This provision was introduced at the request of the administration in the 93rd Congress, but no action was taken.

SECTION 3

This section of the bill revises subsection 5(b).

Subsection 5(b) retains the concept that the food stamp program shall be limited to households whose income and resources are substantial limiting factors in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet. However, it excludes the housing payment in kind from the standards of eligibility. The inclusion of housing payments in kind not in excess of \$25 is most unpopular among the States. To determine the value of in kind income, State agencies must develop expertise in estimating the value of housing or obtain guidance on the matter through other agencies or organizations. In either case, any possible savings to the program are more than offset by the complexities, if not impossibilities, of effectively administering this provision. Further, this provision would

permit housing payments in kind to be disregarded for purposes of income, and thus be treated consistently with the way in which other payments in kind are handled under the food stamp and other welfare-type programs.

The revision of Subsection 5(b) further deletes the provision prohibiting the participation of certain tax dependents in the food stamp program. In its decision in the case of *Murry v. USDA*, 413 U.S. 508, the Supreme Court ruled that the "tax dependency" provision of the Act is unconstitutional. Thus, the "tax dependency" provision in the current Act is not enforceable.

This provision was introduced at the request of the administration in the 93rd Congress, but no action was taken.

SECTION 4

This section of the bill revises Section 10 (e) (7) of the Act.

Subsection (e) (7) is revised to give a State agency an option to establish a system under which a food stamp household may elect to have its charge for the coupon allotment withheld from its public assistance check. The Act now mandates a State agency to offer such a questionable value. An optional system would permit a State to operate the system in an area where it would be a help, such as rural localities lacking adequate transportation. The State would not be required to bear the cost of administering such a system in larger metropolitan areas where public assistance withholding is not only the minimal usefulness but also subject to abuse. Giving the States this option could serve to gain their increased cooperation in other areas of greater program importance.

This provision was introduced at the request of the administration in 93d. Congress, but no action was taken.

SECTION 5

Section 5 removes the requirement that food stamp recipients who are housebound, feeble, physically handicapped, or otherwise disabled must be over 60 years of age to use stamps for meals-on-wheels.

Without this section, many incapacitated persons under 60 who receive meals-on-wheels have to pay cash for the meals even though they have food stamps. Purchase of delivered meals with food stamps would still be limited to incapacitated persons.

[Report of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States together with Supplementary and Minority Views

ACHIEVING PRICE STABILITY THROUGH ECONOMIC GROWTH

Relief Measures for the Poor and the Elderly

The Poor.—The poor have been the hardest hit by changing economic conditions in 1974. The combination of inflation, recession, and rising unemployment has been catastrophic for the poor and near-poor. While the poor may not suffer a proportionately greater decline in dollar incomes than other groups, the decline in their purchasing power is from a level that is at best marginally adequate. Price increases in recent years have caused a greater loss of higher income groups.

In all of the previous inflationary periods since World War II, the poor benefited because of accompanying tighter labor markets. But the economy is now in the midst of a serious recession. Also contributing to the poor's loss of purchasing power is the general tendency for the wages of low-skilled workers to adjust less to inflation than average wage rates, primarily because they lack the bargaining power of better-paid and more highly unionized workers. Prices of the basic purchases made by the poor have been rising faster than the Consumer Price Index. For example, food price inflation of

the past 18 months has added twice as much to the cost of living of the poor as to the average urban worker's cost of living.¹ The poor cannot "substitute down" as the more affluent can to less expensive foods.

Dried beans and rice, which are common items in the diets of the poor, increased in price from December 1970 to March 1974 by 256 percent and 124.3 percent, respectively.

What can be done to reduce the burdens imposed on the poor by the present combination of recession and inflation? Most public assistance is channeled to the poor through the many income support programs which have been established in the United States since the depression more than 45 years ago. These programs, established at different times and with varying objectives, have combined to produce an overall income transfer system riddled with conflicts and inequities, operated at huge cost, and delivering inadequate benefits to millions of needy persons.

A comprehensive program for reform of our income maintenance program was presented earlier this month in a report issued by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of this Committee, under the leadership of Congresswoman Martha Griffiths. The recommended program consists of two parts: Tax relief for low- and moderate-income workers and modest cash grants related to income for the poorest in our society. Tax relief would occur through the substitution of rebatable tax credits, which are deducted from tax liability, for the individual(s) filing the tax return.

This comprehensive system of credits and allowances is more efficient and equitable than the food stamp and AFDC programs which it would replace. This program breaks sharply with the traditional welfare structure in that it avoids the penalties on work, marriage and family responsibility that the old programs perpetuate. We commend the full 260 page report to anyone seriously interested in the Federal income transfer system, the problems under which it currently operates and some of the possibilities of reform.

We recommend that the program for income maintenance reform contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy and the legislation that would enact this program be given the most immediate consideration.

While endorsing this welfare reform package and agreeing fully with the points it raises concerning the serious deficiencies in the current welfare programs, we also recognize that some immediate improvements are needed in the income support programs to help compensate the many poorer Americans who have suffered greatly from this year's severe inflation and developing recession. The Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy realizes, and states in its report, that its recommended program could not be in effect until 1977. In the light of this time lag, extension under existing statutes of the food stamp and Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) programs is required to provide immediate relief to the poor.

The food stamp program should be emphasized since it is the income support program reaching the greatest number of people, it focuses on the necessity which has risen most rapidly in price, and is a program that can be made more effective with a few simple administrative changes. Currently, there are 14.3 million recipients of food stamps out of a total eligible population estimated to be between 30 to 35 million. The cost has esca-

¹Loraine Donaldson, "The Poor Pay More—of the Food Inflation Tax," unpublished paper, Georgia State University, 1974. Food costs, which according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics have risen about three times as fast as other major budget components, generally account for a higher proportion of the poor's expenditures than of higher income groups.

lated in the past three years from \$1.6 billion to \$4.0 billion. Many economists view this expansion of the program as a healthy development in that they see many advantages to food stamps as an income support program. More people benefit at a far lower per capita cost than in the government's two other major welfare programs, Medicare and AFDC. Also, the Food Stamp Program is mandatory, is nation-wide, is based on minimum food needs tied to national standards and most important, is designed to help all the needy. Thus, it includes the working poor, who are usually not covered by other income support measures.

Despite these laudable advantages, the program as it is currently operating suffers from some serious shortcomings. Perhaps the most significant is that the amount of food stamp allotments (currently \$150 per month for a family of four) is simply not enough to provide for a nutritionally balanced diet. In many cases, this deficient payment affects the health of prenatal infants, nursing mothers, the elderly, and the unemployed. As things now stand, a family with a low income receiving food stamps may have to spend more than 40 percent of its income to obtain a minimum required diet.

The monthly bonus amount is based on the Economy Food Plan of the USDA, which currently provides allotments allowing less than 40 cents per person per meal. According to a food consumption survey by the USDA, less than 10 percent of those who eat at the cost level of the Economy Food Plan obtain the full recommended dietary allowances. For this reason, the USDA's Low Cost Food Plan should become the basis for food stamp allotments.

An equally significant defect of the present program is that the maximum purchase price, 30 percent of net household income, is too high. In fact, this ties in with the low level of participation in the program, since the high cost of purchasing food stamps is the most important reason for non-participation by many households. Thus, the maximum purchase price should be set at 25 percent of net household income, which would not only increase the value of the stamps for those currently using them (particularly benefitting the elderly poor), but would also attract many more people into the program, especially those poor people who felt they simply could not afford the current purchase price. These changes would raise the annual cost of the program by approximately \$420 million.

It should be noted that this 25 percent maximum and preservation of the existing sliding scale up to that maximum, is in conflict with the President's recent amendment to the food stamp regulations. This amendment would require, as of March 1, 1975 all food stamp recipients to pay a flat 30 percent of net income for their food stamp allotment. This is a most ill-advised administrative change; it would increase the already severe burden that the poor and near-poor are bearing. Specifically, households with one or two persons would be hurt the most. Of these 50 percent are over 60 years of age. An elderly individual receiving the current Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payment of \$146.00 a month now pays \$30 to receive \$46 in food stamps, a \$16 bonus. The President's amendment would increase the purchase price to \$43.80, reducing the bonus to \$2.20, a virtually negligible amount. Among food stamp recipients of all ages, those with the lowest incomes will experience the greatest percentage increases in purchase prices. The ultimate effect, therefore, will be a strong inducement for many to drop from the program.

The participation problem is already a serious one. Only 40 to 48 percent of those eligible actually use food stamps. Even this low rate overstates the participation of the elderly, blind, and disabled, which is currently 28

percent. Legislation to alleviate much of this problem has already been passed by Congress in July specifying that the Federal Government should cover 50 percent of administrative costs, as compared to the present level of 28 percent. Additional funds to cover administrative costs should enable states to hire more certification workers.

Another major problem is that the semi-annual increase in the food stamp allotment lags four to twelve months behind the increases in cost of the Economy Food Plan. For example, the Food Stamp allotment during this month (December 1974) is based on the Economy Food Plan established in February. Costs are probably 10 to 15 percent higher now.

To increase the value of the food stamps, for current participants, the President's administrative decision earlier this year should be reversed and the maximum purchase price should be reduced from 30 percent to 25 percent of net household income. The present sliding payment scale up to the maximum should be retained. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Agriculture should expand participation in the program, particularly by implementing the provisions of P.L. 93-347 that enable the Federal Government to provide 50 percent of the administrative costs of the program. The payment scales of the Food Stamp Program should be adjusted every four instead of every six months.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RAILSBACK (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today on account of inclement weather.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, for January 20 through January 24, 1975, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. EMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BAUMAN, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DODD) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. EMERY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. SEBELIUS in two instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. COHEN.

Mr. CONLAN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri.

Mr. SARASIN in five instances.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DODD), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ, in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia in 10 instances.

Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. VANDER VEEN

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. MATHIS.

Mr. STOKES in three instances.

Mr. SATTERFIELD.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. DODD in five instances.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1975

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 23, 1975, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV executive communications were taken from the speaker's table and referred as follows:

157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 75-8, suspending the provisions of sections 505(d) and 620(x) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, sections 3(c) and 3(d) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, and section 5 of Public Law 93-570, in the case of Turkey to further negotiations for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

158. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations; transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 75-9, authorizing the ordering of defense articles and services for military assistance to Cambodia in the security interests of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

159. A letter from the President, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc.; transmitting the 46th Annual Report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering fiscal year 1974, pursuant to 45 Stat. 491 [22 U.S.C. 278a], together with a report on the research activities of the Gorgas Memorial Institute-Middle America Research Unit, and the financial report of the Institute for fiscal year 1974 (H. Doc. No. 94-36); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

160. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 to increase the financial assistance available under section 213 and 125, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

161. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting

a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the appointment of officers and employees of the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Customs Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

162. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that the use of surety bonds in Federal construction should be improved; jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations, and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and several referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 1653. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1655. A bill to require the destruction of certain files maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to Members of Congress, and to require notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate of certain other such files; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 1656. A bill to exempt certain automotive parts and accessories from the excise tax imposed by section 4061 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 1657. A bill to amend Gateway National Recreational Area in the States of New York and New Jersey, to authorize the inclusion of North Brother Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 877) to provide for congressional disapproval of Presidential actions to raise or lower tariff barriers in the name of national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LaFALCE, and Mr. McKAY):

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that advertising of alcoholic beverages is not a deductible expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. QUITE, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that advertising of alcoholic beverages is not a deductible expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the personal

exemption from \$750 to \$1,000, to provide that a taxpayer may elect a credit in the amount of \$300 for each personal exemption to which he is entitled in lieu of taking a deduction for each such exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for the performance by an individual of volunteer services for a Federal, State, or local governmental agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 1663. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1966, for purposes of prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of dogs intended to be used to fight other dogs for purposes of sport, wagering, or entertainment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking, Currency, and Housing.

H.R. 1665. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny an exemption from tax to any otherwise tax-exempt organization which discriminates in certain cases against blind individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1667. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax, and to require that evidence of payment of such tax be shown on highway motor vehicles subject to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 1668. A bill to establish the Mineral Conservation Research and Development Commission within the National Science Foundation, and to provide for the inventory of major nonfuel raw materials and the development of substitute minerals; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SISK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LaFALCE, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 1669. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has 40 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend the Forest Pest Control Act of June 25, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon):

H.R. 1671. A bill to further insect and disease control programs of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 1672. A bill to suspend for a 3-year period the duty on mustard seeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H.R. 1673. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1674. A bill to guarantee to the civilian employees of the executive branch of

the U.S. Government the right to have a counsel or representative of his choice present during interrogations which may lead to disciplinary actions and to prevent unwarranted reports from employees concerning their private life; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1675. A bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, to protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. REES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOSS, Ms. MINK, Mr. FRENZEL, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to establish a national policy with respect to the beach resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 1677. A bill to establish a national program of Federal insurance against catastrophic disasters; to the Committee on Banking, Currency, and Housing.

H.R. 1678. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the district courts to enter any judgment, decree, or order, denying or restricting, as unconstitutional, voluntary prayer in any public school; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1679. A bill to establish university coal research laboratories and to establish energy resource fellowships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual who suffers a casualty loss as a result of a major disaster may disregard the amount of any grant or cancellation of loan under a State disaster assistance program for purposes of determining the amount of that individual's casualty loss deduction and of determining his gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself and Mr. McDADE):

H.R. 1681. A bill to establish a program of Federal assistance to provide relief from energy emergencies and energy disasters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 1682. A bill to terminate any phosphate leases issued pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, and rights to such leases within the Osceola National Forest and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take action with respect to the same; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 1684. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain functions of several Federal agencies and departments in a new Criminal Justice Services Administration in the Department of Justice to promote more effective operations and management of the Federal system of criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend the Gun Control

Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS:

H.R. 1686. A bill to establish a Voter Registration Administration within the General Accounting Office for the purpose of administering a voter registration program through the Postal Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 1687. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to facilitate the study of the New River for designation as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 by designating segments of the New River as a potential component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1689. A bill to prevent the construction of a dam on the New River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 1690. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of charitable contributions of inventory and certain other ordinary income property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1691. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 1693. A bill to provide for payments to compensate county governments for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JENNETTE:

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLODY:

H.R. 1695. A bill to provide for the marking of certain fuel oils to prevent the sale or use of such fuel oils as a means of avoiding the payment of the Federal excise tax on the sale or use of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1696. A bill to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of dogs intended to be used to fight other dogs for purposes of sport, wagering, or entertainment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to permit a taxpayer to take an income tax deduction with respect to the purchase and installation of solar heating and cooling equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCOLLISTER:

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to reinstitute specific accounting requirements for foreign currency expenditures in connection with congressional travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and title 18, United States Code, to reform Federal election campaign activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1700. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been de-

feated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1701. A bill to withhold compensation from Members of the House of Representatives and Senate under certain circumstances with respect to attendance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1702. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to permit the partial attachment of retired or retainer pay to satisfy judicially decreed child support contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1704. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Armed Forces to continue to provide certain special educational services to physically handicapped dependents of members serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1705. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the island of Kahoolawe to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1706. A bill to provide for uniform expiration dates for agreements in the long-shore and maritime industries in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1707. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities designed to achieve conservation and nonuse of energy and materials, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the International Education Act of 1966 to provide for the establishment under that act of an Asian Studies Institute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1710. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for travel and transportation expenses on the return of an employee who was a past resident of certain areas outside the continental United States from a post of duty to which he or she transferred in the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1711. A bill to provide that local governments may receive reimbursement from the United States for protection provided by such governments to visiting Federal and foreign governmental officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1712. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide transportation for employees of Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1713. A bill to establish a National Hospital Administration to provide publicly financed hospital care to all individuals in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1714. A bill to amend section 19 of title 3, United States Code, to provide for an election for the office of President and the office of Vice President in the case of vacancies in both the office of President and the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1715. A bill to provide for the sale of certain property acquired by the United States during World War II to the former owners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1716. A bill to provide that time spent by American civilians in enemy prisoner-of-

war camps and similar places shall be creditable (as though it were military service) toward pensions, annuities, or similar benefits under various Federal retirement programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the legal custody requirement and the requirement of residence and physical presence in the United States for the naturalization of children adopted by U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1718. A bill for the relief of certain orphans in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1719. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to permit nationals of the United States to serve as officers and crew aboard vessels documented under laws of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to reduce the rate of postage on certain mail transported between the State of Hawaii and certain Pacific areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service under the civil service retirement system periods of service as contract technicians by persons hired by private authority to perform work under Federal supervision pursuant to a contract between such private authority and the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require certain air carriers to grant free air transportation to certain attorneys and witnesses attending proceedings before the Civil Aeronautics Board and to require the Board to hold public hearings in additional locations; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1724. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a mandatory 60-day notice period prior to a change in any rate, fare, or charge specified in any effective tariff of any air carrier or foreign air carrier; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax any pension or annuity received under a public retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide in certain cases for an exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island):

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 1730. A bill: Compensation and other

emoluments attached to the Office of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 1731. A bill to incorporate the United States Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking, Currency, and Housing.

H.R. 1733. A bill to provide further for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Monday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1734. A bill to regulate lobbying and related activities; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 1735. A bill to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELMAN:

H.R. 1736. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of agencies and expanding the services available in existing agencies which will provide home health services, and to provide grants to public and private agencies to train professional and paraprofessional personnel to provide home health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 1737. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1738. A bill to repeal the lowest unit rate provisions of section 315(b) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1739. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide equitable tax relief to America's small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of advanced education (including certain limited travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 1744. A bill to provide for the establishment of the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1745. A bill to remove the appropriation limitation for development of Chamizal National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1746. A bill authorizing the extension of the American Canal at El Paso, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1747. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands for an entrance road at Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend section 106 of title 4 of the United States Code relating to State taxation of the income of residents of another State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1749. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Department of Commerce, be subject to Senate confirmation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1751. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a fence near the international boundary between the United States and Mexico in the city of El Paso, Tex.; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 1752. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national historic park on the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself and Mr. RUNNELS):

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend section 141 of title 13, United States Code, to provide for the transmittal to each of the several States of the tabulation of population of that State obtained in each decennial census and desired for the apportionment or districting of the legislative body or bodies of that State, in accordance with, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, a plan and form suggested by that officer or public body having responsibility for legislative apportionment or districting of the State being tabulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. QUITE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish on certain public lands of the U.S. national petroleum reserves the development of which needs to be regulated in a manner consistent with the total energy needs of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of June 29-July 5 as Why I Love America Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution calling upon the President to reduce drastically the amount of bureaucratic redtape which currently exists in the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing increased production of petroleum from the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for himself and Mr. DOWNING):

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 13 of each year as American Business Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint meeting of Congress on July 4, 1976; to the Committee on Rules.

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

H. Res. 77. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings incident to the presentation of a portrait of Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Intelligence Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCCOLLISTER:

H. Res. 79. Resolution to require that the fixing or adjusting of certain allowances of Members of the House of Representatives by the Committee on House Administration be approved by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 80. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the acceptance of any honorarium by any Member, officer, or employee of such House; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself and Mrs. FENWICK):

H. Res. 81. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Secretary of Agriculture should rescind the food stamp regulations proposed on December 6, 1974; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to refer H.R. 1561, a bill for the relief of the Upper Allegheny Sand and Gravel Co., to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

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

5. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Tehama-Colusa Canal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to an Armed Forces expeditionary medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Amtrak; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

9. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to restoring the original name to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Morgan-McCool, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Angela Garza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLODY:

H.R. 1756. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Milton Margoies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Plotemina Mabanag Bareng and Bastiana Lillian Mahanag Bareng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Terrence

Jarome Cagulat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1759. A bill to authorize Col. Charles Dolan, U.S. Air Force Reserve, to receive credit for certain activities of benefit to the United States in determining his entitlement to and amount of retired pay for nonregular service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1760. A bill for the relief of Keith Lal McKinney and Clifford Tuan McKinney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1761. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Fegi Matayoshi and Wilma Fegi Matayoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 1762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lessie Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 1763. A bill for the relief of Olga Florida Sanchez Acosta, Jose Ismael Sanchez

Acosta, and Jesus Santiago Sanchez Acosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1764. A bill for the relief of Faustino Murgia-Melendrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 1765. A bill for the relief of Miss Mari Ann Sharar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1766. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leocadia H. Villafuerte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

10. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, Wayne County, Mich., relative to the food stamp program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICA—MERCHANT OF WAR

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress passed historic legislation giving the Congress the legal authority for oversight and control over the sale of weapons of war to foreign countries. That legislation, which was based on an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which I offered in the House and Senator NELSON offered in the Senate, requires the President to submit quarterly reports to the Congress containing listings of all sales and offers to sell. These reports must include the dollar amount of the sale, the defense items to be sold, the country purchasing the item, the military service selling the item, and the dates of offer and acceptance of the sale.

Additionally, the legislation requires that the President seek congressional concurrence for any foreign military sale for \$25 million or more. Under the legislation the President must submit a statement describing the intended sale and wait 20 calendar days before forwarding the letter of offer to the intended purchaser. During this 20-day waiting period, Congress may disapprove the sale by concurrent resolution.

The need for a strong congressional role in determining the U.S. role in stockpiling foreign military arsenals is now more pressing than ever, in wake of recent massive arms sales to Iran and Saudi Arabia and the pro-sales policies of the Ford administration. The United States, according to a January 13, 1975, report in U.S. News & World Report, is the No. 1 arms peddler in the world. The Ford administration reportedly justifies the boom in sales over the last few years in part on economic and pragmatic grounds—the sales provide jobs for Americans, while American refusal to sell only sends countries seeking weapons to other suppliers. Accordingly rather than discouraging sales, U.S. News reports that officials are working hard with defense industry salesmen around the world to boost sales even further.

I would remind the administration that economic and pragmatic considerations are not sufficient grounds for stockpiling foreign military arsenals. Sales based solely on these considerations are irresponsible—and I would hope that the Ford administration would refrain from them. The United States will and should continue to supply some arms to its allies and friends, in amounts and in type consistent with our national security requirements and their defensive needs. But, at the same time, America must encourage restraint in conventional arms transfers.

I call upon Mr. Ford to exercise such restraint and to encourage other nations to do likewise. Given the increases in arms sales reported almost daily in the press and the increasing danger for violence they represent, it is essential that the President move rapidly to implement the sense of Congress resolution on multinational arms transfer regulation contained in the Foreign Assistance Act passed by the 93d Congress. That resolution urges the President to develop and propose a draft international agreement for regulating the transfer of conventional weapons at the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. It also requires the President to report his progress in implementing the resolution to the Congress within 6 months. I urge the President to achieve substantial progress toward the goal of the resolution in less than 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, because of its relevance, I commend the U.S. News report to the attention of my colleagues:

AMERICA ON TOP AMONG WORLD'S ARMS PEDDLERS

Not even Russia sells more major weapons abroad. Orders for American-made arms have doubled in a year, and there is no slowdown in sight.

Sales of U.S.-produced arms to foreign nations are soaring to record levels.

Orders from abroad for U.S. aircraft, missiles, tanks, ships and other weapons of war have doubled in a year to more than 8 billion dollars annually.

U.S. officials say that these sales make the United States the top arms merchant in the world. The Soviet Union, however, is not far behind, with its major armament program in the Middle East. France and Britain are rated a distant third and fourth in arms exporting.

Pictured on these pages are some of the U.S. weapons most in demand now and in recent years.

Iran for instance, has agreed to pay 1.9 billion dollars for 80 of the Navy's newest jets—the F-14 Tomcat. The deal is considered a key factor in keeping open the Long Island plant of Grumman Aerospace Corporation, which makes the plane.

The sale, completed after the Shah of Iran was given a personal aerial demonstration of the plane, helps to make Iran the leading customer of U.S. arms.

Israel is a close second. In the 12-month period ended June 30, 1974, Israel bought 2.1 billion dollars' worth of military equipment, including A-4 Skyhawks and F-4 Phantoms, C-130 Hercules cargo planes and large numbers of helicopters, tanks, artillery pieces and other equipment.

FIERCE SALES FIGHT

Now something even bigger is in the works.

Northrop Corporation and General Dynamics Corporation are competing under an Air Force contract for a lightweight fighter that could result in sales of 8 billion dollars or more, with most of the potential market thought to be in Europe or elsewhere abroad. French and Swedish companies have entered the fierce competition.

The reason for the booming arms market, defense-industry officials say, is partly that the U.S. has reversed its attitude on military sales.

This reversal in policy represents a decision that refusing to sell weapons to foreign countries only sends them to other suppliers and does nothing to halt the proliferation of arms.

Rather than discouraging such sales, U.S. officials now are working hard with defense-industry salesmen around the world to boost sales even further.

Industry officials estimate that for every billion dollars of sales abroad, 31,000 Americans are put to work as a direct result, and another 60,000 jobs are created in support businesses.

In some cases, foreign sales are of critical importance. Items like the Northrop F-5E Tiger are built primarily for export. Pentagon aides say that if overseas sales stopped, the plant making the plane would have to be closed.

Military sales abroad are in addition to the half billion dollars in arms a year handed out free as military aid to friends and allies. Not included, either, are the millions of dollars in second-hand weapons that are passed on to other countries.

Aid recipients are potential customers in the future, say Defense officials.

Japan is an example. Grant aid to Japanese ended in 1966. Since then, arms sales

have averaged about 50 million dollars a year. From 1950 through June, 1974, U.S. arms sales to Japan totaled 424 million.

Since World War II, military sales have risen from token amounts, while the proportion of military aid has declined. Sales averaged about 1.25 billion dollars a year in the last of the 1960s.

The biggest growth of foreign military sales by the U.S. has been in just the last three years. The total for the 12-month period that ended June 30, 1972, was 3.3 billion dollars, double that of the previous 12-month period.

In the following 12 months, orders rose to 3.9 billions; and in the 12-month period that ended June 30, 1974, orders more than doubled again to 8.3 billions.

IN THE FUTURE

Industry officials see a potential for even greater sales ahead.

In recent months, several countries—including Israel, Greece, Saudi Arabia and Iran—have asked for a step-up in arms deliveries.

Friendly and allied countries are also faced with the problem of replacing aging military equipment received from the U.S. in the past. Most are expected to buy later-model American arms.

These factors, added to uncertain conditions in the Middle East, Latin America and other potential hot spots, point to continued high levels of arms sales abroad during the years ahead.

TOP 10 BUYERS OF U.S. ARMS

Based on arms orders placed in year ended June 30, 1974:

1. Iran, \$3.8 billion.
2. Israel, \$2.1 billion.
3. Saudi Arabia, \$588 million.
4. Greece, \$435 million.
5. West Germany, \$219 million.
6. Spain, \$148 million.
7. Canada, \$94 million.
8. Korea, \$81 million.
9. Taiwan, \$68 million.
10. Chile, \$68 million.

A YOUTH VIEW FROM THE INSIDE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in the November 1974 issue of Youth Reporter, there is an interesting article by Brian O'Connor, who participated in the Washington Workshops program and tells all he learned while on the Hill.

Washington Workshops does a splendid job educating these young women and men and deserves support of their effort.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON WORKSHOP—A YOUTH VIEW FROM THE INSIDE

(By Brian O'Connor)

Every year millions of people come to Washington, D.C., to find in the countless memorials the spirit of the great men who, from a violent birth in a despotic world, established the first great free nation upon the face of the earth. But men's souls do not live in marble.

The true spirit of our forefathers lives where those who are willing to search deeper than a frozen gaze of stone may find it. Humans forged this nation and humans continue the work. The search for the "American Heritage" is fulfilled in the discovery of the people who devote their lives to service to their country.

In the past, the human side of government has not been available for public scrutiny and study. The House and Senate galleries were as close as anyone could have hoped to approach their government. But mere physical proximity of the people to their leaders is as meaningless a personal experience as the contact of eyes with the impersonal words of a daily paper.

CLOSING CHASM

The appalling lack of public involvement, while public tourism flourishes, has created a chasm between the citizens and the leaders of this country of Grand Canyon-esque dimensions. This division has given an alarming number of our elected and appointed officials—as evidenced by the tragedy of Watergate—a feeling of immunity from prosecution, an opportunity for aggrandizement, a sense of security while ignoring the law. But the gap is closing and integrity is slowly returning now that citizens are coming to Washington as educated, informed, and concerned individuals rather than as gawking tourists.

Much of the credit for the current awareness must go to Leo S. Tonkin, a Harvard Law School graduate, who came to Washington as a student intern and immediately recognized the need for government education through personal interaction and involvement with its leaders.

He has continually expounded the view of Thomas Jefferson: "A nation that expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization expects what never was and will never be."

In 1967, Washington Workshops Foundation was created by Mr. Tonkin in order to replace ignorance in the operations of the Federal Government with education through a program entitled, "The Congressional Seminar."

FIRST SEMINAR

In the summer of 1968, Mr. Tonkin brought 200 students to Washington for the first session of the Congressional Seminar. The Workshops Foundation received its baptism by fire for that summer the city was engulfed in the flames of riots which followed the murders of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy.

At that time it was difficult to find government officials who were willing to devote their time to talk to young men and women who would most likely ask embarrassing questions. But there were people who showed interest in youth and welcomed the opportunity to meet in seminar sessions with them, and thus with the first dynamic session lauded as an "overwhelming success", the Workshops dream was consummated.

Since that summer the Workshops Foundation has generated tremendous growth in both interest and participation. In 1975 nine sessions of the Congressional Seminar, with over 100 students comprising each session, will be offered. Senators, Congressmen, Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, Pentagon staff, Ambassadors, lobbyists, professional staff, personnel, and numerous other government officials will have dialogue sessions with the students in the various government office buildings.

While current issues and contemporary events are of major importance in the dialogues between the students and speakers, the search for a personal interaction is encouraged by the director, Mr. Tonkin.

EXPERIENCE RECALLED

Howard Ibach, who was a Congressional Seminar student during 1973, recounts an experience during his week in Washington: "During a seminar with Barry Goldwater, Jr. of California at the Rayburn House Office Building, I came to realize that questions regarding his stand on pending legislation and moral issues were just repetitions of what I read in the paper, hear on the news, or could receive in a typed letter from his office. I asked him, 'Congressman, why did you be-

come a Congressman?' He paused for a second and then answered, 'Thank you for asking that question.' He then proceeded to outline the complete background of his motivation and desire for public service and recognition. It was an unusually enlightening and personal experience for me. I had sought and, I believe, succeeded in discovering the 'man behind the myth', so to speak, which is what I feel the Workshops program is all about."

The follow-up opportunities available to students who are interested in extending their government involvement and education beyond the Congressional Seminar are varied. The National Student Advisory Committee, which is only open to those who have completed the Congressional Seminar, is an organization designed to act as a channel for constructive student proposals and amendments to the program. Annual meetings are held throughout the United States. Student editorial projects written by Workshop students command national distribution through the Workshops' mailing list.

Since 1969 the Advanced Congressional Seminar has been offered to Congressional Seminar alumni. The Advanced Seminar entails a three-week internship in the Office of a member of the House or Senate, and three transferable college credits are available to the Advanced Seminar students through a research project written during their tenure in the program.

A PROFOUND EFFECT

Dorothy Hogg, who worked in Congressman Peter N. Kyros' office as a student in the Advanced Congressional Seminar, expresses her feelings on her three weeks sojourn to the nation's capitol: "Working in Congressman Kyros' office has had a profound effect on me. I had never been able to appreciate the hard work and dedication which a seat in Congress requires. The opportunity to work not only for a committed man, but for his constituents as well, has given me a sense of accomplishment which I had never known before my involvement with the Washington Workshops."

A unique and innovative factor of the Workshops program is the student residence at Mount Vernon College in northwest Washington. The academic ambience of a college campus is much more endemic to an educational and social experience than a hotel, which is one reason why the Workshops has been so successful while hotel-based student programs in Washington have come and gone through the years. The freedom, and responsibility of dormitory residence has proved to engender an unexpected maturity by the teen-age students. Young men and women from every social, economic, and geographical background of the country who participate weekly in the Congressional Seminar create a microcosm of the society as a whole.

John McGowan, a former student of the Congressional Seminar, and subsequently an intern in the office of Congressman John Ware of Pennsylvania through the Advanced Congressional Seminar, writes: "For me the most meaningful experience while in Washington was the chance to meet and talk with people my own age from all over the United States. Just the contact I made with others made my whole involvement with the Washington Workshops worthwhile. I have learned through this contact how essential sincere dialogue and an open mind are to understanding persons from different backgrounds. I will always be grateful for the opportunity to broaden my horizons in experience and understanding."

A FULL SCHEDULE

While the students have the option to delegate their own time as they choose, for those who wish to take advantage of them, a full schedule of social, athletic, and cultural activities are offered. The campus sports develop into competition between the Con-

gressional Seminar and the Advanced Congressional Seminar, dubbed Washington Workshops I and Washington Workshops II respectively.

At the end of each session of the Congressional Seminar, a dance is held with a live band. Tours of monumental Washington are organized during free time along with bus rides to outdoor concerts at the Jefferson Memorial, the Capitol steps, the Tidal Basin, and other sites. The close proximity of the vibrant Georgetown section offers students hours of browsing pleasure along with the visual spectacle of that historic yet youthful section of Washington.

The week of the Congressional Seminar culminates in a model Congressional session held at Mount Vernon College and chaired by House Floor Manager Donald K. Anderson. During the week the students divide into five committees: Education, Foreign Affairs, Interior and Insular Affairs, Judiciary, and Select.

General resolutions intended to produce a "sense of the seminar" are written and discussed in the committees and presented to the "committee as a whole", the assembly of the students. The resolutions are debated according to the parliamentary rules of the House as interpreted by Mr. Anderson and then voted upon. The sense of the seminar has proved to be a valuable tool in the practical education of the students.

Both the art of forensics and the compromise of politics come into play during the debate and therefore provide a unique forum where the role of government may be learned.

THE ULTIMATE PROOF

The ultimate proof of the Washington Workshops Foundation's effectiveness in promoting interest in the system of American Government is the involvement that Workshops alumni have shown after their education through the Workshops. Delegates to both the Democratic and Republican National Nominating Conventions, permanent staff positions on Capitol Hill, local and state elective offices, are a few of the positions that Workshop students have gone on to occupy. It is not unlikely that the future will see the first Workshop alumni occupying a seat as a member of Congress.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Brian O'Connor, a former participant in the Congressional Seminar, is currently a freshman at Harvard College. His home town is Moorestown, N.J.

He was assisted in the preparation of this article by three other former participants in the 1974 Washington Workshops: Howard Ibach of Milwaukee, a high school senior at Nicolet H.S., who interned in the office of Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin; Dorothy Hogg of High Point, N.C., a freshman at the University of Virginia, who worked as an intern in the office of Congressman Peter N. Kyros of Maine; and John McGowan of Malvern, Penna., a freshman at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., who worked as an intern in the office of Congressman John H. Ware of Pennsylvania.

O'Connor worked as an intern in the Washington Workshops Foundation Office.

For more information on the program contact: Washington Workshops; 1329 E Street, NW; Suite 1111; Washington, D.C. 20004.

THE NO POSTAGE POSTAGE STAMP

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in the last decade we have seen the price

of the first class postage stamp skip along from 4 cents right up to 10 cents where it rests today. Now the Postal Service, in its ever present desire to serve the public, is ready to make amends for the cost increases of the past by offering the no postage postage stamp. By this, I mean, the cost of mailing a letter will from now on be free.

If you are wondering how you missed the announcement of this innovative idea and are planning to rush down to your nearest post office to find out more about it, do not bother. It was not published in any Postal Service departmental memo and most postal officials and employees know nothing about it. But the free postage stamp does exist.

Actually, the Postal Service, already millions of dollars in debt, was trying to regain rather than lose revenues when it accidentally created the no postage postage stamp.

In the past, many individuals were sending off their letters, most of which were bills, absent of any postage. This way, the individual or company which received the letter would get stuck paying the postage. For the post office, it meant extra time, effort, and expense to collect this postage.

To stop this, the Postal Service announced that it would no longer deliver the letter to the addressee stamped "postage due" but instead would return it to the sender. Unfortunately, the sender has turned out to be more ingenious than the Postal Service.

A member of my staff and a friend of his in Berkeley, Calif., recently demonstrated how to use the new Postal Service policy to their benefit. A letter bearing my staff member's name in the upper left hand corner as the sender and his friend's name as the addressee was dropped into a mail box in Berkeley. Four days later, it was "returned" to Alexandria, Va., stamped "returned for postage." Of course, there was no need to pay any postage and the Postal Service was out 10 cents.

No doubt, it will not be long before more members of the public hear about the no postage postage stamp and begin applying the idea. The Postal Service's next brilliant idea will then be the 15-cent postage stamp so that they can pay for the no postage postage stamp.

A PROGRAM TO REVIVE THE ECONOMY

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a comprehensive package of measures to combat inflation and recession through reduced Government spending that will pump more than \$30 billion back into the private sector of our economy.

The trouble with proposals for a multi-billion-dollar tax cut alone is that this does nothing about the continuing upward spiral of inflationary Federal

spending. In fact, a tax cut without a cut in Government spending only compounds our economic problem.

A tax cut must be matched by a reduction in Federal spending plus a balanced Federal budget to avoid further inflationary deficits that fuel recession and increase unemployment. And the first place to start cutting is with foreign aid and with nonproductive Government programs draining family incomes and removing jobs from our private enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, our goal must be a three-pronged attack against high taxes, high prices, and high interest rates through reduced Government spending, increased productivity, and creation of jobs in the private sector. I believe the four bills I introduced on the first day of this Congress, plus one I cosponsored with Mr. BAFALIS, will get us well on the road to achieving this urgent goal.

I am asking for, first, an immediate moratorium on new Federal spending programs; second, a 10 percent reduction in the Federal budget; third, a 3-year moratorium on U.S. foreign aid; fourth, a balanced Federal budget for fiscal year 1976, and fifth, a constitutional amendment forbidding future Federal deficits and requiring gradual repayment of our \$500 billion national debt.

This comprehensive program to revive our economy by reducing the Government's inflationary drain on productivity, which in turn causes recession and unemployment, deserves the wholehearted support of this Congress.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a complete list of these bills I have introduced and the committees to which they were referred:

LIST OF BILLS

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to provide an opportunity for an orderly and cohesive policy toward reducing the rate of inflation through a moratorium on all new federal spending programs. Referred to Committee on Government Operations.

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to provide an opportunity for an orderly and cohesive policy toward inflation control and economic stability by declaring a reduction in all appropriations for fiscal year 1976. Referred to Committee on Appropriations.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to provide an opportunity for an orderly and cohesive policy toward inflation control and economic stability by declaring a 36-month moratorium on all foreign aid appropriations for economic development. Referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1252. A bill to reestablish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes. Referred to Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Currency, and Housing.

H.J. Res. 5. 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; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

INAUGURATION OF THE HONORABLE RAY BLANTON AS THE 44TH GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Ray Blanton was inaugurated as the 44th Governor of Tennessee on Saturday last in impressive ceremonies in the War Memorial Auditorium in Nashville.

Many of you will recall that Ray served with great ability and distinction as a Member of the House—and I am sure he will govern the State of Tennessee with the same cool competence and courage already demonstrated in his career of public service.

In his inaugural address Governor Blanton pledged to govern Tennessee for the people—for the "plain folks who want a better Tennessee"—and he was repeatedly cheered in the War Memorial Auditorium as he outlined the philosophy, goals and objectives of his administration.

The inaugural was a most impressive ceremony, with Chief Justice William H. D. Fones of the Tennessee Supreme Court administering the oath of office. An inaugural gala and inaugural ball complemented the main ceremony and on yesterday the Governor and his charming wife held an open house for the people of Tennessee at the Governor's mansion.

Symbolizing the transfer of power from a Republican to a Democratic Governor, at the moment Governor Blanton was sworn in, a painting of Abraham Lincoln in the Governor's office was replaced by a portrait of Andrew Jackson, Tennessee's distinguished son, the 11th President of the United States and hero of the Battle of New Orleans. Governor Blanton had instructed his aides to change the portraits at the precise moment of his taking the oath of office.

The full program of the inaugural activities and ceremony follow:

INAUGURAL ACTIVITIES

CALENDAR AND INFORMATION

Inaugural prayer service

Saturday, January 18: McKendree United Methodist Church, 10:30 A.M.

The inauguration ceremony

Saturday, January 18: War Memorial Building, 12:00 Noon.

Inaugural parade

Saturday, January 18: War Memorial Building, 12:30 P.M.

Reception at the State Capitol

Saturday, January 18: State Capitol, 2:00 P.M.—4:00 P.M.

Inaugural ball

Saturday, January 18: Municipal Auditorium, 7:15 P.M.

Reception at the Governor's residence

Sunday, January 19: Governor's Residence, 2:00 P.M.—5:00 P.M.

INAUGURAL CEREMONY

12 o'clock Saturday, Jan. 18

Governor-elect Blanton, Governor Winfield Dunn, Lt. Governor John S. Wilder, Speaker

of the House Ned McWherter and Chief Justice William H. D. Fones escorted from the State Capitol to the front of the War Memorial Building.

Joint Convention of the 89th General Assembly of Tennessee is called to order, by Mr. Speaker Wilder, President of the Joint Convention.

Proceedings opened with prayer by Rev. Tom Bullock, Adamsville Methodist Church, Adamsville, Tennessee.

Mr. J. T. Craig, Chief Clerk of the Senate, reads the Joint Resolution.

National Anthem sung by Lynn Anderson, Nashville, Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker Wilder presents Governor Winfield Dunn who addresses the Joint Convention.

Mr. Speaker Wilder presents Governor-elect Ray Blanton, who delivers the Inaugural Address to the Joint Convention.

Oath of Office administered to Governor Ray Blanton by the Honorable William H. D. Fones, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Tennessee.

Governor's salute by the Tennessee National Guard, Nashville, Tennessee.

Benediction by Rev. Ed Currie, Pastor, Price Missionary Baptist Church, Memphis, Tennessee.

Governor Blanton and party move to reviewing stand.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Blanton takes office as Tennessee, like other States, faces economic problems, increased demands for services with declining State revenues. He is preparing a legislative program to respond to the many challenges facing his administration and to implement campaign pledges.

Certainly I wish Governor Blanton the very best of good luck and success as he assumes his new responsibilities, and I am sure that his former colleagues in the House join me in this expression of good wishes.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, January 15 would have been the 46th birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. For a decade before his tragic death in 1968, Dr. King led the struggle to assure equal rights for the black people in America and dignity for all people. Those were years of change and years of achievement, and Martin Luther King became a symbol in the cause of human rights.

But on this day in 1975, we again face serious challenges to the dignity of our people. Growing numbers of men and women are jobless, poor and middle-income families cannot afford the rising costs of even the most simple housing and food, senior citizens are barely able to make ends meet on their small and fixed incomes.

The growing recognition of this suffering and of the failure to meet the people's pressing need are being dramatized today in Washington and in cities around the Nation by Dr. King's followers, led by Rev. Jesse Jackson. At the same time that the "Silver Rights March" acts to symbolize the plight of so many, the 94th

Congress begins the tough job of developing solutions to our problems.

While this was a day to remember Martin Luther King as a champion of the people in the cause of justice and humanity, this Congress—to truly honor his memory—should move quickly and affirmatively to help those who Dr. King himself would champion today. It is for us to carry on by recommitting ourselves to the dream he had.

A BILL TO STOP ABUSE OF AUTHORITY BY THE FDA

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 94th Congress, I introduced H.R. 186, a bill to prevent the Food and Drug Administration from implementing proposed regulations designed to limit the potencies and combinations of ingredients in vitamin and mineral supplements.

H.R. 186 is identical to legislation I introduced in the 93d Congress and also identical to a bill introduced by former Congressman Hosmer on this subject. During the 93d Congress, many hundreds of my constituents wrote to me and let me know of their opposition to the proposed FDA regulations because certain supplements would be classified as drugs rather than foods and because costly marketing requirements for drugs would drive up prices, making the vitamin-mineral products least available to those who need them most.

Those supplements which are now arbitrarily classified as drugs either have dosage levels higher on a per unit basis than those prescribed by the FDA regulation or they have combinations of supplements other than those allowed. In the case of two vitamins, A and D, dosage levels over a certain amount will now be available only by prescription. Eventually, even more of the supplements may be placed on a prescription-only status. An advisory review panel has been requested to provide its advice on the dividing line between over-the-counter and prescription drugs.

I can see no reason for the FDA to promulgate such regulations. Most vitamins and minerals present no danger to the consumer, indeed, they may be highly beneficial. If some of the vitamins are hazardous at high levels, as may be the case for the vitamins A and D, they should be limited. However, criticism has poured in from academic, consumer, and industry sources, protesting that the levels prescribed are far too low—400 I.U. for vitamin D and 10,000 I.U. for vitamin A.

Considering the present level of knowledge regarding the need for vitamin and mineral supplements, whether or not a benefit can be derived from high potency supplements seems to be a very subjective decision. But regardless of the availability or lack of benefits, the consumers

have every right to purchase food supplements at dosage levels they desire as long as they are unadulterated, correctly labeled, and present no hazard to health. The FDA seems to have made a value judgment that consumers are wasting their money on useless supplements. It is not within the legislative mandate of the FDA to regulate how consumers spend their money. The mandate was designed by Congress only to protect their safety.

In an attempt to stop this abuse of authority, I have introduced H.R. 186 which would require the FDA to prove that any vitamin or mineral—synthetic or natural—is “intrinsicly injurious to health in the recommended dosage,” before restricting its dosage level or requiring a warning label. H.R. 186 would prohibit the FDA from arbitrarily controlling what goes into vitamin-mineral supplements. In those instances where a high potency supplement does pose a threat to health, the FDA would be free to impose limits on the dosage strengths or require a warning label.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored this amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the firm belief that its passage is imperative if we are to protect the rights not only of the manufacturers, but of the consumer. Therefore, I strongly urge the support of my colleagues for this legislation so that this crucial amendment can be enacted into law.

TRIBUTE ON 75TH WEDDING
ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a story with a positive message about American family life. This is a love story that has been going on for three-quarters of a century. On January 8, 1975, Mr. and Mrs. Simon A. Stanard celebrated their 75th wedding anniversary at their home at 10201 Westchester Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio.

Simon Stanard was born in North Carolina 97 years ago, the son of a minister. He met and married Clara Bell Mountain in Bel Air, Ohio, at the turn of the century, and moved with his young bride to Cleveland in 1903. Mr. Stanard worked as a custodian for the Cleveland Trust Bank for over 60 years before retiring in 1962. Mrs. Stanard has been active in civic work as a member of the Parent Teachers Association and the Christian Women's Temperance League right up to the present day. They are both members of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church and the American Leprosy Foundation.

The Stanards raised a family of nine. Four of their children are now living: Mr. Harold Stanard, Mrs. Alice Hulse, Mrs. Elsie Voorhies, and Mrs. Clemence Wright. Mr. and Mrs. Stanard are also blessed with 20 grandchildren, 27 great-

grandchildren, and 8 great-great-grandchildren.

In our times the institution of marriage has changed from when the Stanards pledged their troth at the turn of the century. When asked how they managed to withstand the changes and stay in love for 75 years the Stanards say:

We give the credit to God.

Mrs. Stanard adds a note of wisdom saying—

We haven't always seen eye to eye but we always disagreed agreeably.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in congratulating this remarkable couple.

IMPACT OF OIL EXCISE TAX
INCREASE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message President Ford announced that he will impose a graduated excise tax on imported crude oil, starting at \$1 per barrel and rising to \$3 per barrel, in an effort to decrease domestic consumption and lower our dependence on foreign suppliers.

While I wish to support my President in achieving these goals, unless there are some qualifications in the excise tax proposal I must oppose the tariff increase because it discriminates heavily against those areas which must rely on foreign crude oil for the energy needs. My home State of Florida is one such area. Florida utilities now pay \$12.38 per barrel for imported Venezuelan crude, and a \$3 per barrel import fee would push that price to an astronomical \$15.38 per barrel—nearly three times the cost of price-controlled domestic oil.

Electricity bills in Florida have more than doubled in the last year, and according to figures obtained from industry sources, an additional \$3 per barrel tax could cost 2.2 million Floridians an additional \$5 per month in their electric bills.

Such increases hit hardest at those who can least afford them. Many residents in my own Sixth Congressional District are retirees living on small fixed incomes and are already overburdened by the rate increases of the past year. A further increase could mean the difference for some between using electricity and eating.

If we are to have a tariff increase, it must be accomplished in a more equitable fashion. Floridians must be allowed access to a fair share of the cheaper domestic oil, rather than continue a forced dependence on expensive foreign crude.

Last fall the Federal Energy Administration issued a proposal to allow hard-hit utilities an entitlement to domestic oil based on a percentage of the foreign oil they are buying. I strongly supported this proposal, known as alternative rule 4, but the FEA failed to adopt it as a final allocation rule.

Therefore, I am drafting legislation to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act to require the FEA to give all utilities the same access to cheaper domestic oil. My bill will establish a form of national oil pool, and utilities will be able to draw upon this pool to meet their energy needs in the same proportion that the Nation as a whole uses domestic oil. Thus, if the Nation uses 11 barrels of domestic oil for every 7 barrels of foreign oil, Florida utilities will be able to buy 11 barrels of cheaper domestic oil for every 7 barrels of expensive foreign oil they buy.

This proposal will spread the burden of foreign oil costs and the tariff increase equitably among all utilities and greatly ease the costs of Florida electric consumers, and the incentive to further reduce dependence on foreign oil will exist throughout the Nation.

The 94th Congress faces a major task in drafting energy legislation. I believe that equitable treatment of all Americans should be a priority in our deliberations. Under present law, certain geographic areas, including Florida, suffer undue hardship and economic costs that their residents are ill able to afford. Legislation along the lines which I have suggested will eliminate these inequities, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

WAR WITHOUT END

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, it is really unbelievable that a fourth American President should now be seeking to reinvolve the United States in Vietnam.

Garry Wills, the well-known columnist, expresses my views on this matter in the Washington Star-News on January 17, 1975.

Mr. Wills concludes:

We have nothing to win in Saigon, and never did. We have all kinds of things to lose there; and this President, like the three men who preceded him, is asking us to risk them.

Mr. Wills also reminds us that Henry Kissinger did not end the war in Vietnam. Rather, he “kept it alive by endless blood transfusions.” Mr. Wills fails to find any reason “to prolong the agony.” Certainly, he suggests, the United States should not become reinvolved in order “to keep the shine on Henry Kissinger's shameful Nobel Peace Prize.”

Mr. Wills' article follows:

WAR WITHOUT END

(By Garry Wills)

Remember President Nixon's defense in the last days of his mendacious regime? It went something like, “Watergate will not matter in the long run, not for a man who ended the war in Vietnam.”

Actually, he did not end it. Rather, with Henry Kissinger's help, he kept it alive by endless blood transfusions. The war went on, and took an even deeper toll of Vietnamese life, after the so-called settlement.

But the war is now finally lost. All men of sense should at last see the dark at the end of the tunnel.

Yet we are being asked to prolong the agony. For what—To keep the shine on Henry Kissinger's shameful Nobel Peace prize? To pretend that the inevitable is indefinitely prolongable? It isn't.

The sad thing is that the struggle over Vietnam-after-Vietnam develops on so many false fronts. Take just these three:

President Ford is asking for extra military aid to the land that already gets most of our aid. Congress will fight back fiercely by trying to stick to our mere \$700 million dollars scheduled for Vietnam this year. Both positions are crazy—that of Ford because it asks us to escalate again toward an impossible victory, that of Congress because it tries to continue the myth of a gradual let-down that will be neither victory nor loss.

Ford tries to pump blood back into one wound while it pours out of 14 others. Congress tries to put a bandage on the one wound, while more wounds are delivered. If Congress "wins," we all lose—Vietnam by a series of further bloody twitches galvanized by us, Americans, by the drain of money in our desperate economic situation, and the rest of the world by the loss of American determination and resources.

Another false issue will be raised—that of Secretary of State Kissinger's position over against the Congress. If Congress comes even partially to its senses now, it will be called part of the "revolt" against the Secretary of State's control of foreign policy. Kissinger wants a free hand in Cyprus, on foreign trade, and in the Middle East.

Maybe he deserves some cooperation in these areas—but not in the soured dealings over Vietnam. The longer he holds out there, the worse he makes things for himself in regions where some hope remains.

The more we prolong the Vietnam craziness, the harder it gets to judge the merits of activism or restraint in other places. The administration is indulging in wild talk now of war in the Middle East—talk that becomes more plausible, to ourselves and others, if we go on defending the indefensible in Vietnam. On the other hand, a firm non-violent economic resistance in the Middle East becomes harder, the more all hostile acts get equated with further Vietnams.

We have nothing to win in Saigon, and never did. We have all kinds of things to lose there; and this President, like the three men who preceded him, is asking us to risk them.

NEEDED: HIGHER TAX ON GASOLINE

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on Sunday, January 12, the Richmond Times-Dispatch offered some interesting arguments with respect to a possible increase in the gasoline tax as a means to combat our Nation's oil problems and economic difficulties.

I believe this editorial will be of value in our discussions of these momentous problems in the days ahead:

NEEDED: HIGHER TAX ON GASOLINE

As the new Congress prepares to convene, government leaders appear to be on the verge of panicking about the nation's economic problems; and when men panic, they can do some irrational and dangerous things. News stories report that President Ford, only re-

cently a bullet-biting fighter of inflation, is about to make at least a 179-degree turn to aim his fire at the recession. From congressmen comes scary talk of massive tax cuts and soaring budget deficits, which could, in the long run, aggravate the country's economic troubles and make the current period of gloom seem like a golden age by comparison.

A far more thoughtful and more responsible approach is necessary if the nation's economic problems are to be solved. There is no quick and painless way out of this agonizing mess, and those who suggest otherwise are guilty of a despicable attempt to deceive the American people.

Consider, for the moment, the oil problem. Unquestionably, the exorbitant price of imported oil is a major cause of the nation's economic difficulties. Far too many American dollars are gushing from this country into the coffers of the oil-exporting countries. During the third quarter of 1974, the outflow of oil money was primarily responsible for the United States' balance-of-payments deficit of \$3.6 billion, the second highest three-month deficit on record. Obviously, a successful assault against the nation's economic problems must include a major reduction in the importation of oil.

Experts have said the United States' goal should be to cut oil imports by one million barrels a day by 1976. Only if we are prodded, however, are we Americans likely to reduce our consumption of gasoline enough to achieve that goal. And it is becoming increasingly clear that the most efficient, most effective and most equitable way to encourage the conservation of gasoline is to increase its cost sharply.

One way to achieve a one-million-barrel reduction in the daily consumption of oil by next year, the Ford administration has been told, would be to raise the federal gasoline tax by 50 cents per gallon. This would boost the pump price of gasoline to \$1 or more per gallon, about twice what it is now in most sections of the country but less than most Europeans have been paying for it for a long time. Such an increase would be all the incentive that most of us would need to adopt more frugal driving habits.

Critics of a gasoline tax increase complain that it would impose an unfair burden upon people with low incomes. And a 50-cent increase, one news magazine has argued, could cause "a drop in demand sharp enough to send the economy into a tailspin." But it should be possible to develop a plan that would blunt these objections, and one possible approach is suggested:

The plan could be designed to permit people to purchase up to 10 gallons of gasoline per week at the present federal tax rate of 4 cents per gallon. On all purchases in excess of that amount, the increase would apply.

So that there would be no need to print coupons, require the maintenance of massive records or establish a new federal bureaucracy to administer the program, the higher tax should be collected from everyone at the time of purchase. Then the federal government, acting through the Internal Revenue Service, could give each person who filed an income tax return a rebate of \$260 per year, which would represent the total annual tax collected at the 50-cent rate, on 10 gallons of gasoline per week. Actually, the rebate could and should show up in each paycheck as a \$5 per week reduction in the withholding tax, which would mean that the money could be put to immediate use. Provision also should be made for Social Security recipients, many of whom own automobiles. And to prevent the 50-cent gasoline tax increase from boosting the cost of other goods and services, it should be rebated on all fuel purchased for commercial and agricultural uses. The tax would be collected at the time

of the sale, but buyers could apply for refunds at the end of each month.

Let us cite some figures to show how the plan might work:

According to the most current estimates, 73 billion gallons of gasoline are consumed by passenger cars each year. At this rate, a 50-cent tax increase would generate for the federal government additional revenue of more than \$36 billion a year.

If the government refunded \$260 per year for every income tax return filed, it would disburse a total of more than \$21 billion annually, a figure based upon official estimates that at least 83 million individual returns will be filed for the 1974 tax year. Most of the refunds would go to heads of households, but some, of course, would go to other individuals, some of whom might not even own an automobile. But disbursements to them could be justified by the fact that almost any individual who earns enough to be required to file an income tax is likely to spend enough on gasoline, directly or indirectly, to merit inclusion in the plan.

A fair way to deal with Social Security recipients, whose driving needs will differ from those of workers, might be simply to increase each one's annual benefits by \$130. In many cases, this would mean \$260 per household per year, since some families would include two recipients. The total disbursement for people on Social Security probably would not exceed \$2 billion a year.

On the basis of all of these figures, the federal government would be left, after distributing all rebates, with a net return of about \$13 billion. But since the purpose of the program would be to reduce gasoline consumption, and it surely would have that result, the government's gross receipts from a 50-cent tax increase probably would never total as much as \$36 billion a year. However, consumption could drop by as much as one-third and revenue from the tax increase still would be sufficient to finance all of the suggested rebates.

Most of these refunds, it should be emphasized, would go back into the economy. Thus a reduction in the demand for gasoline should not cause the "tailspin" that the magazine pessimistically predicted.

A gasoline tax increase would be far preferable to two other proposals that have been advanced, an increase in the tax on crude oil and fuel rationing. A crude oil tax increase would send inflationary shock waves throughout the economy immediately, for such a boost would increase the price of nearly every product or service utilizing oil or energy produced by oil. Adversely affected, for example, would be the power plants that generate electricity for American homes. There certainly would not be anything inflationary about a gasoline tax as suggested here. Rationing and other restrictions on the sale of gasoline would mean red tape for sellers and buyers, long lines at service stations and other problems. An army of bureaucrats would have to be assembled. Such schemes tend to be fraught with inequities and abuses, including black-marketeering, and are extremely difficult to administer.

One very important aspect of the tax increase plan suggested here is the freedom it would give the motorist. He could drive as much as he liked as long as he was willing to pay the price.

This plan is designed for the gasoline problem and is not intended to be a substitute for action that may be needed in other areas of the economy. It is not in conflict, really, with Mr. Ford's opposition to a general increase in the gasoline tax, for each person in effect would determine whether he would pay any tax increase at all, and if so, how much. He would pay none, obviously, if he used only 10 gallons of gasoline a week.

We do not pretend that this proposal is perfect. It is offered not as a finished pro-

gram but as the outline of a plan for an equitable and effective approach to one of the nation's most challenging problems. The development of such a plan should be the common objective of President Ford and Congress.

JOHN O. HOLLY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between the 93d and the 94th Congresses funeral services were held in Cleveland, Ohio, for one of our most illustrious and extraordinary black leaders. Mr. Speaker, John O. Holly was a fearless fighter for the rights accorded to all Americans by the Constitution. He was a man for whom I had great admiration, and I was proud to have him as my friend. I deem it a privilege to cite his accomplishments to my colleagues as set forth in his obituary which follows. I also at this time include the remarks which I was privileged to make regarding Mr. Holly at his funeral. I commend both the obituary and my remarks to each of my colleagues in order to acquaint them with the life of one of the finest men I have ever been privileged to know:

OBITUARY

John Oliver Holly, Jr., passed away December 20, 1974 in Richmond Heights General Hospital.

A native of Tuscaloosa, Ala., where he was born, Dec. 3, 1903, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John O. Holly, Sr., the family moved to Roanoke, Va., where John completed his high school education at Harrison High.

John's father moved to Detroit, Mich., where he established a trucking business. In Detroit, John took a commercial course at Cass Tech while employed at the Packard Motor Co.

In the late twenties, John O. Holly moved to Cleveland, Ohio. In 1927, he married the former Leola Lee (deceased), and from this union, two sons were born, Arthur (deceased) and Marvin. In 1961, he married Marguerite Stone, secretary to the late Bishop A. J. Allen, now office manager of the City of Cleveland Law Department.

Mr. Holly was employed as a shipping clerk at the Federal Sanitation Company. After a trip to the Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, he was inspired by what he saw and got the idea of harnessing the power of Black people to improve their living conditions.

In 1937, with a nucleus of a small band of Cleveland business and church leaders, the Future Outlook League was organized.

The first targets of the new organization were the hundreds of community based businesses that did not hire Blacks except in menial jobs. Victories were scored through persuasion, followed by boycotts and picketing. As a result of his crusades for jobs, John O. Holly was sent to jail for defying a court order. This, however, did not deter John O. Holly in his efforts to advance his people.

The whole story of the life of John O. Holly and the Future Outlook League was published in a book in 1947 which was authorized by Charles H. Loeb of the Cleveland Call & Post.

Mr. Holly, for more than 40 years, was one of Cleveland's most involved citizens. His

name is synonymous with that of the Future Outlook League, Inc., an organization he helped start in 1935, and served as President until his demise which laid the groundwork for much of the economic advancement of Blacks in the greater Cleveland area, and a number of Ohio cities. During those years, the principles of the Outlook League, which had branches in Akron, Alliance, Canton, Mansfield, Painesville, Youngstown, and Springfield, became a guide in the field of civil rights. Its slogan, "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work," have served as an example and guide for Black community organizations throughout the nation.

The integration of Blacks into employment in banks, department stores, utilities, industrial plants and housing, and the development of Black entrepreneurships, was largely predicated upon the FOL's program.

John O. Holly exerted his leadership and extended his unique ability into other fields, including that of effective political action.

He organized and gave leadership to the Federated County Democrats of Ohio, Inc., and, in 1949, was its first and only State Chairman. In 1937, he was a candidate for Cleveland City Council and was nominated on the Democratic ticket from the 12th Ward. In 1952-56, he was elected Delegate-at-Large to the Democratic National Convention, serving as vice-chairman of the Ohio delegation.

In 1954, he was the first Black candidate to run for nomination for Congress from the 21st District.

As a member of Champion City Lodge #177 of the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks of the World, Mr. Holly held many responsible Grand Lodge posts and, at the time of his death, was serving as Grand Convention Director.

An active member of Mt. Sinai Baptist Church and member of its trustee board, Mr. Holly was a former member of the Executive Committee of the Cleveland Branch NAACP.

John O. Holly started former Cleveland mayor Carl Stokes on his political career and was the champion and patriarch of many other young Blacks who worked in both the Democratic and Republican parties. At the time of his death, Mr. Holly was employed by the City of Cleveland.

Survivors are: Wife: Marguerite; Son: Marvin; Grandchildren: Arthur; Barbara; John O. 3rd; Deborah; Marva; Three great-grandchildren; two nieces: Barbara Boyd, Rosetta Newman; One nephew: Melvin Clark; and numerous relatives and friends.

REMARKS AT THE FUNERAL
OF JOHN O. HOLLY, JR.

Reverend Clergy, Grand Exalted Ruler Reynolds, Marguerite and Marvin Holly, Granddaughter Ruler Smith. In 1946 Charlie Loeb authored the book, *The Future Is Yours*. This book eloquently chronicles the history of John O. Holly and the Future Outlook League. In the front of this book where the dedication appears it says "To the new generation of American Negroes who are no longer content with second-class citizenship and who intend to do something about it, this book is respectfully dedicated." This then to me symbolizes the life of John O. Holly. Few men die and leave an institution. John O. Holly was a pioneer in protest, a man decades ahead of his time. The forty year existence of the institution which he founded for the perpetuation of the progress of black people is a great legacy. John Holly became a civil rights leader long before the modern day pioneers and martyrs such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Medgar Evers and Malcolm X, whom we honor today. A few days ago I picked up "The Future Is Yours" and read it again. I did so in order to once

again bring into perspective the enormous contribution that John Holly and his devoted followers made to black economic progress in that era. I was 10 years old in 1935 and though I can recall the soup lines and other indicia of poverty I was unaware of many of the conditions affecting black people at that time. Every man and woman here today should read that book which describes the conditions of black people in Cleveland in 1935 when this young black man set out to create black unity and black economic opportunity. As we look at our community today it is difficult for us to realize that in 1935 Cleveland had a black population of 80 thousand people, that 80% of that population was either on direct or indirect relief. That at the same time there were more than 3,000 business places operating in the Central area. But that less than 100 employed black people—and these were in menial positions. Black high school graduates were for the most part relegated to jobs as porters, shoe shiners, factory labor and domestic work. John Holly triumphed over race prejudice, public indifference, and even apathy in the black community itself. His fierce determination and strong leadership qualities enabled him to be a Moses to his people. Thousands of black men and women enjoy positions of trust, prestige, and dignity today because a John Holly was determined that in America no man should be denied an equal economic opportunity because of the color of his skin. I am proud of my own personal friendship with him and equally determined and committed wife Marguerite. You and his family were his strength. Two of my relatives, Linton and Ruth Freeman were among his first supporters, with Ruth having the honor of being the League's second office secretary. My brother was not only the recipient of jobs through John Holly, but he was also his political protege. And so the Stokes family enjoyed a close and intimate relationship with the Holly family. Not all men have the capacity to become a legend in their own time. God, in his infinite wisdom saw fit to give John Holly this capacity. Yet he was a man who walked with Kings and never lost the common touch. For those of us who have studied his life it is apparent that he was indeed a man ahead of his time. Secondly his success at struggle and protest in behalf of mankind does indeed teach us that the future is ours. While history will record him as a pioneer in protest, he will live in the hearts of all of us who knew him as our "Uncle John".

TIME TO RETHINK COMPULSORY
RETIREMENT

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing a rural district in Kansas where many of our fine citizens are over the age of 65. I make mention of this fact not only because I am very much interested in the problems of our elderly in rural areas but also because I know many of my colleagues share this interest in behalf of their elderly constituents throughout the Nation.

I recently had occasion to read an article written by Mr. Allan C. Brownfeld that I feel sums up very well a par-

ticular problem facing our senior citizens that fortunately could be rectified through proper legislation. Mr. Brownfeld's article is entitled, "Time to Rethink Compulsory Retirement," and certainly such is the case.

In the past session of Congress, my friend and colleague, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY from Illinois, introduced legislation that would terminate age discrimination in employment. Congressman FINDLEY's bill would simply put an end to compulsory retirement at 65 or in reality what has come to be a most damaging form of age discrimination. I was most happy to cosponsor this legislation.

In the interest of utilizing one of our Nation's most valued resources, and putting an end to senseless discrimination, I commend the following to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Dec. 11, 1974]

TIME TO RETHINK COMPULSORY RETIREMENT
(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

When the Congress passed legislation outlawing discrimination based upon race, sex and age, it overlooked one of the most damaging forms of age discrimination—compulsory retirement at 65.

Today, millions of able-bodied men and women are told, upon their 65th birthday, that they are no longer wanted or needed as contributing members of society.

Existing law allows employers in both government and private industry to discharge employes when a predetermined age is reached. The difficulty and anguish this enforced retirement has caused is only beginning to be understood.

In a recent published study, Retirement: A Medical Philosophy and Approach, the American Medical Association's Committee on Aging states "The increase in life expectancy and higher health levels will prove of little benefit to man if he is denied the opportunity to continue contributing of his skills at a certain chronological age, whether this be 45, 65, or 85 years."

It is the conviction of this medical committee that such arbitrary retirement and denial of work opportunity—whether the work is for pay or the pleasure of giving—seriously threatens the health of the individual concerned.

Society exerts every effort to assist each individual to achieve his maximum potential, to utilize his abilities for his own and the human community's greatest benefit.

The committee adds, "From the beginning of life until its end, these objectives and motivation should continue to apply. Unfortunately, however, they apply only until a certain chronological age—most often 65—when forces outside of medicine inflict a disease—or disability-producing condition, upon working men and women that is no less devastating than cancer, tuberculosis, or heart disease. This condition—enforced idleness—robs those affected of the will to live full, well-rounded lives, deprives them of opportunities for compelling physical and mental activity, and encourages atrophy and decay. It robs the worker of his initiative and independence. It narrows physical and mental horizons so much that the patient's final interests and compulsions are in grumbling about his complaints."

It is the view of doctors studying the question of aging that compulsory retirement on the basis of age will impair the health of many individuals whose job represents a major source of status, creative satisfaction, social relationships, or self-respect.

In a position paper prepared for the 1971 White House Conference On Aging, the

American Medical Association noted that there are no known diseases specifically attributable to the passage of time and that, since compulsory retirement and artificial barriers to employment based on age can be prime factors in the deterioration of health, middle aged and older workers should be afforded equal opportunities with others for gainful employment, based on their personal desires and capabilities.

Now, a suit has been filed in federal court by Martin Weisbrod, an attorney in the Chicago office of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Weisbrod brought the suit in December, 1972, two months before reaching age 70 and mandatory retirement. His suit declares that the civil service provision forcing him to retire—although he has been re-hired on a temporary basis—is unconstitutional.

"I'm not built for retirement. I don't want to sit on a park bench," the plaintiff told Time Magazine, which added, "thousands of aged Americans would probably echo that sentiment."

At present, discrimination based on religion, national origin, race, sex, wealth and practically every other variable which can be used to separate citizens into "classes" has been eliminated—but age discrimination is still practiced.

Rep. Paul Findley (R-Illinois) has sponsored legislation which would eliminate mandatory retirement based upon age. The legislation is attracting a good deal of support.

One of its co-sponsors, Rep. Philip Crane (R-Illinois) notes, "If mandatory retirement at 65 were suddenly imposed on the House of Representatives, about 60 members would be unseated. Congress," however does not have a mandatory retirement age because the founding fathers recognized that advancing years alone were not the measure of lessening wisdom or ability. Is it not just as absurd to require millions of workers to retire when they reach their 65th birthday—or earlier?"

Pollster Louis Harris said recently that the nation's aged feel they are being misused by the society and warned, "It is not hard to predict that we shall see a wave of militance grow. Mr. Harris stated that a recently completed study sponsored by the National Council on Aging showed that nearly a quarter of all people over 65 would like to be working, either with or without pay. "The basic shame . . . about the way senior citizens are treated is that people are declared . . . useless long before their time in a society that will be aging dramatically in the next decade, this can be a highly dangerous political fact."

All forms of collectivism—viewing people as "blacks" or "women" or "Catholics" eliminates the need for a free society to judge each person solely as a unique individual.

This is also true with regard to age. We can ill afford to waste one of our greatest natural resources—the experienced men and women who have provided their younger fellow-citizens with the society from which they are now being cast aside.

END COMPULSORY RETIREMENT
(By William Loeb)

At this newspaper, any man or woman can continue to work as long as he or she wants to work and 65 means nothing to us. At one time we employed the oldest Composing Room superintendent in the nation. John Laing, who lived to 98, was 81 when he finally said his legs would not keep up with the speed required at edition time and he would like to retire.

Laing was financially able to retire years before but he just enjoyed working and we enjoyed and needed his sage and able advice and leadership.

At the same time, John Laing was working for us, we employed the youngest editor of a

daily newspaper in the nation. Cliff Noyes, a New Hampshire born and raised lad who was 18 when he held that position.

Both were employed for the same reason—they had a great deal of enterprise, courage and good judgment and a capacity for hard work.

More than 30 years ago, when this writer was in his 30's, he protested, as he still protests, compulsory retirement at the age of 65. Not only does it deprive the individual of the opportunity to go on and enjoy work but in many cases, it also deprives the nation of the services of some of its most able citizens.

While it is true that there are some works and professions so fatiguing that, when a man reaches 65 he is ready to retire, there are other occupations where this is not the case. Furthermore, people vary greatly in the way they age. Some individuals are senile in their 50's, while others are still in good physical and mental health in their 80's and 90's.

If you feel compulsory retirement at 65 is wrong, read the very interesting article by Columnist Allan C. Brownfeld at the top of our back page today. He quotes a recently published study by the American Medical Association's Committee on Aging which states, "The increase in life expectancy and higher health levels will prove of little benefit to man if he is denied the opportunity to continue contributing his skills at a certain chronological age, whether this be 45, 65, or 85 years."

Furthermore, there is another practical aspect of this situation. As better health and advances in medical science increase, more older people will be living a healthy and vigorous life longer and there will be more and more of them.

As the birth rate drops, if these older people were to retire at 65, then the burden of supporting them by a national pension system would fall on the younger population and it would be unbearable.

From every aspect, the good that can come from the productivity of the older people, the fun and security they can have if they continue to work and, lastly, the lowered cost of retirement pensions, the idea of doing away with compulsory retirement at 65 should be adopted on a national level.

WORRIED, CRITICAL OF STATE OF WORLD, CYRUS EATON SAYS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, one of Cleveland's great industrialists and a noted world figure in his own right, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, has recently celebrated his 91st birthday. On the anniversary of his birth, December 27, 1974, he was interviewed by reporter William Montalbano for a front page article in the Miami Herald. His frank observations on the international scene make fascinating reading and are most timely. I submit the article for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1974]
WORRIED, CRITICAL OF STATE OF WORLD, CYRUS EATON SAYS

(By William Montalbano)

ISLAMORADA.—Cyrus Eaton, "ending my life as a farmer and a philosopher," is restless and worried. He is 91 years old, a patriarchal figure of lively eyes and gnarled cane, feeling feisty as he paces a deserted Atlantic beach.

"I am somewhat in a critical mood of the

human race," he says. "And I am unhappy over the state of the world. We haven't done our highest and our best."

Cyrus Eaton has been outspoken and controversial for a long time, the multimillionaire who made friends in Moscow, Hanoi and Havana and preached detente with the Communist world before detente was fashionable.

Detente is a fact, now, and Eaton is no longer pilloried as a Communist-sympathizer and dupe. Today, as he marks the anniversary of his birth in 1883, Eaton has been vindicated into respectability. He is kind of an international elder statesman without portfolio, one of the few private citizens in the world with instant access to both the White House and the Kremlin.

Cyrus Eaton fears for the future.

"I am at an age when I don't want to kid myself or to help kid humanity about what is going on. If humanity is to be preserved the United States must take the lead."

The threat of nuclear war that could wipe mankind from the face of the earth is the spectre that haunts Eaton most. Since 1957 he has sponsored conferences of international scientists to warn against the peril-called Pugwash conferences after the Nova Scotia village where Eaton was born.

"At last summer's conference in Austria, the scientists said the arms race was worse than it was in 1957. Only now it is compounded by complacency. Everybody is used to the idea that doomsday is just around the corner. There is no sense of urgency."

The arms agreement at Vladivostok between President Ford and Soviet Communist Party Chairman Brezhnev was a tragic step in the wrong direction, Eaton says.

"They didn't agree to reduce weapons, but to stop after a big increase on both sides. This is a challenge to all the rest of the world to develop these terrible weapons of destruction.

"The risk in not having defense is less than the risk of developing these weapons on a vast scale. The United States must take the lead."

Eaton, who now spends his vacations in Florida because his doctors made him abandon skiing five years ago, worries about the ramifications of the U.S. preoccupation with defense.

It has helped spawn, he says, the CIA, which he has attacked for nearly a decade and now terms "perhaps the most evil institution in the world. It is misleading, irresponsible, highly dangerous. It ought to be abolished."

America's international posture has contributed substantially to the current domestic economic woes says Eaton, who's "probably the only living American to be keenly affected by the recession of 18 and 93 and every one since."

Eaton, a Cleveland industrialist, rail and utility magnate who still rides horseback on his Ohio farm, blames the current recession on the high cost of money.

"That is the result of our folly in spending countless billions like drunken sailors on trying to reform the rest of the world. The CIA is a prime manifestation of this.

"There is no return on money spent on bombs."

Eaton's last venture as a merchant of peace came last year on a trip to Cuba. He has maintained good relations with Premier Fidel Castro since Castro seized power.

"The United States will move swiftly toward complete and friendly relations with Cuba," Eaton says. "We can't much longer keep up the illusion that Cuba is a dangerous enemy. Everywhere among business people there is a desire to have completely friendly relations.

"That is unfortunate for those who left Cuba. They will have to make their future in the United States and other countries."

Although he professes to be an optimist,

Eaton's reading of history leaves him largely unimpressed with the progress of mankind.

"Man in some form has been on this earth for more than a million years. For a million years ignorance has been the outstanding characteristic of humanity, followed by intellectual laziness and vanity.

"It has only been 500 years since Columbus discovered the New World. And 400 years ago when Galileo said in Florence the earth went around the sun instead of vice versa he was sentenced to burn at the stake.

"In my lifetime I have seen development of the electric light, the telephone, the automobile and the airplane. Now that man is beginning to use his head, is he going to end it all?"

Cyrus Eaton sits erect in a white wicker chair in an old wood frame house by the sea. He savors the beauty of "the morning sunlight dancing off the ocean and the sea breeze fingering the Australian pines.

He has come to enjoy these reflections by the sea, to dream that one day Florida might become an intellectual center for men anxious to overcome "the myths and superstitions" he finds to have characterized too much of human history.

"It is a time for humility," Cyrus Eaton says. "The progress we have made is so limited . . . Instead of boasting of progress we ought to wonder why it took up a million years to get this far."

OBJECTIONS TO ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL HELP TO SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a cogent statement from the American Association of University Professors outlining the objections of this prestigious organization to the proposal that an additional \$300 million be given to South Vietnam.

This statement issued from the office of Mr. Joseph Duffey, the general secretary of the American Association of University Professors, points out that the \$300 million proposed by the administration for South Vietnam could be used to provide funds for a work-study program for 600,000 students and basic opportunity grants for 400,000 persons studying in college.

The article follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,
Washington, D.C. January 10, 1975.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY JOSEPH DUFFEY, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Reports that the President is seriously considering requesting from Congress supplemental foreign aid funds for South Vietnam and Cambodia are extremely discouraging. We believe that the President should not make such a request and that if he does, Congress should overwhelmingly reject it. The recent history of the national controversy over aid to Southeast Asia, should guide both the President and Congress in determining how the American people view the situation in Indochina. America's interests are not served by further intervention, whether it be with money or personnel. The signing of the cease-fire and the withdrawal of American troops brought to an end the divisive internal strife in America over this

issue. It would be terribly unfortunate if this highly emotional issue were revived at a time when Americans are confronted with a grave economic crisis at home.

Placed in the context of current national priorities, the suggestion of appropriating additional funds for Indochina would be a direct affront to the American people who believe that more pressing current issues require resolution. The Administration's belated recognition of the gravity of the recession and its impact upon lower- and middle-income groups should lead the Administration to conclude that an additional \$300 million could be spent more profitably on human resources at home rather than on war materials shipped to Indochina. The American people have been exceptionally tolerant of previous errors of judgment on Southeast Asia, but their tolerance of continued misguided policy and ill-spent funds will surely wear out in a period of grave economic crisis.

In the list of federal spending priorities, it may be significant to point out that an additional \$300 million applied to the federal program for postsecondary education would permit over 600,000 students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions to participate in the College Work-Study program authorized by Congress and over 400,000 students to receive Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. For most of these students, the grants and work-study payments permit them to go to college and to receive training in specialized programs necessary to both our society and economy. This investment in human resources would be significantly more productive at the present time than \$300 million worth of war materials shipped to Indochina for further destruction of that ravaged area.

BULLDOGS WIN NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. MATHIS. Mr. Speaker, someone once said that competitive athletics is the best character builder anywhere and I had an opportunity over the Christmas holidays of witnessing such an event not only for the men participating, but also the entire community.

The Thomasville High School football team located in Thomasville, Ga., was selected as the No. 1 high school football team in the Nation by the National Sports News Service in Minneapolis, Minn. This award is not taken lightly in my part of the country and I am extremely proud of the entire community. I want all my colleagues to be aware of this award and I am submitting two articles from the Thomasville Times-Enterprise and also a copy of a congratulatory letter from President Ford.

BULLDOGS WIN NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

(By George Lassiter)

The Thomasville Bulldogs today were officially proclaimed National High School Football Champions for 1974.

This ultimate in accolades was bestowed by the National Sports News Service (NSNS) at Minneapolis, Minn., in an announcement by NSNS Editor Art Johlf's.

Johlf's list of 20 top high school teams across the United States features Thomas-

ville in the No. 1 spot that twice (in 1962 and 1971) was awarded to the Valdosta Wildcats.

Only one other Georgia team, the Lakeside Vikings—ranked No. 17—were included in the top 20. Thomasville defeated Lakeside, 26-20, in its season's finale to win Georgia's AAA football championship for the second consecutive year. Lakeside was ranked No. 2 in the nation last year and has been in the top 20 consistently for five consecutive seasons.

Rounding out the top five teams behind Thomasville are Glenbrook, of Northbrook, Ill.; Harding, of Warren, Ohio; South Hills of Covina, Calif.; and Brazoswood, of Houston, Tex.

Leon High of Tallahassee, Fla., was ranked No. 9; Wheeler of Marietta, Ga., No. 39; Americus, Ga. No. 61; and Dougherty of Albany, No. 99, in the official poll by the NSNS.

Thomasville was ranked No. 13 in the NSNS poll last year after its defeat of Wheeler of Marietta to finish the 1973 campaign with 13 consecutive victories for its first-ever State AAA football crown.

Thomasville thus becomes only the second team in Georgia ever to win the national high school football championship. The other was Valdosta.

Region IAAA of which Thomasville and Valdosta are both members, is far and away the most illustrious football conference in Georgia—and perhaps the nation. Region IAAA also produced another state champion in Albany High School in 1958—and Albany that year also was ranked high nationally.

It was another Albany school this year—Dougherty High—that upset the defending state-champion Bulldogs, 27-20, in Thomasville's only loss since 1972. Until then the Bulldogs had won 19 straight games. But Thomasville defeated all other opponents, and now has won 25 of its last 26 games—and 32 of the past 35.

NSNS Editor Art Johlfs said this was the first time in 20 years of the national poll that a team without a perfect record had won the national championship.

He said Thomasville, after its defeat of Lakeside, was trailing but in the running with teams from Ohio, Texas and California—all state champions in 1973—for the No. 1 spot. And their seasons ran a week longer than Thomasville's.

However, when none of them repeated as a state champion, Thomasville vaulted into the No. 1 spot for keeps!

Johlfs said the NSNS, in making its selections, collects information on football teams in each state and evaluates them according to statistics, caliber of competition, past records and a special formula developed by the NSNS. The data is then fed into the computer and a final judgment is made.

The Bulldogs outscored their opponents this year by 443 to 153—or an average score of 34-11 per game. They averaged 283 yards rushing and 78 yards passing in each of their 13 games.

En route to the championship(s) they knocked off three undefeated teams—Bainbridge, during the regular season; and Groves of Savannah and Columbus High during the playoffs. These and other opponents were ranked high in polls either in pre-season or regular-season selections.

The NSNS's Johlfs said certain states have consistently strong football programs, and he said Georgia is highly regarded. In addition to Thomasville, Valdosta, Lakeside and Albany, Southwest High of DeKalb County also has been ranked in the poll's Top 10.

The NSNS poll is the only one of its kind, and Johlfs emphasized that the team chosen No. 1 wins only a "mythical championship"—as in the national rankings among colleges—since no actual gridiron playoff system exists.

Johlfs said only one other team in the top 20—John Marshall of Rochester, Minn.,

with a 12-0 record this year—repeated as a state champion.

Thomasville High is one of the smallest schools in Georgia's AAA ranks, and it is the second smallest in Region IAAA.

TOP 20 TEAMS

The Top 20 teams:

1. Thomasville High, Thomasville, Ga. 12-1
2. Glenbrook, Northbrook, Ill. 12-0
3. Harding, Warren, Ohio 11-1
4. South Hills, Covina, Calif. 13-1
5. Brazoswoods, Houston, Tex. 13-1
6. John Marshall, Rochester, Minn. 12-0
7. Morristown, N.J. 10-0
8. Gateway High, Monroeville, Penn. 11-0-1
9. Leon High, Tallahassee, Fla. 13-0
10. Syosset, N.Y. 9-0
11. Leominster, Mass. 11-0
12. St. Xavier, Middletown, Conn. 12-1
13. Washington, Indianapolis, Ind. 12-0
14. Holy Name Catholic, Huntington, Long Island, N.Y. 8-0
15. Upper Sinclair, Penn. 10-0-1
16. Putnam City, Okla. 11-1-1
17. Lakeside, Atlanta, Ga. 11-3
18. East St. Louis, Ill. 11-1
19. Upper Arlington, Ohio 11-1
20. St. John Bosco, Bellflower, Calif. 12-2

HUGHES: IT'S A DREAM COME TRUE FOR US (By Ed Kelly)

The Thomasville Bulldogs sit atop the prep football world today, and nobody is more ecstatic than their ultrasuccessful head coach, Jim Hughes.

Hughes, 37, not only has the top team in Georgia—and the nation—but also one of the country's hottest college prospects, William Andrews.

"Everything has just fallen into place, and we couldn't be happier," Hughes said. "This is a dream come true for us."

And, with an obvious reference to Valdosta, Hughes said:

"Thomasville is no longer playing in anybody's shadow."

Acknowledging that his team being named the national champion is only a "mythical title," Hughes said: "So are the collegiate rankings—and there is nobody who can disprove that we deserve the honor."

Hughes added: "We don't go out seeking such rating, but when they come from the success of hard work by our football team, we are naturally delighted. I certainly feel this team could hold its own with anybody."

In five years as Thomasville's head coach, Hughes has compiled a record of 46-7-3 in Region IAAA—the toughest, and certainly the most prestigious football region in Georgia, and the only one ever to produce two national champions. The other, of course, was Valdosta, which won the national championship in both 1962 and 1971.

Recent talk of a Valdosta-style "dynasty" at Thomasville gained more impetus when Hughes said: "We felt that if someone was going to get us, then it had to be this year."

Now that the "truth" can be told, Hughes and other Thomasville coaches felt before the 1974 season started that the team was "one year away from another possible championship."

The coaching staff privately predicted that Thomasville probably would win the Region IAAA championship again this year—and they figured that anything beyond that would be "icing on the cake," a bonus.

"We have a lot of youngsters playing for us," Hughes had said, "and we didn't know how they would react."

How they "reacted" is now history, especially those breath-taking, come-from-behind victories they made their trademark. For example, in the South Georgia championship game against Columbus, they trailed 14-0 after six minutes of action—but won the game, 28-14.

Hughes will lose 17 players off a team numbering about 80, but he figures he has one of the finest sophomore classes in the school's history coming up in 1975. Add these to the present varsity, and the "makings" are there for another powerhouse—stronger, perhaps, than the 1974 team.

Although Hughes will lose several fine athletes off the current team, only one of them could be described as irreplaceable. That player, of course, is William Andrews, the most sought-after football player in Thomasville's history—and certainly the most highly-recruited player this year in Georgia, the South and perhaps the nation. College scouts from UCLA to Miami, Fla., and from Nebraska and Oklahoma to North Carolina—you name it—are after him in droves. Andrews in three seasons has rushed for 4,349 yards and has excellent leadership that makes him the most popular player on the team.

Andrews' running was made especially effective this year by the threat of quarterback Jack Cannady's passing, an extra dimension the Bulldogs didn't have in winning 13 straight games in 1973.

Cannady completed 64 of 115 passes for 912 yards—a 55.6 per cent completion average.

While the 1973 team specialized in rugged defensive play, the 1974 squad was, to put it mildly, explosive on offense. And its defense toward the season's end rivaled the play of the 1973 team.

And, as faithful Thomasville fans already know, nearly everybody on the defensive team will return in 1975!

JANUARY 3, 1975.

Mr. JIM HUGHES,
Coach, Thomasville High School, Thomasville, Ga.

DEAR Mr. HUGHES: It was good news to learn from Congressman Dawson Mathis that Thomasville High School's football team has been selected the top high school football team in our nation by the National Sports News Service of Minneapolis. I know how proud everyone in Thomasville must be of this high honor that has come to you, your team and your school, and I just wanted to add my own congratulations to the many you are receiving at this time. This is a well-deserved honor and I wish you many more successful seasons ahead.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

FRED PACKARD: NEVER A LOSER

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, too often in dealing with the handicapped, we may think of them as a group apart, as individuals whose outlook and expectations are radically different from those of the rest of the population. I am very pleased therefore to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article of one "handicapped" person from my district. Fred Packard's perspective, determination, and accomplishments despite birth defects restricting the use of his hands and legs should do much to change such limited notions, and as legislators, provide us with a better understanding of the handicapped and the Federal programs which involve and assist them.

Last year, for instance, the Congress enacted legislation to extend and improve the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This program makes important contributions to our Nation and its economy by training handicapped people for regular employment and participation in our society. Clearly, however, the potential of these individuals is a resource we are just beginning to develop. I commend Fred Packard's story to my colleagues as a reminder of just how much our handicapped citizens can achieve when provided the opportunity and encouragement.

FRED PACKARD: NEVER A LOSER

(By Mark Vogler)

BRIDGTON.—Somebody must have been wrong about Fred Packard.

Born with only four fingers and badly deformed legs which restricted his movement to crawling, doctors in Portland said he would never lead a normal life.

But Friday, during the Maine Rehabilitation Vocational Council's Annual meeting in Bangor, he walked up to the award table to receive state honors for individual achievement in life.

"They gave me the award because they thought I was handicapped—but I really don't look at it that way," said the 29-year-old Packard in a recent interview.

Perhaps Packard is right.

"I've never been a loser at anything I've ever done."

As one of the up and coming success stories in the state's insurance circles, Packard is happily married, has a two-month-old daughter and lives in an attractive raised chalet which he planned and contracted himself.

He said all the credit belongs to his parents, who sent him to a Shriner's hospital in Springfield, Mass., at age four after being told in a Portland hospital that their son would never be able to walk.

There he spent almost eight months over three years, undergoing orthopedic surgery in about 20 operations.

"I didn't walk in, but I walked out of there," he recalls.

"The fascinating thing about the hospital was that most of the doctors there didn't receive any money. Even though the Shriners support 23 of these hospitals across the country today, parents who have handicapped children are afraid to take them there."

Right from childhood, and even without adequate facilities for the handicapped in town, Packard said he never felt out of place.

"My development was normal in what I call 'the ordinary world,'" he says.

"I don't think there's a finite difference between what is 'normal' and what is 'abnormal.' Some of those people who are so-called normal, I think are three bricks short of a full load in the brain capacity."

When he was five his father gave him a cow to take care of. And he believes that it was the rural farm upbringing which enhanced his personal growth.

"I was taught responsibility at a young age, which is true of any child on the farm," he says.

"I was never hidden, put or shied away . . . but marched in public like the rest of us, and the real credit belongs to my parents.

It never dawned on Packard that he had a handicap because he remembers "always being with people who didn't have them."

"When I was five years old, there was nothing else available, so I had to step on that school bus like the rest of them and have an education," he says.

"If a person can possibly cope in the normal situation, it is so much better."

Because his parents bought and saved \$2,500 in savings bonds from cash awards young Fred won in 4-H contests, he was able to get a head start toward a college education.

But even before receiving a bachelor of science degree (1969) in business administration at the University of Maine at Portland, Packard worked year round to pay more than half of the expenses.

He got into the insurance field as a result of his outgoing, warm personality, it seems.

As a youngster, people knew him all over town. He used to walk the streets selling raffle tickets if he wasn't entering farm animals in 4-H contests, says a friend.

Carroll Lurvey, now an executive sales director in Maine for American Bankers Life of Miami, Fla., inquired in the neighborhood about a go-getter who would make a good salesman for the company.

A client of Lurvey's suggested Packard. Shortly after, during the summer of 1967, Lurvey went into the woods where the older Packard and his son were working and told the boy, "You'd make an excellent salesman."

A summer later, Packard needed a job and found one.

But there were some other companies who obviously felt differently about hiring a handicapped person.

As a senior and president of the businessmen's fraternity of UMP, Packard helped sponsor a Native Sons and Daughters program through the local chamber of commerce. Fifty companies came to the University to screen 800 graduates looking for jobs.

"Although I was more qualified than most—and even was responsible for setting the thing up—I never received one response," he recalls.

"I knew what the basic reason was, they didn't want to hire anyone with a handicap."

But the day after Packard graduated from UMP, he went to work for American Bankers Life. For four years he has had his own booth at the Native Sons and Daughters clinic and boasts that he hired a classmate who did not like his job with one of the 50 companies.

"This fellow I guess, just couldn't handle the work, it was not a case of his competence with the company. It's just what you call experience," he says.

"Basically, all companies are ruthless. They throw everybody up against the wall. Whatever sticks is fine. And whatever falls on the ground, they got the work out of anyway."

He considers his company's attitude to be different from most other insurance firms, contending that his retention rate of personnel is 85 per cent after two years compared to five remaining people out of 100 hired by the average firm.

After only five years with American Bankers Life, Packard is agency manager in Western Maine of the Assurance Division with more than 400 clients . . . and 95 per cent he claims, were referred to him.

Besides being one of 40 Maine men who has sold a \$1 million of insurance in one year, he has hired and trained two others.

Packard says he is looking for anyone who wants to work. And though he has hired a man with cerebral palsy, he does not place emphasis on hiring the handicapper.

"I'm an equal opportunity employer," he says in one breath, adding that it was a strange way he met his wife.

"It was one of those rare things. She was standing in the doorway one day looking for employment and I turned around and said 'I'll hire you.'"

Mrs. Connie (Bourque) Packard, who had just graduated from the University of Maine at Gorham (1973) said those were "welcome words" since she had been everywhere looking for a job.

Mrs. Packard began selling insurance and knew her boss on a "strict business relationship for about eight months."

"Then, one night we went out for dinner together . . . things happened . . . and a year later we were married," says Packard.

The chalet, which was meant to be a bachelor's pad, was completed in September of 1973, just a day after their wedding. Having given birth to Elizabeth-Marine last October, Mrs. Packard hasn't sold much insurance lately, but says she plans to in the future.

Packard himself, has no personal philosophy which has helped him in life—just an anonymous poster which he keeps at home:

"Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence . . . Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent . . . Genius will not; unrewarded genius is almost a proverb . . . Education will not; the world is full of educated derelicts.

"Persistence and determination are omnipotent. The slogan 'press on' has solved and always will solve the problems of the human race. . ."

Perhaps that was coined for people like Fred Packard.

THIS IS GOING TO HURT A LITTLE

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard the President's state of the Union message with spelled out the serious problems that the Congress and the people of this Nation will have to come to grips with.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Fred DeArmond, has set forth his view of the problem in a succinct summary. I commend it as important reading to my colleagues.

The article follows:

"THIS IS GOING TO HURT A LITTLE"—INFLATION CALLS FOR RADICAL TREATMENT

(By Fred DeArmond)

In the reception room of a Springfield, Missouri dentist is a sign reading vertically in the manner of Japanese print: "Painless Dentist—Upstairs." The building is one-storey, the painless dentist a fiction.

This sign points a lesson to the doctors of economics and their patients: There is no painless cure for inflation. Any treatment that is effective is bound to hurt somebody, as the disease has already hurt millions of others. The pain is at the very core of the cure. And those who will be hurt the worst are for the most part the same individuals who profited most by inflation.

Most of the participants at the Summit Conference on economic issues at Washington were looking for a painless therapy that doesn't exist in heaven or on earth. Many of the specifics they came to advocate would worsen rather than alleviate the disease that afflicts this country. With three or four exceptions, they offered nostrums that somebody else would pay for, but "you mustn't touch me or my group!" They were there to Get but not to Give.

Everyone admits, publicly at least, that the spendthrift habits that have been indulged for 40 years must be reformed. But the presently orthodox method, as my friend and retired businessman Dan Howard describes it, is like that of an adviser to a confirmed alcoholic who would say to the delinquent: "You must find a way to get off the stuff. Here's a quart of Old Standby rye whiskey. See that you use it in moderation as a cure."

If we are to hold to any degree of sense and realism, four principles are essential to

any hope of halting or even materially slowing down inflation:

1. Government at all levels must set an example by living within its means. Many of its services are luxuries we cannot now afford.

2. Considerable unemployment will be an inevitable result of any successful curative efforts.

3. Tight money—high interest on borrowed funds—is absolutely essential, temporarily, for cooling off the overheated economy.

4. Inflation cannot be controlled by increasing taxes.

Anyone who has ever struggled to keep personally solvent should know that we cannot go on running up enormously unbalanced budgets year after year, decade after decade, without bringing a crash.

Some degree of unemployment is the first place where the cure will hurt, although it will also pinch the profit nerve of business. But the present excessive concern about unemployment is unjustified. Actually, there is little real unemployment in the United States, in the sense that more work is available than there are hands to perform it. Also the meaningful statistic is number of family breadwinners out of work. The Bureau of Labor Statistics figure can rise by half or more without being a genuine cause of concern except to vote-hungry politicians. When there is some competition among workers for jobs and among employers for help, that is a healthy condition. Employment could be sustained and stabilized by repealing minimum wage laws and making labor contracts with escalation clauses illegal. The politician who is shedding tears over unemployment that might result from proposed anti-inflation measures is thinking in terms of votes first of all.

In truth, the main reason inflation has raged for so long and to such extremes is because so many people don't want it controlled. They believe an easy formula has been discovered, and because it helps them at the expense of others, they don't want it changed. They are so wedded to high wages and salaries and fees and "growthmanship" with all the attendant perquisites—three automobiles and a power boat to a family, cross-continent vacation trips, and heedless high living—that they have come to regard these things as normal for everybody. Actually, this luxuriating in extravagance is abnormal. Someone ought to be thinking about that well-worn abstraction, the general welfare. No literate person can escape the conclusion that to continue this mad pace is to assure disaster for all, and that not far in the future. This overheated economic structure must be cooled off by some means. The sure and only cure is deflation, even if it does hurt a little.

The degradation of the dollar has been defined as the result of too much money (purchasing power) chasing too few goods. Money is loose and becoming looser; to retain its value it must be made tighter. One of the Federal Reserve Board's weapons for winning this fight is its power of controlling the discount price of money to banks and thus making capital harder to acquire by loan. This means is being partially utilized right now, but in the face of enormous political pressure for easy money. It means high interest rates for all borrowers. That of course hurts some and helps others. It helps the retired person, for example, trying to weather the storm by living on Social Security and the interest on his savings accumulated while he was active. It also helps every consumer dismayed by the relentless upward push of prices for what he or she buys.

We hear a cackle of voices raised in debate over which group of citizens is hurt most by inflation. Up until quite recently, liberal economists favored an inflationary stance because it provided more jobs for the "lower orders" at higher wages. Lately we've seen

the liberal tune change to the claim that inflation is a cruel tax on "the poor." This line ignores the fact that food stamp coverage has expanded in the past four years from 4.3 million to 12.9 million, according to *National Review*.

It cannot be denied that for a time income through wages and salaries did increase at a faster rate than prices of goods. As long as that was the case, in disregard of the fact that the whole nation was living on the cuff, employed persons thought they were serving their selfish ends by resisting anti-inflationary measures. Now there is general agreement that consumer prices have forged ahead of income, and that knocked the props from under the equalitarian claim that the lower classes were benefitting by the situation. A fair estimate seems to suggest that the Keep-up-with-the-Joneses middle classes, living in their \$30,000 to \$40,000 mortgage-laden homes, are harder hit than the proletarians with their food stamps.

The notion that inflation can be curbed by higher taxes is a basic fallacy embraced by some of the doctors seeking for palliatives. Taxation is the means for raising needed revenue for public functions. That it can in addition be designed as a cybernetic governor of the economy and a redistributor of wealth is one of the shop-worn and now discarded New Deal fallacies. If the additional revenue raised by a federal tax boost were applied toward reducing the national debt it might have a certain deflationary value, since it would lower spending by the private sector. But any American born earlier than yesterday should know that such revenue would not be so used. Instead it would simply go to swell some of the innumerable forms of paternalistic government spending.

Much alarm over a threatened recession is expressed, along with the proposition that an offsetting stimulation could be provided by lowering taxes. This assumption is as fatuous as that higher taxes would slow down inflation. Actually, a mild recession is part of the real cure for our troubles. It would tend to slow the galloping shrinkage in the dollar's purchasing power and at the same time relieve the alarming depletion of our natural resources. Above all, it would come to the aid of beleaguered consumers by providing some real competition among the suppliers of goods and services. Right now we should look upon mildly falling indicators of business activity as a blessing in disguise.

With the dangerously developing prognosis, inflation taxes to the utmost a traditional free enterprise, republican-democratic society. It is so perplexing in its ramifications that men otherwise level-headed and reasonable are spouting nonsense about it in the communications media. Most of the proposals for remedying it would only make a bad situation worse. They amount to a conflicting riot of inconsistencies. At the President's Summit Conference, the chorus of selfish interests and politics was relieved by four sane voices. They were those of FRB Chairman Arthur Burns, Treasury Secretary William E. Simon, Presidential Economic Adviser Alan Greenspan, and Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield.

Any remedy worth a nickel at this stage is bound to be politically unpopular. An Executive or a Congress intelligent enough to adopt sound economic measures must also be courageous enough to stand against the clamor of mobocracy egged on by economic illiterates among the opinion makers. The atmosphere is charged with partisanship as it has not been since the Civil War.

Congress has been saying to the President, "It's your problem; what are you going to do about it?" The President might reply, and in effect has been doing so: "It's your headache as much as mine. Why should I and my party take the rap for surgery to correct a condition that has been forty years in the

making?" When such a state of affairs is stalemated in a corporation's governing board, wise heads in the organization get ready for bankruptcy.

It's true that the initiative rests with the President. But it's a state priority as long as Congress is thinking in terms of a game to be won against a hated rival. Maybe this situation is a built-in weakness of a democracy; if so, it's high time to start repairing the fault. The trouble we suffer from is not merely a national indisposition but a malignancy that has already begun to spread into the political and moral as well as the economic tissues of the nation. At this stage, it will respond only to radical therapy. Those dollars men and women are scrambling for so greedily are presently worth around 25 cents, compared to their value at the time the disease struck with the Second World War. Soon they may be down to a dime—and then look out for the Deluge.

A TRIBUTE TO LLOYD SKINNER

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, probably the highest tribute a man can receive is to be recognized by his peers. Recently such a singular honor was paid to a great Nebraskan, Mr. Lloyd Skinner.

Familiar to housewives around the country, the Skinner name has always stood for excellence in macaroni products. Now Lloyd Skinner has been honored by the 36th annual U.S. Durum Wheat Show for his many years of effort to improve the quality of pasta products through durum wheat research and development.

At the U.S. Durum Wheat Show in Langdon, N. Dak., 1 day was designated "Lloyd Skinner Day" in recognition of his leadership.

Mr. Speaker I include those excerpts from Milling and Baking News which describes the honor bestowed on Mr. Skinner at this point in the Record:

DURUM AWARD TO SKINNER

LANGDON, N. Dak., November 11.—Lloyd E. Skinner, chairman of Skinner Macaroni Co., Omaha, was honored at the 36th annual U.S. Durum Show in Langdon Oct. 22 for his many years of participation in efforts to improve the quality of pasta products through durum wheat research and development. Among durum growers, Mr. Skinner has acquired the reputation of holding to 100% durum in the face of widening cost differentials.

Mr. Skinner was presented a plaque by Mr. Hofstrand at the Oct. 22 afternoon session. In his acceptance comments, Mr. Skinner said he simply wanted to thank the durum farmers. "You went through a hectic year and you gave us a crop," he said. Text of the plaque presented to Mr. Skinner reads as follows: "Presented with sincere appreciation to Lloyd E. Skinner for dedicated efforts which have contributed substantially to understanding and progress in the durum wheat industry, U.S. Durum Show—1974."

WORLD DEMAND FOR PASTA INCREASES—SPEAKERS AT ANNUAL DURUM SHOW SEE GROWTH IN DURUM REQUIREMENTS BUT CITE CONCERN OVER EFFECTS OF BLENDING; FARM HOLDING DEFENDED

LANGDON, N. DAK., November 4.—Burgeoning demand for pasta in the U.S. and around the world holds the promise of increased durum sales and points to the need for con-

tinued research and market development or informational services, participants in the 36th annual U.S. Durum Show at Langdon Oct. 21-22 heard from speakers representing all segments of durum-related industries and the academic community. Recurring questioning by the various speakers dealt with the potential effects on pasta consumption of blending because of the wide margin of durum costs over other classes of wheat.

Tuesday, Oct. 22, was designated "Lloyd Skinner Day" in recognition of the active participation over the years by Mr. Skinner, chairman of the board of Skinner Macaroni Co., Omaha, in the promotion of durum utilization and in the Durum Show itself.

Macaroni manufacturers were represented on the program by Nick Rossi, president of Procino Rossi Co., Auburn, N.Y., and president of National Macaroni Manufacturers Association, and Robert M. Green, executive secretary of N.M.M.A. Joseph Halow, executive vice-president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., spoke on "Exports and the Consumer," and Charles R. Pence, international marketing director of the Grain and Feed Division of Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S.D.A., discussed "Producing for the Market." Melvin Maier, administrator of North Dakota Wheat Commission, pointed to the continued need for market promotion even in periods of world scarcity. Norman Weckerly, member of N.D. Wheat Commission, presented a grower's point of view. Dr. James Quick, plant breeder at North Dakota State University, reviewed durum variety research and Dr. H. R. Lund, assistant director of North Dakota Agriculture Experiment Station, Fargo, discussed research in perspective.

CANNOT ISOLATE SOVIET DEMAND

"There is no way we can isolate our markets from the impact of Soviet grain buying," Mr. Halow told the Monday session. He pointed out that if the U.S. should not sell the grain to the Soviets directly, they would buy it from other sources, creating shortages in other areas which the U.S. would then be called on to supply. He commented further that the Soviets could, if they were unable to purchase all they need on the world markets, then perhaps elect not to meet their own export obligations. This would mean, he said, that "countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia would turn to the U.S. for wheat which they might otherwise obtain from the Soviet Union." Much of the wheat which these countries bought from the U.S.S.R. in 1972 was, in fact, shipped from the U.S. as part of the orders which the Soviets placed here, he pointed out.

Mr. Halow said it was unfortunate but true that most Americans still see something sinister in grain sales to the U.S.S.R. "Despite the fact that exhaustive investigations proved nothing, most Americans want to think there was something crooked about that sale, or, at least, that the Soviets pulled something over on us." Mr. Halow expressed the view that the Soviets had been "quite candid about the fact that they expect to continue to be grain importers." He commented that in 1970, Great Plains Wheat had correctly forecast that the Soviet Union was grain deficient and would become an importer rather than an exporter of grains.

SEES DISCRIMINATION IN INTERVENTION

Limitation of grain sales to the U.S.S.R. is discrimination, Mr. Harlow asserted, because "This is a restriction placed in no significant manner on any other country."

Speaking of production possibilities for next year, Mr. Harlow said there was some indication that the world could run into a glut of grains by next summer, given normal production weather. He based that assumption on the fact that livestock herds are being reduced and that the world will not be able to build up herds fast enough to consume all the grain which should be produced next year. "We should not forget,

however," he commented, "that despite fluctuations over periods of days or months, the wheat consumption trend is up."

BEST OF TWO WORLDS FOR DURUM

Referring specifically to durum, Mr. Halow said, "The durum grower has the best of two worlds, for an improvement in world diets will mean increased demand for durum. This is actually true of all wheat, but pasta is not only a supplement to a meal—it can be the meal itself. Rising meat prices cause consumers to eat more wheat-based foods—a very popular one of which is pasta. Furthermore, if consumption of livestock products continues to increase—as it should—durum growers will benefit also from the strength in the entire grains complex as well as the growing demand for pasta."

PENCE SEES "WONDERFUL OPPORTUNITY"

Mr. Pence of F.A.S. stressed the point that durum products have a "wonderful opportunity to increase sales of their product in world trade." He cited growing consumption of pasta in the world, specifically referring to great expansion in South America. He cautioned that the growth in world pasta consumption was taking place with products using wheat of other classes than durum. "Price relationships are restricting the amount of durum you can sell," he said.

The current year was described as one with a "habit of changing more than any other" by Mr. Pence. He referred to increased acreage last spring when the great concern was how big crops could be moved. At that time, many of us "could not see wheat exports so high and saw surpluses in corn, but Mother Nature took care of all this," he said. Mr. Pence said an effort was being made to keep our doors open for future demand while supplying adequate amounts of grains for needs here at home.

Mr. Pence described the difficulties encountered in coping with seemingly contrary data in reports on exports. The Statistical Reporting Service data, issued under requirements of the current farm legislation, show more sales than we could deliver and still have enough for here at home, he pointed out. But, he said, the figures are inflated and he cited the European Community's aggregate of "more corn on books than they can possibly handle" as an example of grain that won't be shipped.

Much more resistance to price than in the past has been in evidence this year, Mr. Pence pointed out. "This is the first year the consumer has been faced with increased cost of food grains or grains for livestock and some have to cut down," he said, adding that "price resistance is there in the world."

GROWER CONCERN WITH BLENDING

Mr. Weckerly, who recently was a member of a durum team that traveled to Europe and Algeria, reported that "Our foreign friends are just as concerned as our domestic trade over the problem of blending of soft wheats into the semolina and producing an inferior product which could signal a reduction in per capita consumption." This will directly affect the demand for durum, he acknowledged, while countering that "with the alternate crops we have competing for our acreage here in North Dakota, each of us must weigh these facts and decide for ourselves how much of a premium we must have to contribute the acreage to durum to continue to satisfy the demands of our domestic and foreign trade."

MINIMUM POTENTIAL FOR NEW ACREAGE

The potential for any increased durum acreage in Europe is minimal, Mr. Weckerly stated, with the following comments: "In France, we heard that acreage could be up 20% next year. In Italy and Algeria, officials felt that there would not be any increase as they were currently at maximum potential production. In France, the increase in durum acreage will come at the expense of reduced

acres of corn and soft wheats, mainly, with some reduction in sugar beets also. Hence, a tradeoff as far as total agricultural production is concerned.

"We as durum producers have always prided ourselves that on most issues of concern we have kept open the lines of communication with domestic millers, manufacturers and exporters," Mr. Weckerly said. "We are now in an era in which we must broaden our objectives to include more periodic communication with our foreign trader buyers, millers, governments, manufacturers, and also producers to continue to solve the problems which today face the pasta industry."

"UNJUSTLY ACCUSED" OF HOLDING

Mr. Weckerly said that durum growers have been unjustly accused of holding stocks off the market. "To the contrary," he said, "who else in our industry wants to pay the interest and carrying charges on our inventory of grains in the hands of producers, and who could even accomplish this feat? It looks as though we have finally achieved some of our goals of the past, but we had better not be complacent because we have many more challenges in the future for our entire industry."

MAIER: INTO BETTER INFORMATION

Mr. Maier described new market development as being more in the area of information, technical assistance, the exchange of ideas, than in the old concept of sales promotion. He described a "thirst for information" among users of spring wheat and durum in world markets. He cited the need for "knowing our product a little better," the need to do a better job of monitoring and to provide a final crop quality survey faster.

We must maintain one important selling point of U.S. durum, Mr. Maier said, referring to color of semolina.

Pasta consumption is up every where, Mr. Maier pointed out, at the same time expressing concern over the growing trend towards blending.

"HEALTHY INCREASE" FOR PASTA

Mr. Rossi reported that pasta sales in the U.S. are expanding again after a brief interruption and predicted that the year will show a "healthy increase." He also referred to blending with the comment, "In order to hold retail prices, macaroni manufacturers have taken the route of blending with ingredients with cheaper costs. We don't like to blend. We hate to blend. We are forced through the numbers game to blend to keep our businesses healthy—to keep Mrs. Consumer picking up our product."

"I'm not here to say we want lower prices," Mr. Rossi said. "You have a world market and we expect to have to compete. The root of the problem is worldwide inflation."

Mr. Green estimated that pasta consumption increased 20% in the past year in the U.S. durum grind is down, he acknowledged, but "macaroni business is not that bad." A lot of blending is going on, he said, estimating that a third to 40% of the industry's production is on blended products. Mr. Green differentiated between the long-time blending done by C. F. Mueller Co., a macaroni manufacturer that advertises the benefits of its type of blending, and the blending that is done on the basis of price alone.

"My message is this," Mr. Green said. "I have been attending the annual Durum Show since 1949 and the pasta industry needs good quality durum at a fair price."

NEED GREATER NUTRITION EMPHASIS

Dr. Quick outlined plant breeding with three major objectives—resistance to stem rust, yield and good quality. He described two types of quality as physical and nutritional and said not much has been done with respect to nutrition. He said the need is to develop better protein and he said up to 20% could be accomplished without much search for additional germ plasm.

CONGRESSMAN PETER H. B.
FRELINGHUYSEN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed on both sides of the aisle that a number of distinguished congressional careers were concluded upon adjournment of the 93d Congress.

One such career which I would like to bring to the attention of the House today is that of New Jersey's great Congressman, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, a man who has given this institution and our Nation more than two decades of dedicated service.

Peter Frelinghuysen is a member of one of the Nation's most distinguished families, one which has a history of outstanding military and governmental service that began with the founding of the Original Thirteen Colonies. Frelinghuysens have served in the Continental Congress, in the Minutemen militia, as decorated generals in the Revolutionary War, and in the Cabinet. Four members of the family have served in the U.S. Senate, and one, Theodore, was Henry Clay's vice-presidential running mate on the Whig ticket in the presidential election of 1844.

Since he was sworn in as a Member of this body by Speaker Joe Martin in January 1953, Peter Frelinghuysen has lived up to the noble tradition of governmental service which his family has come to symbolize.

For many years he served as the ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee and is the man responsible for bringing minority staffing to that important committee.

Peter Frelinghuysen has also made his mark in the arena of international affairs. Members of the House are familiar with the expertise and dedication he has brought to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which he served as the ranking minority member. His profound insight into the intricacies of international politics and his broad knowledge of both the potential and the limitations of American foreign policy will be sorely missed by Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation.

Congressman Frelinghuysen's diplomatic skills, however, have extended far beyond the foreign policy decisionmaking of the House. During his tenure as a Member of the American delegation to the United Nations, he singlehandedly persuaded that body to provide badly needed assistance to refugees from Palestine. And, as anyone who has traveled to foreign capitals will know, Mr. Frelinghuysen commands the highest respect from heads of state all across the globe.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has expressed his own high regard for Mr. Frelinghuysen's brand of diplomacy, most recently following the Congressman's trip to the Middle East earlier this year. During this trip, he managed to do what few others have accomplished: win the confidence of both the Arabs and the Israelis. Many nations of

the world have had a good friend in Peter Frelinghuysen.

There are, of course, many other accomplishments that have marked this career of 22 years in the House. I shall always recall his remarkable ability for bringing about political compromise on controversial issues facing several Republican National Conventions, at which he has chaired important subcommittees of the Committee on Resolutions. New Jersey, the most urban State in the Union, will be eternally grateful to him for personally insuring the preservation of the Great Swamp, which is one of the last and largest spans of totally undisturbed terrains in the Nation.

However, the most important work performed by Mr. Frelinghuysen may well prove to be his efforts to bring about reform of the House of Representatives. His last year in this body largely was devoted to working tirelessly and diligently as a member of the Select Committee on Committees. Many of the internal reforms which have already been adopted and those which this body will hopefully have the courage to institute in the future bear the mark of Peter Frelinghuysen.

Although he is still a relatively young man, Peter Frelinghuysen's decision to retire after 22 years of service in the House is wholly consistent with his desire to revitalize the U.S. Congress.

One would hope that the "new blood" which Congress will receive next year, will have as much courage of conviction and spirit of true reform as Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Peter Frelinghuysen is a good friend and a valued colleague. I am confident that neither the Nation nor New Jersey will lose his ability in the future. One large segment of his career may now be at an end. But the avenues for continued participation—in his party, in government, and in foreign affairs—will remain open to him for many years to come. We all should be hopeful that this dedicated and capable public servant maintain the spirit of service and participation that has been the hallmark of his family.

THE ART OF URANIA CUMMINGS

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the St. Thomas Daily News telling the remarkable story of Urania Cummings, one of our world-renowned local artists.

Having won numerous prizes and held countless exhibitions throughout the country, Urania Cummings did not take up serious painting until late in life. But her unique creative vision could not be forever repressed and her most recent success has been an exhibition at the very school in St. Thomas, where she was once scolded as a young girl for drawing pictures instead of studying.

I commend to you the following article on Urania Cummings:

[From the St. Thomas (Virgin Islands) Daily News, Dec. 31, 1974]

URANIA CUMMINGS, GRANDDAUGHTER HOLDS EXHIBIT

In the year 1889 a remarkable, inspirational woman named Urania Prince was born in St. Thomas, Danish West Indies. At the age of 21 she left the island, returning periodically. While a student at Nisky School, she was reprimanded for drawing instead of studying. Eighty years later Urania Prince, now Cummings, held a one-woman show in that same classroom. In finally realizing her lifelong dream of expressing creative vision through the medium of painting, she has gained world-wide fame. Her tireless efforts and involvements make this uniquely, contemporary great lady a living symbol. This past year, an ART NAIF exhibit of folk art at the Sancier Museum of Art won praise for her bright paintings of life in the Caribbean. A.H. Rise Art Gallery will hold her exhibit from Dec. 30 through Jan. 11th, '75. Mrs. Cummings extended her creative enthusiasm to include raising three talented children, inspiring 11 grandchildren, and three great-grand children. One of these scholarship winning grandchildren, Sharelle Cummings will show four of her paintings, as well.

Urania Cummings, in 1921, began studying the violin as one of her first pursuits toward a musical career. However she married and reared her children with this love for music, instead. One of her sons, Arthur E. Cummings, saxophonist, heads the successful Art Cummings Trio. Many years later, after she was already a grandmother, she started night school with a course in public speaking. In her desire to express and inspire her creative reality this was the logical first step. At the age of seventy, she indulged in her first love, painting. For the past 26 years she has been studying art, exhibiting, winning prizes, lecturing and teaching it. A few of her credits include: 15 participations in the Berkeley and San Francisco Art Festivals, prize winning show at Pleasanton Fair, silver cup at the National Convention for her role as Superintendent of Arts and Crafts for Federated Women, honored guest at Oakland Museum for 5th time in '72, won Senior Artist Award in Berkeley, won 7 ribbons in New Mexico, 3 participation shows in the Virgin Islands, and Aug.-Oct. San Francisco Museum of Art. Her paintings of her vivid remembrances of daily life in St. Thomas, cooking, eating, washing, all done under the palms, are so vibrant, joyous, and filled with historical nostalgia, that they speak for themselves.

Sharelle Cummings, a scholarship winning graduate of the California College of Arts and Crafts, now teaches there. She attributes her interest to her grandmother. Sharelle paints with observed realism and an imagined surrealism. She has shown at the Ethnic Studies Art Department in Oakland among others. "Being all of you can be" and being an inspiration to others, especially young people, is what makes life meaningful to Urania Cummings.

AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have spent many of my days in the past several years on the issue of automotive air pollution. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 were a breakthrough in law and provided hope that the auto would be cleaned up. Now, only a little over 4 years later, it appears that those who opposed the original law have a chance of repealing it. They call this repeal a postponement of the goals, but it

amounts to an abandonment of the goal of clean air because we can achieve the goal of cleaning up the automobile without severe energy losses or economic dislocations, and without a postponement.

It is because I feel strongly about this issue, to which I have given so much of my time, that I was disturbed to see yesterday's lead editorial in the Washington Post. I have sent a short and incomplete rebuttal to the editors of that paper, which I hope is printed.

In any case I would like to insert into the RECORD both the editorial from the January 19, 1975, Washington Post and my letter to the editor, which was mailed today. I will be saying more about this topic later this week, but I would like to have these two items inserted into the RECORD at this time.

The editorial and the letter to the editor follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1975]

CHOICES ON AIR POLLUTION

Congress is now about to undertake a comprehensive review of the country's environmental protection laws. The immediate impetus comes from President Ford, who thinks the laws ought to be loosened to help meet the energy crisis. But the present standards were written into law by Congress and it is Congress that will have to decide whether to change them.

Easy generalizations do not apply here. Some emissions are much more dangerous to health than others. Relaxation offers real fuel savings in some cases; in others, the savings are spurious. It is quite true that most of the present standards were written at a time when nobody was worrying about energy efficiency. But the central principle for Congress to follow here is that protecting citizens' health is more important than saving fuel. Because of our growing population and the new emphasis on domestic energy production, firm legal sanctions against air pollution have become more important than ever to the national interest.

Ranked in order of manifest danger to human life, the first among the common air pollutants are the sulfur oxides. They are produced mainly by large generating plants burning high-sulfur fuel, and the evidence leaves little doubt about their effects on the people who habitually inhale them. In most large American cities, statisticians have shown a close correspondence between fluctuations in atmospheric sulfur levels and the death rates.

In his State of the Union Message, President Ford said: "We must strike a reasonable compromise on environmental concerns with coal. I am submitting Clean Air Act amendments which will allow greater coal use without sacrificing clean air goals." The basic issue here is when to require electric utilities to run their stack gases through desulfurizing units known as scrubbers. The precise meaning of the President's words is not entirely clear, but it appears that a new truce has been negotiated between the White House and the Environmental Protection Agency. As it is explained by Russell Train, the head of EPA, the truce involves a relaxation of certain rules, but only—and explicitly so—in areas where there is no health hazard. Mr. Train sees an important improvement in the administration's present position since, he says, it now accepts the ultimate necessity for scrubbers on any plant burning high-sulfur coal. In the end clean air is going to make power cost a little more, but the benefit is emphatically worth the price.

The case of the automobile emissions standards is more complex. Present law has put controls on three components of automobile exhaust; carbon monoxide (CO), hy-

drocarbons (HC), and nitrogen oxides (NOx). The easiest way to get an overview of past progress and present prospects is to consider a brief table comparing (1) the average emissions before the first controls in 1968, (2) the present federal and California standards, (3) the standards that present law mandates for coming years, and (4) the President's proposed substitute standards for 1977 through 1981. All are measured in grams per mile.

	HC	CO	NOx
Pre-1968 average emissions.....	8.7	87.0	3.5
1975 Federal standard.....	1.5	15.0	3.1
1975 California standard.....	.9	9.0	2.0
1977 Federal standard.....	.41	3.4	2.0
1978 Federal standard.....	.41	3.4	.4
President's proposed substitute for 1977-81.....	.9	9.0	3.1

As you can see, the automobile manufacturers are now making cars to two separate standards, one for California and another, somewhat less stringent, for the rest of the country. Although the California cars emit less pollution per mile, they use more gasoline—5 to 15 per cent more, depending on the car's weight. As you can also see, the sharpest reduction in pollution required by the present 1978 standard is in nitrogen oxides. As a matter of engineering it would be difficult to attain and would entail substantial reductions in fuel economy. The present controversy pivots chiefly on the nitrogen oxide standards.

Congress commissioned the National Academies of Science and Engineering to study the present automobile emission standards. Hydrocarbons are not a threat. Carbon monoxide is dangerous, but the Academies' panel found that the 1977-78 standards are tighter than necessary to keep air fit for human consumption. Regarding nitrogen oxides, the technical questions are exceedingly complex and the answers are far from complete. The Academies' report concluded that present evidence does not justify the very tight 1978 standard and that the costs of achieving it would be disproportionately great. Some environmentalists sharply challenge the Academies' findings here and charge that they have understated the potential harm in rising volumes of nitrogen oxides. They will press this point at the hearings that both the EPA and the congressional committees are to hold soon. But the Academies' reports are the most reliable guide to policy at the moment, and according to this guide the President's proposed standards are a reasonably safe concession to an industry in great trouble.

The President overstated the case a bit when he said that this concession is part of a bargain under which the automobile manufacturers will improve fuel efficiency by 40 per cent from 1974 to 1980. In fact, that 40 per cent improvement is merely what the automobile companies think will probably happen. The 1974 cars were scandalously inefficient, and fuel mileage of the 1975 models is already up 13.5 per cent because of the catalytic converter. The companies expect the remainder of that 40 per cent to be achieved mainly through the continuing trend to smaller cars. Mr. Train thinks that the fuel efficiency standard might usefully be written into law. He is, once again, right.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1975.

EDITOR,
Editorial Page, Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial of 1-19-75 entitled "Choices on Air Pollution" dealt very unfairly with the question of automotive air pollution. First, and perhaps foremost, you are simply wrong when you state, "Hydrocarbons are not a threat." The dangerous oxidant concentrations that are being reached in dozens of U.S. cities are there

because of the hydrocarbon emissions from automobiles. The National Academy of Science report which you cited stated, on hydrocarbons, "At least in the Los Angeles area, the Federal statutory hydrocarbon emission standard of 0.41 gms per mile may not be sufficiently stringent to ensure compliance with the national ambient air quality standard for oxidant." Yet your editorial endorsed a freeze for five years at the 0.9 grams per mile hydrocarbon standard.

Your review of other issues, such as the nitrogen oxide standard, was fair but incomplete. The Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions of the National Academy of Sciences concluded that there are several ways of reducing auto emissions, including NOx, without a fuel penalty. The MVE-NAS report also showed that 34% of the foreign auto manufacturers already meet both the 1980 fuel economy goals of President Ford, as well as the 1977 emission standards of the Clean Air Act. It appears reasonable to require no less from American auto manufacturers.

But we must not lose sight of the key to this entire question of auto emission controls, and that is that they are to protect the public health. It has been demonstrated that the existing auto emission levels endanger the health of humans, and in oxidant plagued areas like Southern California this is considered more important than the equally important need to control sulfur-related emissions from coal.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.
Member of Congress.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 57th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine and I am looking forward to joining Chicagoans of Ukrainian descent on January 26 for the annual Ukrainian Independence Day banquet, sponsored by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which promises to be a truly significant tribute to the ideals of human and national freedom. This most important moment in the history of the Ukrainian people is commemorated by over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent.

The officers of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in Chicago include Julian E. Kulas, president; Michael Panasiuk, vice president; Myron Luszcak, secretary; Myron Kuropas, public relations director; and Wasyl Branznyk, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in Chicago has issued a statement on the significance of this inspiring event for freedom-loving peoples everywhere and at this point in the RECORD I am including that statement:

STATEMENT

January 22, 1975, will mark the 57th Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Independence of Ukraine, and the 56th Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnographic lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of the

Ukrainian people. Both the Independence of Ukraine and the Act of Union were proclaimed in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918 and January 22, 1919, respectively.

Unfortunately, the young Ukrainian democratic republic was short-lived, as it was attacked by Communist Russia, even though the Bolsheviks had officially recognized Ukraine as an independent and sovereign state. The same recognition of Ukraine was given by the Central Powers and a number of the state of the *Entente*, including France and Great Britain, which tendered *de facto* recognition to the Ukrainian republic. For over three years, 1917-1920, Ukraine waged a defensive war against Communist Russia, alone and unaided; deprived of all assistance from abroad and overwhelmed by vastly superior forces of Communist Russia, Ukraine succumbed.

But in destroying the Ukrainian National Republic, Moscow did not dare destroy the state structure of Ukraine. It had created a Communist puppet government in Ukraine, to be known as the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," which in 1922 was forced into the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" (USSR) as an "equal and sovereign state." In 1945, Ukraine became a charter member of the United Nations, along with the USSR and Byelorussia.

Despite the spurious facade of "independence and sovereignty, Ukraine is an outright colony of Communist Russia, as attested to by the Reds' 50-year bloody rule over Ukraine, characterized by inhuman persecution, Russification and genocide of the Ukrainian people. Stalin tried to decimate the Ukrainian nation by mass deportations, arrests and executions. This policy was continued under Khrushchev, without mass executions, but through arrests and deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia and other parts of Asia.

Cultural and national repression in Ukraine is relentlessly pursued by the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime. From 1970-73 the KGB, the Soviet secret police, arrested some 600 Ukrainian intellectuals under suspicion of conducting "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," many of whom have been sentenced to severe terms of imprisonment; some of them have been tortured, such as Valentyn Moroz, 39 year old historian, and Leonid Plyushch, 35 year old mathematician, both of whom are reported to be driven to insanity and slow death. Mr. Moroz went on a hunger strike on July 1, 1974 in Vladimir Prison, and said that he would die from starvation unless he were transferred to a regular camp. He was fed intravenously, beaten and denied proper medical care. He ended his 20-week hunger strike on November 22, 1974, after Soviet authorities promised to improve his prison conditions. But he has lost much weight and is suffering from kidney and heart ailments.

Both Moroz and Plyushch have become symbols of resistance to tyranny, and they have found defenders all over the world. In our own country a number of U.S. Senators and Congressmen have introduced special resolutions in Congress, requesting President Ford to intervene with the Soviet government for the immediate release of Moroz and Plyushch.

January 22 is the greatest national holiday in Ukraine's modern history, for on that day the Ukrainian people established their national state and regained freedom. Both were lost, but the desire and will of the Ukrainian nation to regain these God-given rights are very much alive today. This the Ukrainian people demonstrated during World War II, when they organized the powerful Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which waged a liberation struggle against Nazi

Germany and Communist Russia at the same time; this they manifest today through their resistance to Communist enslavement and for the defense of human and national rights of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. Speaker, Valentyn Moroz, Leonid Plyushch, and many other heroic individuals in Ukraine are risking their lives for the ideals of national independence, Ukrainian cultural integrity, and personal freedom. It was for this reason that I introduced House Resolution 15, to establish in the House of Representatives a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and House Resolution 14, which resolves:

That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

I have also introduced House Concurrent Resolution 4, which resolves:

That it is the sense of Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

It is with pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in tribute to the millions of Ukrainians who are continuing their struggle for the blessings of liberty in their own homeland and I am honored to join with Americans of Ukrainian heritage in my own 11th District and all over this Nation who continue to cherish the hope of eventual independence and a free Ukraine. The spirit of the people of Ukraine is testimony to the fact that tyranny, in whatever brutal form it manifests itself, cannot conquer the soul of a nation and its people.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, January 22, 1975, will mark the 57th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine, and the 56th anniversary of the act of union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnographic lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of the Ukrainian nation. Both the independence of Ukraine and the act of union were proclaimed in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918, and January 22, 1919, respectively.

Regrettably, the young Ukrainian democratic republic was immediately attacked by Communist Russia, despite the fact that the new Soviet Russia Government had officially recognized Ukraine as an independent and sovereign state. The same recognition to Ukraine was granted by the Central Powers and a

number of states of the *Entente*, including France and Great Britain. By 1920, Ukraine, alone and unaided, succumbed to the vastly superior forces of Communist Russia, which destroyed the Ukrainian National Republic, created a Communist government in Ukraine known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and incorporated it forcibly into the Union of Socialist Republics.

Since that time, Ukraine has been harshly controlled by the centralized state in Moscow. Unable to continue developing their own individual art and culture, Ukrainian citizens have found it harder and harder to maintain a sense of their own identity and give to their children an understanding of their past.

Forefront in the struggle to maintain a sense of cultural independence for Ukraine is Valentyn Moroz, a Ukrainian author and historian currently imprisoned in the Soviet Union on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. The charges are unjust; Moroz deserves to be free.

In light of the historically demonstrable concern that we have for the oppressed people of the world, it is important for our country to take a stand here and do all it can to free Moroz and so aid Ukraine in its long and difficult battle to guard and enhance its own national heritage.

COST OF PRODUCING FOOD

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal today about the food price problem. We also have a related problem now being confronted by the men whose job it is to produce food in this country. Some time ago, I had occasion to read a letter distributed by the Cooperative Extension Service of Kansas State University in Concordia, Kans., within the district I am privileged to represent.

The latter is addressed to farm managers within the area and shows precisely what kind of economic problems they are facing. I submit it should be required reading for everyone within this body interested in spiraling food costs. The folks within the Concordia, Kans., area extension office should be commended for publicizing this particular problem in language everyone can understand and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

DECEMBER 4, 1974.

DEAR FARM MANAGER: Association #4 sites the following examples of what is happening to prices and the economic disaster faced by a farmer.

In 1973 he purchased 28 bales of twine to bale the hay to feed his dairy herd. The cost was \$6.50 per bale.

28 times \$6.50 equal \$182.00 cost of year's twine.

Two baby bull calves were sold for over

\$100.00 each. This paid for the year's twine with some change left over.

In 1974 he again purchased 28 bales of twine to bale the hay to feed his dairy herd. The cost of the twine from the same supplier was \$27.00 per bale.

28 times \$27.00 equal \$756.00 cost of year's twine.

Two baby bull calves were sold at a local livestock auction. The net sale for these two calves was \$36.11.

At this rate it would take the sale of 43 calves to pay for the 28 bales of twine. Last year the sale of 2 calves paid for the same amount of twine.

Sincerely,

EVERETT K. EVERSON, Jr.,

Area Ext. Economist Farm Management.

QUENTIN C. SMITH,

Area Ext. Economist Farm Management.

KENNETH L. STIELOW,

Area Ext. Economist Farm Management.

L. S. GREENE,

Area Ext. Economist Farm Management.

THE SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM ACT OF 1975

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the American small business community produces 43 percent of the gross national product, amounting to over \$426 billion in 1972, and provides over 50 percent of the Nation's jobs.

But, in this era of economic uncertainty with a scarcity of resources, record high interest rates, and more and more governmental dictates, the small business is the first to be squeezed out of the marketplace.

The Federal corporate tax structure, rather than encourage small enterprises, is actually geared to benefit the huge conglomerates which can afford the expertise and manpower to take advantage of the complex tax code.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, 9,345 businesses closed their doors for the final time in 1973 as a result of failure due to bankruptcy, et cetera. And that year was considered a good business year. In addition, approximately 350,000 businesses close up voluntarily, leaving an even greater share of the market to the giant corporations.

But small business is not a sacred cow—it must justify its own existence and earn its place in our economic system.

Yet, consider for a moment what we lose if small business is forced to yield to the larger concern:

First, without the existence of a large

number of small businesses, we lose the competition necessary to assure the consuming public reasonable prices and quality merchandise.

Second, without small business to keep a check on the conglomerates, we would witness an increase of political and economic power in the hands of fewer individuals, with the resulting ability on their part to eliminate competition by setting prices and allocating markets.

Third, without small business, we lose the opportunity for personal expression, personal initiative, and individual judgment.

Fourth, without the innovative small businessman, we lose the new products and methods which are often developed by individuals in a small business.

Fifth, without the small businessman, and his flexible operation, we lose essential services which are designed to meet individual demands rather than those designed for mass marketing.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that small business has an important and necessary role to play in our economy, and that we must take affirmative action to permit the small enterprise to compete, to keep abreast of new methods and techniques, to diversify, to research and pioneer, to survive during downturns in the economy, to grow, prosper, and flourish.

TAXES DISCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, our tax schedule places disproportionate burdens on the small businessman. According to the Federal Trade Commission, small- and medium-size businesses pay tax at about 50 percent of their income, while the largest firms pay at about 35 percent. And one study presented to the House Ways and Means Committee revealed that the largest 4,348 corporations have an effective tax rate of only 26.9 percent.

I find it both economically unsound and morally unfair to permit the largest U.S. corporations, as a class, to pay taxes at half the rates paid by small- and medium-size businesses, as a class.

As a result of this inequity, we find that "big business" is getting richer and "small business" is getting poorer. For example, the billion dollar firms—those with assets exceeding \$1 billion—received 28 percent of the corporate profits in 1959. In 1971, almost 55 percent of all corporate profits in America were achieved by the billion dollar corporations—a total of only 260 firms.

In 1971, the 1.4 small corporations averaged a profit of only \$1,598, but the Nation's largest corporations averaged a profit of \$422,768.

In addition, proliferating tax and Government reporting requirements impose burdens on the small businessman. Ac-

cording to a study conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, a family-owned restaurant must spend about \$820 in accounting fees to fill out the required forms, whether or not it makes a dime of profit.

In 1971, the Congress enacted the Revenue Act, which was designed to spur the economy by giving tax benefits to corporations and individuals alike. However, an estimated 40 percent of the \$11.5 billion in annual corporate tax benefits were funneled to less than 400 of the Nation's largest corporations.

We must reverse this trend that has led to discrimination against the small enterprise or we may find thousands of long-established smaller firms closing their doors and thus yielding to the giant corporations an even greater share of the marketplace.

THE SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM ACT

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide tax equity for the 8 million small businessmen and women who employ over 50 percent of the workforce in this country, I am introducing the Small Business Tax Reform Act.

First, this bill would establish a permanent Intragovernmental Committee on Tax Simplification for Small Business in order to simplify the regulations, the laws, and the instructions relating to business taxation.

Second, it would create an Office of Small Business Tax Analysis in the Department of the Treasury to examine tax problems from the view of small business and free enterprise, rather than the Government's interest in raising revenue.

Third, my proposal would establish a new corporate normal tax rate which is a graduated scale bringing corporate taxation more nearly into accord with the principle of the ability to pay which has long been in effect for individual income taxes. For example, under current law, a small business with \$25,000 taxable income is subject to a 22-percent tax, or \$5,500. Under my proposal, the same small business would pay only \$3,300 in Federal taxes. Another firm, earning \$50,000 income subject to Federal tax, currently pays \$17,500 to Federal taxes. Under my proposal, that firm would pay \$14,425.

Generally, under my proposal, a firm earning less than \$300,000 subject to Federal tax would find its tax burden less than that under current law. A firm with profits over \$300,000, however, would find its taxes gradually increasing—especially those million dollar profit-making companies.

Under my proposal, the normal tax would be the amount determined in accordance with the following table:

PROPOSED GRADUATED CORPORATE NORMAL TAX RATE SCHEDULE

If the taxable income is:

The normal tax is:

Not over \$5,000.....	11% of the taxable income.
Over \$5,000 but not over \$15,000.....	\$550 plus 12.5% of excess over \$5,000.
Over \$15,000 but not over \$25,000.....	\$1,800 plus 15.0% of excess over \$15,000.
Over \$25,000 but not over \$100,000.....	\$3,300 plus 18.5% of excess over \$25,000.
Over \$100,000 but not over \$200,000.....	\$17,175 plus 22.5% of excess over \$100,000.
Over \$200,000 but not over \$300,000.....	\$39,675 plus 26.5% of excess over \$200,000.
Over \$300,000.....	\$66,175 plus 26.8% of excess over \$300,000.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point a table compiled by the Congressional Research Service which shows the present tax liability of corporations and the Federal taxes paid by corporations under my proposal:

COMPARISON OF CORPORATE INCOME TAX LIABILITIES UNDER PRESENT LAW, AND THE NEW RATES AS PROPOSED BY REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON, FOR SELECTED LEVELS OF TAXABLE INCOME¹

Selected levels of corporate taxable income:	Tax under proposed tax rate schedule		Percentage reduction (-) or increase (+) compared to present law
	Tax under present law	Amount	
\$5,000.....	\$1,100	\$550	-50.00
\$15,000.....	3,300	1,800	-45.45
\$25,000.....	6,500	3,300	-40.00
\$50,000.....	17,500	14,425	-17.57
\$75,000.....	29,500	25,550	-13.39
\$100,000.....	41,500	36,675	-11.83
\$200,000.....	89,500	85,175	-4.83
\$300,000.....	137,500	137,675	+0.13
\$400,000.....	185,500	190,475	+2.68
\$500,000.....	233,500	243,275	+4.19
\$1,000,000.....	473,500	507,275	+7.13

¹ All the tax liabilities reflect both the normal tax and the surtax applicable to corporations.

Fourth, to encourage the establishment of new small business enterprises, the Small Business Reform Act would allow a new small business to exempt \$25,000 of income from Federal taxes for the first 3 years, providing that it is reinvested in the business.

Finally, this proposal has several features which are designed to provide encouragement for modernizations, efficiency, and cost reduction.

REVENUE BALANCE

Mr. Speaker, in this time of huge deficit spending, all of us are aware that we simply cannot lower a tax rate for one group without raising taxes on another so that there would be no revenue lost for the Treasury.

This bill which I am offering is balanced in the revenue sense, with slight, immediate, and long term increases of tax revenues through minimally higher normal tax rates on giant corporations and the cultivation of vigorous new small enterprises which will enlarge the tax base in the future.

The revenue gains made possible by the rescaling of normal rates would make it possible to shift a small fraction of the corporate tax—about 1 percent—on the basis of the ability to pay. In fact, the increase levied on a single firm with million dollar profits is enough to equal the benefit which would accrue to 15 firms earning \$25,000.

CONCLUSION

The small businessman is the very backbone of our economic system, yet he is in danger of extinction. It has been through his skills, his initiative and enterprise, and his energy that America has become an economic power and that we enjoy the highest standard of living in the world. The small business is a national asset and must be treated as such—not by creating tax loopholes or by giving special treatment—but rather, by

providing equity so that he can compete on an equal footing with his brothers in business, commerce, and industry.

As the President has suggested lowering the corporate tax from 48 percent to 42 percent, I feel that a complete overhaul of the system is warranted in order to establish a corporate tax that is based on an ability-to-pay principle.

GOVERNOR BLANTON IS MOVING TO KEEP HIS PROMISES

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Tennessee have just seen the inauguration of a new Governor of their State, a man who served in this body for 6 years as a U.S. Representative from Tennessee. Gov. Ray Blanton, returning to public service after a 2-year absence, brings with him a new manner to the Governor's office of Tennessee.

In these times of challenge facing all of our United States, Governor Blanton offers to the people of Tennessee a sense of dedication and responsible leadership demanded by not only Tennesseans, but all Americans. His devotion to sound and nonpartisan government for all the people of Tennessee will provide an example for elected officials at all levels of government throughout our Nation.

At the hour of his inauguration as Tennessee's 44th Governor last Saturday, Ray Blanton had already begun the task of putting together a legislative program aimed at fulfilling his pledges offered to the voters of Tennessee as he crisscrossed the State in primary and general election campaigns.

That program has been labeled as a new populism, but his proposals and his outlook on State government are better described in this newspaper article from the January 19 edition of the Nashville Tennessean which I would like, at this time, to enter into the RECORD:

PREVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—BLANTON IS MOVING TO KEEP HIS PROMISES

(By Larry Daughtrey)

Out on the campaign stump last summer, Ray Blanton sounded like a new populist, out to reform an antiquated election system, give the consumer a better break, and crack down on monopolists.

Lots of politicians make such promises. The surprising thing about Blanton is that he apparently intends to keep his.

Blanton, of course, was sworn in yesterday as Tennessee's new governor, and tomorrow morning will move into the rectangular office on the first floor of the State Capitol.

Probably later this week he will begin putting the finishing touches on a legislative package which may be the most far-reaching in recent Tennessee history.

Blanton's legislative program has been overshadowed since the election by the selection of his cabinet. But a young aide to the new governor, Elliott Ozment, has been putting Blanton's campaign rhetoric into the form of legislative bills.

Ozment has now completed more than 20 of them, and while some details remain to be worked out, it is an impressive package.

High on the list are four bills designed to wipe from the books the old laws which require price fixing on such items as liquor, cigarettes, milk and hundreds of items sold by brand names.

Those laws, zealously guarded in the legislature by high-paid lobbyists over the years, cost Tennesseans millions of dollars in higher costs at the drug store, grocery store and liquor store.

Blanton said repeatedly during the campaign that he intended to persuade the legislature to repeal those laws, and he has repeated that intention several times since the election.

But Blanton also is planning other bills which may help ease the pressure on inflation-burdened consumers.

One is a bill with almost universal support in the legislature to remove the sales tax on prescription drugs.

Although the bill would cost the state about \$5 million per year, a number of legislators, as well as Blanton, made campaign issues of removing the tax, which they say hurts the elderly most.

Blanton also is preparing a bill which would force utility companies which require a deposit in excess of 12 months to pay interest of 6% on the deposits.

Some telephone, gas and electricity companies require such deposits, often for years, without paying interest.

A new approach to helping consumers as they shop is included in the Blanton package. Called a "Truth in Energy" bill, it would require such items as appliances to carry labels describing their true energy consumption.

Ozment explained that this would allow consumers to judge the energy consumption of various items, as well as the price.

In an effort to improve state programs to help consumers, the Blanton administration and State Attorney General Ray Ashley will propose a bill giving Ashley's office new powers to deal with consumer frauds.

The current state consumer affairs law has no teeth, and only two employees in an obscure office in the Department of Agriculture.

Another bill which the Blanton administration may propose also is the result of a campaign promise. It would set up a state anti-trust bill, giving the attorney general new powers to deal with businesses which act in restraint of trade or attempt to set up monopolies.

Apparently the only tax being considered by Blanton administration officials is a tax on nonreturnable bottles, a measure which has been promoted as an ecology measure in other states.

Blanton promised during the campaign to revamp virtually the entire political structure of Tennessee, and the bills to do so are now being drafted.

One of them would force a runoff in primary races for governor if no candidate receives a majority of the vote.

The idea has been debated heatedly for years, but gained momentum last summer when Blanton won a 12-man Democratic primary with only 23% of the vote. He promised then to do something about the situation.

Although the details have not yet been settled, Blanton also will propose a substantial new package of ethics legislation, a subject on which the legislature was never able to agree last year.

Several bills on the subject already have been introduced or discussed in the legislature's organizational session, but it will probably take gubernatorial leadership to pass anything on the subject.

Blanton's bills cover lobbyist regulation, financial disclosure for public officials, an ethical practices act and a campaign financing disclosure act.

Another highly controversial bill will require registration by political party as a requirement for voting in a party primary.

To start the registration, voters would be

declared a member of the party in whose primary they voted last August. They would be restricted to voting in that party's primary in the future unless they applied in writing for a change of registration in advance of a primary election.

Blanton also has promised a complete re-writing of the state's presidential primary law to make it comply with national party regulations and give Tennessee one of the nation's first presidential primaries in 1976. That, too, is in the package.

One of the decisions which must be reached by the Blanton administration soon is how far to go with the limited constitutional convention the new governor has promised to ask the legislature to call in 1978.

Among the items considered certain to be placed in the call is an expansion of the homestead exemption for the elderly, a possible exemption for older persons from the state's income tax on stocks and bonds, and popular election of the lieutenant governor.

Aside from the bills on consumer affairs and electoral reform, Blanton also is planning on taking significant steps in an area of special interest to him, energy.

He plans to propose new state regulations covering the location and standards for site for power plants, including nuclear generators like the one at Hartsville.

The state now has no authority to place restrictions on such facilities.

Blanton will try to push through a budget-minded legislature authorization for a new department of state government to deal solely with energy. He will also seek new gubernatorial powers to deal with critical energy shortages.

Almost every bill in the package is loaded with controversy. They invade areas where powerful lobbies dwell, and passing them in the legislature will not be easy, even with the kind of partisan majority Blanton's Democratic Party enjoys.

WORKERS IN PERIL

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 20, 1975

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in the RECORD, the second in a series of four articles from the Washington Post entitled "Workers in Peril."

This article deals with the problem of coke oven emissions. According to data developed by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, individuals working near coke ovens have a death rate from cancers of the respiratory system 2.5 times that of other steelworkers, and those workers who are stationed at the top of the coke ovens have a rate of 7 times that of other steelworkers.

Despite these figures and despite the fact that NIOSH submitted a recommendation in early 1973 for a Government standard protecting these workers, the Federal Government has as yet taken no action in promulgating such a standard.

Also, I am including a second article which puts the problem of coke oven emission in more human terms, describing the health problems confronted by one worker who was subjected to emissions for 15 years at the Sparrows Point plant of Bethlehem Steel Corp.:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 1975]

COKE OVEN WORK: HOT—AND DEADLY

(By Douglas Watson)

"It's the hottest job and the dirtiest job. You're really in that smoke," Isaiah A. Kelly said in describing what he did for 23 years as a coke oven worker at Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s Sparrows Point complex near Baltimore.

Kelly, 64, passed out on the job several years ago and had to retire with a medical disability. Now, he spends most of his time in his brick bungalow in north central Baltimore, doing his breathing with one good lung and waiting for his \$179-a-month disability check.

A University of Pittsburgh's school of public health study of 59,072 steelworkers at seven mills supports the conclusion that coke ovens are hot, dirty and potentially dangerous. The study reported in 1971 that coke oven workers are 2½ times more likely to die from lung cancer than are other steelworkers.

The continuing study found that the risk of lung cancer depends on how long an individual works near coke ovens and exactly where he works. After five years, the lung cancer death rate for a coke oven worker is up 3½ times the average for other steelworkers.

Workers in the smoke on top of coke ovens have a lung cancer death rate seven times the steelworkers' average. After five years, topside worker lung cancer death rate jumps to 10 times the steelworkers' average.

Coke oven workers also were found to have a death rate eight times higher than other steelworkers from a rare kidney cancer.

Dr. J. William Lloyd, director of occupational health surveillance for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health and the person who headed the University of Pittsburgh study before coming to the NIOSH, said of the death statistics for coke oven workers, "We've isolated out as many factors as we possibly could, like smoking or geographic location, and we're still left with these abnormally high cancer death rates."

It thus appears to fall in the category of occupational illness, which is treated by the 1970 Occupational Health and Safety Act. The act aims "to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the nation safe and healthful working conditions."

The University of Pittsburgh study has prompted labor and management to begin looking for better ways to make coke—the fuel coke ovens make from coal, which goes into blast furnaces with iron ore and limestone and provides the intense heat needed to melt the ore and produce steel.

The April, 1974, contract between the United Steelworkers and the nation's 10 biggest steel companies, including Bethlehem Steel, provides for the first time an agreement that management and labor will seek "to define and delineate the health effects of employment in the environment of the coke plant and to develop preventive measures and appropriate controls designed and directed to resolve the health and safety problems."

Coke ovens convert chunks of coal into coke—a black, solid residue that is mainly composed of carbon and is left after the coal has been heated and the volatile materials distilled away.

Coke ovens are arranged in groups of 10 to 100, forming a coke battery. The Sparrows Point plant has 12 such batteries. Each oven is only about 1½ feet wide but at least 40 feet long and 12 to 20 feet high.

For his last 10 years there, Kelly operated a "larry car," which ran along the top of a coke battery pouring coal down chutes, thus "charging" the ovens.

After 16 to 20 hours of heating at temperatures as high as 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit, a "pushing machine" on one side of the oven shoves the hot orange mass of coke out the other side into a "quench car" on which cooling water is poured, producing billows of steam.

Smoky coal tar emissions that escape from coke ovens are a pollution problem in most steel mills. Such emissions occur during charging and pushing and from leakage out oven doors.

Vacuum ducts meant to draw off dangerous vapors from the coke ovens sometimes become clogged, and when a larry car operator drops his charge of coal into a coke oven, black smoke and gases may shoot 10 feet up from the top of the oven and envelope the larry car.

Kelly recalled that the closed larry car cab would then fill with smoke, causing him to choke and gasp for air. "It can be hell when you drop that charge," said the former \$160-a-week worker.

A committee composed of management, labor, government and public representatives held its first meeting in November and met again last month to develop recommendations for better federal standards for emissions from coke ovens, where 10,000 Americans work.

Federal officials concede that the present U.S. limit of two-tenths of a milligram of coal tar pitch volatiles per cubic centimeter of air is an inadequate and largely unmet standard for coke oven emissions.

IDLED WORKER BLAMES FUMES

(By Douglas Watson)

David E. Brown is a big man—6 feet, 1½ inches, 238 pounds—who for 15 years did heavy, hard work in a processing mill at Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s Sparrows Point complex.

Brown, 44, has been ill and unable to work much of this year. Instead, he spends most of his time sitting in his brick row house, coughing almost constantly and hoping that he will get well enough to go back to work at "the Point," if only as a janitor.

Like many other Sparrows Point steelworkers, Brown was born in West Virginia. "My father was a coal miner for 36 years. Black lung, that's what he had," Brown recalled recently as he discussed his own lung condition.

Brown has worked since 1959 in Sparrows Point's mammoth "68 mill," where orange-hot slabs of metal with a maximum width of 68 inches are quickly rolled into much thinner and longer strips of steel.

Brown said his job in recent years required him to spend a lot of time working near the 9-foot-deep "pickler" tubs of sulfuric acid, and occasionally, near tubs of hydrochloric acid, in which steel plates are dipped.

Some 200,000 Americans in many industries work with sulfuric acid, and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) says "Concentrated sulfuric acid can burn and char the skin, and its irritant properties are rapidly injurious to the eyes and mucous membranes of the respiratory tract."

NIOSH adds, "Inhalation of high concentrations of sulfuric acid can result in symptoms of bronchitis, conjunctivitis, respiratory infections, emphysema and digestive disturbances."

The fumes from the acid tubs near which Brown worked are powerful and occasionally, workers there got sick and vomited, he said. But for years Brown didn't have any noticeable health problems and continued to work near the tubs.

When six 500-pound plates accidentally fell on a coworker last year, Brown single-

handedly lifted the crushing load off him, perhaps saving the man's life but straining his own back. This resulted in a reprimand rather than commendation from Brown's boss, who said Brown should have summoned help to lift the heavy plates.

"I'd never been sick a day in my life other than when I had an appendectomy in '56 or '57," Brown said. He hasn't smoked since 1967. As he talked he regularly paused to spit out phlegm from his lungs into a coffee tin placed alongside the sofa.

A year and a half ago Brown started wheezing when he breathed, which he continues to do but he kept on working till March 3 when he was reading the Sunday paper at home and suddenly found himself fighting to get a breath. "My head started buzzing and I slid down on the floor, sweating so that I was ringing wet and I could hardly get my breath," Brown said.

He was treated at a local hospital that released him later that day. "They gave me two shots, X-rayed me and said my lungs were full of fluids," said Brown. He went back to work for Bethlehem Steel a month later and didn't have another attack until he resumed working near the acid tubs. Again, he felt like he was smothering and could hardly walk to his car, he said.

Brown continued to be treated by his

family doctor and didn't go back to work till Aug. 12. He felt all right for several weeks "till they started painting in the mill and that painting seemed to start me off again," coughing and wheezing and struggling for each breath.

He hasn't worked since Sept. 27 and has seen an allergist who, Brown said, told him he "didn't have any business" continuing to work in a steel mill.

Dr. Jose Ardaiz, Brown's family doctor, said his patient has bronchial asthma. Asked what the cause was, Dr. Ardaiz noted that Brown had long worked close to acid tubs at Sparrows Point and seemed to be bothered most when near their fumes. But Dr. Ardaiz added cautiously, "It would be very difficult to prove" that Brown's illness was caused by his work in the steel mill.

A spokesman for Bethlehem Steel said in regard to inquiries about Brown and several other ill workers, "The medical records available to us do not indicate that these individuals are suffering from work-related illnesses."

Asked why he had never worn a respirator on the job to protect himself from the acid fumes, Brown said, "Well, they never gave me one." The company does make respirators available.

He said the acid tub fumes cause paint to

peel off steel beams high overhead in the mill and rust off steel beams high over head in the mill and rust workers' new belt buckles within a couple of days.

Brown earned more than \$19,000 in 1973 when he was working steadily and as long as 72 to 80 hours a week on occasion, as he proudly showed by pulling out his pay check stubs. He had \$2,000 in the bank when he had to stop work, but that's gone now and he receives \$113 a week from the company.

Brown's medical and financial worries, he acknowledged, have made him nervous and jumpy and likely "to fly off the handle." The Browns' three younger children who live at home with them avoid asking their father for spending money any more.

Brown told his story quietly while sitting in his living room which features a big white Bible, a color television set, a "God Bless Our Home" plaque on the wall and trophies Brown won drag racing in previous years. Now, he rarely goes outside. Just walking up the 13 steps to the second-floor usually sets off a coughing spell.

"My doctor told me to move to Arizona," said the big man known as "Brownie" by his fellow workers. However, he added, I just couldn't leave here. Sure, I want to go back to Bethlehem Steel. The union said they'd try to get me a janitor's job there."

SENATE—Tuesday, January 21, 1975

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the Vice President.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we give Thee thanks for this Nation which Thou hast given us for our heritage. Spare us from scorn of the past and from fear of the future. Make us great and strong in the things of the spirit. Show us how to be rich in proportion to the fewness of our wants—how to be strong in devotion to the elemental simplicities of life—home, family, friends, work, play, and worship. By faith and prayer, shape our lives, O Lord, for these testing times that we here may shape a program to lift America to new heights of justice, brotherhood, and peace.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 17, 1975, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTIVITIES OF THE FBI CONCERNING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with recent allegations that the FBI is currently improperly soliciting information concerning Members of Congress or misusing information in FBI files concerning Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that a release by FBI Director Clarence M. Kelley, for whom I have an extremely high regard, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,

Washington, D.C., January 21, 1975.

FBI Director Clarence M. Kelley issued the following statement today:

"In connection with recent allegations that the FBI is currently improperly soliciting information concerning Members of Congress or misusing information in FBI files concerning Members of Congress, I wish to state unequivocally that such statements are erroneous and without any basis in fact.

"The policy of the FBI is that information concerning Members of Congress is collected when Members are the subjects or victims of an investigation or a specific background check is requested concerning the suitability for nomination to a position in the Executive and Judicial Branches. Solicitation of information concerning Members of Congress is done only as necessary to discharge our investigative responsibilities.

"Information concerning Members of Congress is maintained in various files at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C. Such files exist because they relate to an investigation or a background check, correspondence with the Member of Congress, or information not solicited by the FBI, but volunteered by the public. In this latter category, unsolicited information is received from time to time making allegations concerning Members of Congress as well as other individuals in public and private life. If such allegations appear

to relate to matters within the investigative jurisdiction of the FBI, they are appropriately investigated. If such matters do not reasonably appear to relate to the investigative jurisdiction of the FBI, a reply letter is addressed to the correspondent advising him that his communication was received, but that the matters related do not appear to come within FBI investigative jurisdiction. Such correspondence and the official reply made by the FBI are retained as a record of official action taken by the FBI. Correspondence of this type is filed for record purposes.

"As indicated, Congressmen are treated substantially the same as any other citizen concerning whom the FBI may receive information. However, when information is received concerning employees of the Federal Government or those serving as Government officers in any of the three Branches of Government, as a matter of practice it would be submitted by FBI field divisions to the FBI Headquarters in Washington so that it would be available in the event a check of our records is necessary. Such routine name checks are conducted frequently concerning persons who are being considered for appointment to positions in the Judicial and Executive Branches. It is not possible to predict, when information is received, whether the individual whom it concerns will or will not at some time in the future be given consideration for such appointments. Therefore, all such information voluntarily submitted is retained for record purposes.

"In summary, it is the policy of the FBI to solicit information concerning Members of Congress only when there is investigative jurisdiction to justify the collection of such information. However, unsolicited information received from time to time is appropriately retained for record purposes. Further, it is the policy of the FBI that the use of such information would be limited to assistance in investigations and background checks and is never used to influence the judgment or actions of any Member of Congress.

"Early hearings are being scheduled before the House Judiciary Committee and I welcome the opportunity to appear and dispute the fallacious statements about the FBI's