

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. CHARLES EHRLICH: POLITICIAN IN BEST SENSE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it has become the fashion in these post-Watergate days to view those who served in public office with distrust and, unhappily, in some cases with disdain. And yet, there are those public servants who have served their fellow citizens with courage, with ability, and with good humor.

One such public servant was Dr. Charles Ehrlich, a man whom I was pleased and proud to call my friend. "Doc" Ehrlich, as we called him, epitomized the best that there is as a public officeholder. I could describe at length his many virtues and qualities, but the following editorial which appeared in the July 3 edition of the Burlington County Times does it much better than any effort that I might produce.

My sympathies and those of my wife go to his widow, Elsie, and his family.

The editorial reads as follows:

DR. CHARLES EHRLICH: POLITICIAN IN BEST SENSE

Not too long ago Delran resident Dollie DeFlece went before the board of chosen freeholders to plead for improvement of Creek Road. Mr. DeFlece lives on Creek Road and had come to complain about its potholes, some 300 of them by his count.

The freeholders listened attentively, shuffled the request around a bit getting advice from their solicitor and engineer, and concluded nothing could be done. Creek Road was not a county highway, so there was nothing the freeholders could do.

Why not have the county take it over, Mr. DeFlece suggested, noting that the townships involved would be glad to get rid of it.

That might be a solution, the freeholders acknowledged, but the federal government had already agreed to fund a major overhaul of the road sometime in the future (inasmuch as Creek Road had become a major feeder route for Interstate 295). The county, the freeholders asserted, couldn't start working on a highway that the feds would soon be doing over.

Soon, DeFlece retorted, could be five years or more the way the federal government moves.

That's true, the freeholders sympathized, but . . . sorry, there's just no way.

The discussion seemed over, DeFlece defeated.

Then freeholder Charles Ehrlich spoke up. We'll do it, Dr. Ehrlich said simply.

Two months later the county crews had come, the potholes were gone, and Creek Road had a new asphalt surface.

It was a typical Ehrlich performance.

The veteran freeholder, who passed away this week, was ever responsive to the needs of those he served.

"Doc" Ehrlich was a member of the old school of politics. He was no ideologue, no advocate of any particular philosophy or cause. He was a representative, and he saw it as his duty to protect the people he served and to help with their problems.

Indicative of the way he knew and responded to the wishes of the majority is the

way he ran the office of the county clerk, a position he held from 1960 to 1970. During each of those years, the budget he submitted to the freeholders was less than the year before. It was no small feat. Inflation and rising taxes were with us then too.

His role as a watchdog for the people sometimes conflicted with his role as a loyal Democrat. "Doc" seemed always to be a member of the loyal opposition, no matter which party was in power.

When he first came on the freeholder board, the Republicans were in control, and he soon established a reputation as a barb in their side. He teased them, kept them on their toes, tore into them when he thought they were going astray.

When his own party took over, it seemed he couldn't quite adjust to being a member of the majority, and, in fact, he didn't. He continued to play the role of antagonist, watchdog, and became known as a "maverick." It was a role that got him into trouble with the powers to be in his party in the last few months.

He talked like he acted, straightforward and plain. He never attempted to mislead the press or the public.

He was not without a sense of humor, however, nor lacking compassion. The work he was most proud of was his drive to improve Buttonwood Hall, the county home for the aged, and to replace Evergreen Park, the county mental hospital.

There's much that can be written about "Doc" Ehrlich. He was born and raised in Riverside and never strayed further from that old industrial town than Delanco. He was a football star in high school and college and later with a semi-pro team. He was a practicing dentist all his working life. He served a plethora of charitable and service organizations over the years.

This newspaper by no means always agreed with "Doc" or thought his ways angelic.

But, in the balance, we saw him as a dedicated public servant, as a politician who genuinely cared about the people he served, not just his own career.

Not everyone keeps up with county politics nor knows the personalities involved. Not everyone, then will miss "Doc" Ehrlich.

But know it or not, his constituents have suffered a loss in his passing.

TIME TO ACT ON CANNING LID SHORTAGE

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues have received numerous complaints from their constituents, as I have, concerning the critical shortage of replacement lids for home canning jars. This is a problem that is particularly irritating to the 22 million home canners in this country because the canning season is upon us and they face the potential loss of their home-grown fruits and vegetables if they cannot get lids.

We should note that there is no shortage of new jar-and-lid combination units; in fact, manufacturers are planning to produce an excess of 100 million of these units this year. Likewise, if our

home canners are willing to buy a case of instant coffee, they can get the lids they need. They cannot, however, find enough separate lids to use on their old jars. They are being forced to buy jars, and coffee, they do not need in order to get the lids they do need.

Mr. Speaker, we need to look further into this problem and I urge my colleagues who have received mail on this subject to get involved, too.

At this time I would like to share with my colleagues my testimony before the Subcommittee on Commodities and Services of the Small Business Committee as follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE BOB TRAXLER, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the members of this Subcommittee for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the home-canners of Michigan and my district on the critical shortage of canning lids. Your Subcommittee is to be commended for its inquiry into this most vexing of consumer problems, one that affects millions of households across the nation.

I know that a subject like "canning lids" may not capture the interest of sophisticated city people in Washington, but back home in Michigan it is the number one issue that I hear about when I visit with constituents. I think it is definitely time for the Congress to get more deeply involved in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a Congressional district with both urban and rural areas. The people of Snover and Wilmot and Bad Axe and Bay City are angry. They are angry because they cannot buy, at any price, canning lids for their jars. The canning season has begun for certain fruits, and other crops will soon follow. These crops will go to waste if they cannot be preserved.

Listen to the words of just a few of my constituents who have written me in the past week:

Mrs. Rittmueller of Frankenmuth says, "The strawberries are ripe and beautiful. Cherries are beginning to blush . . . and NO lids for our jars. Why?"

Mr. Lanczek of Pinconning writes, "Most Michigan housewives are very upset as there are still no lids available. Jars and lids, but no lids alone."

Mrs. Daenzer of Frankenmuth: "We all were taught to save and be conservative. As long as I can remember, our grandparents, parents, ourselves and our children have had a garden. Now as we would like to can, there is not one canning lid available in any store since January. The government tells us that we should all make a garden, but what should we do with the stuff we can't all eat. It's a sin to waste it. Is there anything you can do?"

And finally, Mrs. Tarkowski of Bay City summarizes the frustrations of many with her comments: "You tell me the companies are working 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That sure is a lot of B.S. I'll tell you one thing, if they worked that steady, they would make enough lids to pave Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. Where are the canning lids? You tell me."

Mr. Chairman, last fall President Ford urged Americans to grow anti-inflation WIN gardens. Millions of Americans have responded enthusiastically and patriotically and the demand for canning supplies has increased.

Last year, the surge in new demand and the shortage of raw materials produced short-

ages of canning supplies that were explainable and understandable. But this year, the increased demand was clearly predictable. The shortage of raw materials has disappeared, and the industry has had a whole year to gear up production. Yet, we still have shortages.

There have been suggestions in these hearings that "consumer hoarding" and "panic buying" may be to blame for current shortages. I cannot speak for what is happening in other parts of the country, but let me tell you that in Bay City and Saginaw and Bad Axe and Caro, there is no hoarding. People cannot find lids, period. Retailers tell us they place orders weekly, but receive no lids. In this area of Washington, D.C., one of my staff members went to five separate retail concerns this past weekend to buy lids for a constituent back home. *She could not find one lid.* I don't think the consumer is to blame.

It is true that many gardeners may be trying to buy their supplies earlier in the season than they normally do, but this is entirely understandable after what happened to them last year. I have no evidence whatsoever that they are buying more than they need, however. To the contrary, most housewives who have talked to me can't get anywhere near the number of lids they can use. So let's not blame the consumer.

So who is responsible? Are we really to believe that the increase in demand is so sharp that 24 hours a day, seven days a week production for almost a year hasn't produced enough lids to meet that demand? Prices have almost tripled for these products, so the economic incentive certainly should be there. It is simply amazing to me that our free enterprise system has not been able to respond to this supply and demand problem more quickly and more adequately.

But perhaps if we look into this problem a little deeper we might find some things of interest. One point to remember is that there are no longer any raw materials shortages. *We also seem to have no shortage of jar and lid combinations.* Housewives in my district tell me they can purchase as many of these combinations as they want. In some cases, they are told they cannot buy lids alone, but will only be sold separate lids if they also buy some combinations. Testimony before this Subcommittee indicates that while demand for new jar and lid combinations will be about 300 million units this year, the companies involved plan production of about 400 million jar-and-lid combination units. Thus, we will have an *excess* of 100 million units. 100 million lids would be available if we simply could do some unscrewing!

At the same time that we have an oversupply of these combination units, the projected shortfall of lids alone could go as high as 1.2 billion units.

Mr. Chairman, many of my constituents believe that the oversupply of combination units, and the marketing practices that seem to be pushing these combination units, are an attempt by the companies to reap the higher profits of these combination units. People are being forced by the "shortage" to buy the jars and lids in order to get just the lids. They must buy jars they don't want and they don't need.

I thought it was interesting that a representative of one of these companies yesterday could not cite the profit margin on the jar and lid combinations as compared to the profit margin on just the lids alone, even though these products account for 30% of his company's business. This kind of information would seem to be very basic to the running of a business. I have the feeling that private enterprise in this case is very enterprising. It certainly is private.

The Federal Trade Commission in a letter to me has suggested that if manufacturers are consciously producing more jar and lid combinations in proportion to just lids alone

in order to force the sale of more of the combinations at a higher profit to people who don't need the jars, that this is a marketing decision that does not violate any anti-trust laws. This may be so, but it would be a marketing decision that violates the public interest, violates the principles of competitive supply and demand, and violates our national policies of promoting conservation and recycling of precious resources. If these practices are in fact taking place, I believe that we in the Congress should take a hard look at the law and consider corrective action.

I know that this question has been raised before and inquiries have been made, but it seems that all inquiries seem to end up by simply asking the companies themselves whether they are doing this. They respond by saying, "I am not a crook" and everyone believes them. I think this Subcommittee should look further into these marketing practices to see if this "shortage" isn't somehow being exploited by either manufacturers or distributors to force the sale of jar and lid combinations to those who can't find lids alone.

Mr. Chairman, the canning lid shortage is a very real problem. Our constituents are demanding action and I am not satisfied that we yet have all of the answers we need. I thank the Subcommittee for this opportunity to present my thoughts and urge you to continue to explore this very important issue until it is finally resolved in favor of the American home-canner.

MAURICE B. MARKS—MR. FREMONT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 29, 1975, 500 friends will gather at the Castlewood Country Club to honor and celebrate with Maurice Marks his 80th birthday.

There is probably no individual in the city of Fremont, Calif., that has given more of his time, talent, and devotion to building Fremont into the city it has become. Maurice and his wife Emma bought land and moved to Mission San Jose in January of 1946.

As head of the nomenclature committee, Maurice had a decided influence in the formation of the city of Fremont, and the bringing together of the five small communities, and has since worked diligently on every bond issue to improve Fremont, from the original formation of the city to the establishment of Ohlone Community College.

One of the gifts of talent that Maurice Marks has given to the city is his "Living History of Fremont." Tapes of interviews with longtime residents of the area and individuals who had a part in building the city as well as sets of slides of the development of the city are on file and available at the Olone College Library.

Maurice Marks' civic activities are many and varied. He joined the Niles Rotary Club in 1950, and later began the Fremont Rotary Club, acting as its first president. He continues to be an active member in retired status. He has been a member of the Niles Congregation Church for many years. His support of

the Boy Scouts, Boys Club, and youth organizations has brought him many awards. He is an active member of the Fremont Philharmonic and is serving presently on the executive board. He was also made an honorary member of the Fremont Chamber of Commerce.

Maurice has been married to his lovely wife Emma for 50 years. Together they have built a life dedicated to serving others. Emma Marks, through research, discovered the Fremontia flower, which has five petals, symbolizing the five small communities brought together to form the city of Fremont. It was adopted as the official city flower.

The numerous accomplishments of Maurice Marks in the short time of 80 years, are an example to us all. He should, indeed, be named Mr. Fremont.

It is an honor for me to be able to join with all of his friends in wishing Maurice a very happy 80th birthday, with the hopes he will have many more.

THE ETHICAL CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the graduates of the School of Business at California State University, Chico, received a special challenge from Dr. Lawrence B. Wilson, vice president and director of urban affairs for the United California Bank, at their commencement on May 25, 1975. Dr. Wilson, speaking on the past and future of the American business community, addressed the graduates on the theme of ethics in the American business and education communities.

Dr. Wilson has had wide experience in the field of education, Government service, and business. During his career he has served as a college instructor, a savings and loan executive, organizer and officer of Superior Escrow Co., a Foreign Service officer, and an official of the United California Bank. He has been active in many civic and community organizations, including Men of Tomorrow, the Los Angeles Urban League, the YMCA, the United Way, the ICBO National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Los Angeles Board of Traffic Commissioners, Dollars for Scholars, the Advisory Committee of the School of Business and Economics, California State University at Los Angeles. Dr. Wilson is also chairman of the Los Angeles County Overall Economic Development Commission, a member of the Urban and Community Relations Committee of the California Bankers Association, and a member of the Board of Trustees of Howard University.

In addressing the graduates, Dr. Wilson has outlined the serious problems which our country faces today. He gave special attention to the ethical and moral responsibilities of today's businessmen and educators. In discussing the moral

climate which led to such problems as Watergate, which involved many businesses as well as Government officials, Dr. Wilson outlined the need for a stronger effort in emphasizing moral leadership in the field of education. He called on professors of our universities and colleges to help in teaching attitudes of strong ethical conviction so that tomorrow's leaders can help to keep the country the great nation that it has become over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dr. Wilson's comments have a message for us and for the American people. Therefore I take this opportunity to call them to the attention of my colleagues:

THE ETHICAL CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION

(By Dr. Lawrence B. Wilson)

Mr. President, Dean Kinney, Members of the Faculty, Members of the Graduating Class, Parents, Relatives, Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen.

First, permit me to say how flattered I feel to have been invited to address this class this afternoon. I consider it a distinct honor, and I wish to thank you for your kind invitation.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate each of you on having successfully completed the requirements for the Baccalaureate Degree you will receive this afternoon. I am sure that many of your parents, relatives and friends who are present here this afternoon are justifiably proud of you and your educational accomplishments.

Some of you will be continuing your education at the graduate or professional level, and many of you will be entering the world of full-time work. Whatever your ambition or goal happens to be, I urge you to permit nothing to deter you in your efforts to achieve it.

During the Senate Watergate hearings last year, Senator Joseph Montoya asked Gordon Strachan what his advice would be to an honorable young man thinking of a political career. Strachan thought for a moment, and said in a forceful manner, "Keep Out".

If someone in this class would ask me what advice I would give to an honorable young man or woman today thinking of a business career, I would say, without hesitation, "Come On In".

I would say this despite the fact that business today is being subjected to much criticism and abuse.

David Rockefeller put it rather succinctly when he said: "It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that right now American business is facing its most severe public disfavor since the 1930's. We are assailed for demeaning the worker, deceiving the consumer, destroying the environment and disillusioning the younger generation".

Within the past year a number of questionable legal and moral practices on the part of corporate executives have surfaced which serve to undermine the positive image of corporate America.

Item: Nineteen corporations, several of which are our largest and most prestigious, have pleaded guilty and have been fined for making illegal contributions to candidates for public office. Three of these corporations were found to be maintaining secret political slush funds:

Item: A. T. & T. in 1974 was ordered to make a first year settlement of approximately \$45 million for discriminating practices in hiring and upgrading of minorities. Another \$30 million, of which 60 percent went to women, was paid because of sex discrimination.

Item: This past February, the chief executive officer of United Brands plunged to his death in New York City, the apparent victim of suicide. This came soon after his in-

volvement in a secret million dollar bribe to the then President of the Republic of Honduras for favorable export rates on bananas began to unravel.

On last Wednesday (May 21) the Wall Street Journal reported that three (3) former independent auditors of the scandal-ridden Equity Funding Corp. were found guilty on multiple criminal counts of securities fraud and filing falsified financial statements with the S.E.C.

I could go on ad infinitum and recite example after example of how a surprising number of America's finest companies and their executives seemed to have lost, along with Jeb Stuart Magruder, their moral compass. I think most of these companies and their executives now realize that they must amend their ways. If not, government regulatory agencies, consumer activist and public interest groups and others are going to make it extremely difficult for businesses not only to maintain any type of public image, but to operate profitably as well.

Thus, it is at a crucial cross-roads that many of you are about to launch your careers into the business world. Along with the difficulties of finding gainful employment in your chosen field during an economic slowdown, you must also contend, once you find that job, with what I refer to as the ethical challenge to American business and education.

The ethical crisis confronting American business is shared by the greater society. Our involvement in Vietnam and the Watergate debacle formed the backdrop for the moral dilemmas facing America's business-persons today. As we seek first to understand the moral lapse of our society and business, we soon find that this lapse is not the product of any one shortcoming in our immediate past. Indeed, one must look back over the last three decades—and do a good deal of historical browsing—to get an accurate fix on how we got to where we are now.

The past thirty years have witnessed a head-long plunge into uncertainties and dilemmas of the future. From a society that had just begun to adjust from a rural to an urban orientation, we were flung into World War II that permanently thrust us into our global community. Ending that war with a terrible bang of an atomic bomb, we have lived under radioactive, moral and psychological cloud from that event ever since. From a fairly simple people long-concerned only with our own nation-building we have had to contend in rapid-fire succession with the cold war, assassinations, a race to the moon, urban riots and protests, Vietnam, Watergate, and inflation. The national roller-coaster ride we have been on for the last three decades has hardly allowed for us to catch our collective breath. We have survived this torrent of events, but we have been seriously weakened. We are tired, confused, and possessed of a sense of doom and gloom that pervades our society from top to bottom, from President to unemployed porter.

Well, now you may ask—what does all of this have to do with me? With this fine university? Or with education in general? The answer to that query is that during this period of great social faulting, the schools, colleges and universities of our Nation did little to strengthen our lives, our values. Indeed, future historians may very well ask: Where were the teachers whose examples were to be ethical and moral guidelines? Some were overcome by the notion that the nuclear and space age were too demanding of their rarefied talents to permit them to be concerned with values. Rarely—during this period—did an advanced degree graduate ever have any kind of course in ethics or values. Academic leaders, especially the social scientists, armed themselves with the spirit of the rockets and computers and waded into the midst of the new behavioral fields, de-

claiming that it was wrong for educators to be teaching or talking about values. Sadly, many of their number became so entranced by the behavioral exploits of their subject—man—that they observed only what man did and never dared to ask what man might be able to do given sufficient guidance, inspiration and incentive.

Since World War II our academic communities have been quite upset by the rapid social changes in the Nation. They have retreated en masse from value-oriented teaching. They have generally developed such a fear of stating what is or may be a given value that they have been careful to make no value commitments at all. Teachers have received very little help from textbook publishers in obtaining value teaching and value clarification materials. In the absence of being able to teach religious guidelines, they have failed to teach the ethical values that are basic not only to all major religions but to a free society as well. Yet—it has never ceased to be the obligation of the educational system of a nation to be a transmitter of values.

An editor recently observed that a valueless education is apt to produce a valueless people: I fear that education without values may produce a people not only lacking values but actively deploring and despising them as well.

American education today is in the midst of crisis. No one is pleased with the way the education is being conducted. Trustees are troubled by spiraling costs, administrators are disturbed by declining enrollments, professors are concerned about the declining need for professional educators, students decry the abysmal gap between classroom pedagogy and real-life needs and hard-pressed mothers and fathers—and, yes, even grandmothers and grandfathers—are choking at the costs of it all and businessmen stand disappointed at the knowledge deficiency and ethical confusion of the men and women being sent their way via the American campus. Recent statistics from the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare tell us that this society is spending nearly \$94 billion per year on education—yet NO ONE is genuinely pleased with the product of American education.

A recent article in TIME magazine indicates, in fact, that more than ill feelings or idle suspicions are at play here. It is a fact—however displeasing or disquieting it may be—a fact that U.S. public school students are learning less now than they did a decade or even a few years ago. That is the horrifying finding of not one but three separate national tests. Here is one example. Most college admissions offices use scoring on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SATs) to judge applicants. Would you believe that SAT scores across America have been falling every year since 1962! And the director of admissions testing for the prestigious College Entrance Examination Board—following long and careful study of these numbers—confesses that their conclusion is "real". Indeed, he states flatly that the reason for these lower scores year after year has nothing to do with the test—for it remains essentially unchanged. The reason is, he insists, a steady decline in the "developed reasoning ability" of our students.

A second study—one by the National Assessment of Educational Progress—reported within the last few weeks that American students knew less about science in 1973 than they did just three years earlier. And the results of a third study—sponsored by the Federal Government—show that public school students' reading levels have been falling steadily since the mid-1960's.

Turn these facts over in your own mind briefly—America spends \$94 billion per year on all education. YET—the students produced by American education read less well than their parents or older brothers

and sisters, know less science at a time when more scientific knowledge exists than at any previous point in human history—and perhaps more frightening than all others—are losing their ability to reason. Surely you will reach the same concluding question I do: WHY?

The answer is, I think, no mystery. The failures of American education—and, indeed, the failures of the American society from highest to lowest levels in the ethical sphere—can be traced along an arrow-straight path to the fateful decision to take a neutral, hands-off position in the classroom where questions of human values are concerned.

One educator has recently said that much of the blame for the decline in American education can be traced to television. This generation—your generation—he says, "Is the generation of students most affected by the media revolution." He may very well be right. It is a fact that many young men and women today argue vehemently that reading is passe, that we are in the midst of a knowledge revolution unlike anything every seen on this small planet before—and that it is our good fortune to be alive at a time when communications media can update our knowledge base instantaneously and even painlessly.

For far too many Americans, I fear—both young and old alike—the mass media has become the only real source of knowledge, information and learning. And there are chilling problems with that fact. Chief among these is the fact that whatever data television or radio imparts is, so far as the viewer is concerned—and to the degree that he is unable to watch all the media all the time—a jumbled mish-mash of sporadic, random, incoherent, inconsistent, uneven and even contradictory assertions and/or impressions. The media never conveys anything like a coherent, systematic body of factual knowledge. The same is true of values.

Where American educators have turned neutral on the question of teaching conclusions about right and wrong, the American media teaches everything—that right is wrong, that wrong is wrong, that right is right and on and on. Adam-12 for example, may leave the viewer with the hard and fast conviction that theft is wrong. But the movie of the week which immediately follows may celebrate a criminal conspiracy as not only successful and financially rewarding—but high adventure as well! And, when the late evening newscaster relates the details of the latest corruption in high places, what is the young and malleable mind viewing this kaleidoscope of values to conclude?

Unfortunately, so-called "value-free" learning—however imparted—is heavily laden with values; for the systematic negation of values—or the persistent absence of values—is itself a value system. Some call it nihilism—the complete negation of everything, of all value, even the inherent value of the human being. Those who are cowed by the preachments of value-free education are yielding up their young not to everything, as it contended, but to *nothing*. Can any human enterprise be built with confidence on *nothing*?

Now this seemingly-academic discussion of the failings of our educational system, and the importance of value-laden teaching to the restoration of our educational excellence, is not nearly as isolated as it appears. The Watergate tragedy made clear as nothing I could say would, the enormity of the ethical problem in America today. And the litany of ethics-related challenges to the corporation I began this address with, bring the Watergate scandal directly into the boardrooms and offices of corporate America—where many honored in this solemn assembly today may fairly soon be sitting.

Irving Kristol, the distinguished Henry Luce Professor of Human Values at New

York University wrote recently in the Wall Street Journal about the ethical trauma now whipsawing corporate America. He said that "at a time when the reputation of business in general is low, when the standing in popular opinion of the large publicly-owned corporation is even lower, and when there is a keen post-Watergate concern for probity—(basic honesty)—among officials of all organizations public or private—at such a time one would expect corporate executives to be especially sensitive even to appearances of conflict of interest, or to the mildest deviations from strict standards of fiduciary behavior. "Yet," he sadly concludes, "This seems not, on the whole, to be the case."

Well, my friends, the corporate community—the educational community—the entire American community is badly in need, I believe, of what Vice President Rockefeller recently called—"a jolt". We need to be shaken to our senses, wrenched from our fantasies of a world without standards or absolutes, forced to concede that situation ethics means no ethics and, finally, that free men cannot live—or indeed survive—when the standards they live by differ in no way from those observed by men who are not free.

That jolt may well have started less than a month ago, last April 30 with the fall of Saigon to the Viet Cong. History may well record our involvement in Vietnam culminating in the rout of the army and government we once had sworn to support as the greatest repudiation of American international intent since our founding. The repercussions of that debacle are just beginning to be felt. We have already suffered the infamy of having one of our major allies in the Far East, Thailand, say publicly that they feel we are "lacking in morality." The past four weeks have seen other allies reassessing their foreign policy in respect to the United States. All ready talk has started about the unsoundness of any American investments in Asia, for fear that they could not be protected.

Perhaps this tremendous fall from international prestige, paralleling a similar domestic fall suffered by Richard Nixon last August, might cause us to reflect, as he surely must have, on where we lost our bearings.

I hope that the soul-searching will probe some of the thoughts I have shared with you already as well as the need to rekindle, as we begin to celebrate our Bicentennial, that essential moral vision that first founded this nation and captured, at that time, the hopes of the world. Imagine successful, well-educated men like Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and John Hancock pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honors to found a nation of laws and political freedom. Where are their counterparts today? Can we summon enough faith in ourselves and our moral judgments to match their ethics and their achievements? I believe we can and we must.

It will require that universities engage professors who are not afraid to venture forth in the ethical thicket and cut a path for students to follow. It will require that college view students not simply as physics majors or history majors but first and foremost "responsible human beings and citizens." It will require the development of commonly accepted concepts of what we want to be as a nation and as individual citizens. It will require that you as future managers of America's economic strength place a higher loyalty in your moral beliefs than in your company's goals, but knowing as well when the two are truly in conflict and when and when not to compromise.

And it will require that all of us as voting citizens continue to expect and demand the highest moral performance from our public leaders.

The ethical challenge to American business

and education as well as to the greater society is to have no less than the foresight, the insight, the fortitude and the tenacity to do what is morally responsible and right. No less can be expected if we are to regain our bearings; no more could be asked if we are truly to fulfill what Abraham Lincoln once said of America: "last best hope of mankind".

FINANCING THE DEFICITS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, money management is an issue that requires more decisive action than we give from Congress. Deficit financing caused by congressional spending has serious implications.

Eugene C. Zorn, Jr., the economist of the Republic National Bank of Dallas, wrote a paper on the trend. Bankers understand it. Secretary of the Treasury, Bill Simon, has told us where deficit financing leads. Arthur Burns speaks consistently about loose financing. But the public does not yet know the road they are being led down. I wonder how many in Congress anticipate what will happen to the money market in the next 5 years.

Congress should balance the budget now. We need to use more commonsense and stand behind Bill Simon at Treasury with a positive program. Here are some comments from Zorn:

The impact on credit markets of the current and prospective heavy Federal deficits cannot be evaluated in the context of traditional business cycle responses. Rather, it should be considered in light of the serious distortions that now exist in various sectors of the economy and credit markets as a direct consequence of an inflation that has been unprecedented in modern times.

The performance of the econometric models in the past couple of years, in their failure to forecast subsequent trends and levels of economic activity and financial market conditions, points up the marked departure of the current environment from the historical experience upon which such models are constructed.

The size of the so-called "gap" of Federal deficit financing that might have to be financed by debt monetization through the banking system is not as critical or meaningful as is the effect of prospective large deficits upon the perpetuation or further aggravation of inflationary psychology, with its influence on the savings-investment process. Anticipations that deficits will generate further inflation have become increasingly significant.

Financial markets tend to adjust to expectation of what lies ahead. If expectations are that Federal deficits will result in subsequent inflation, the effects on the cost and availability of funds will be experienced before the actual deficits have to be financed.

Moreover, financial markets have become increasingly exposed to a political environment that gives rise to concerns that attempts might be made to legislate impediments to the functioning of market forces on both supply and demand sides of the market.

If the foregoing analysis is accepted as valid, it may be stated that the problem of financing the heavy deficits, for at least the next year or two, will not be a crowding-out by the Treasury of private borrowers from credit markets, but rather the consequences

of the deficits for total credit demands generated by an inflationary economy. To the extent that the deficits feed the inflationary psychology, they will amplify the distortions and imbalances that already exist in private credit markets, including the propensity for liquidity and the interference with long-term savings-investment relationships. These effects are likely to be more significant than the influence of the level of economic activity on the current volume of bank loans outstanding.

The Federal Reserve can supply reserves through which the deficit can be financed. It can thereby add to the total supply of credit, as the reserves will support an additional volume of bank loans and investments. Since a new supply is created, Treasury borrowing will not be drawing funds away from private borrowers. The major concern, however, is that the Treasury borrowing will set in motion new inflationary forces that impact upon the supply and demand for funds in markets for private credit.

With growing concentration in bills and other short-term issues, private holders have used Treasury issues primarily as a source of liquidity. As additional debt is created in the period of heavy deficit financing that lies ahead, the preference for liquidity is likely to be reinforced.

It is the near-money character of the debt, including a recognition that it is not likely to be retired, that is more significant than whether it is "monetized." However, it would be expected that banks would seek to maintain a posture of liquidity if inflation is anticipated down the road, and therefore would confine their acquisitions to short maturities.

To the extent that the deficits are financed in the non-bank credit markets, the growth in the narrowly-defined monetary aggregates will be restrained. However, in view of the propensity of investors for liquidity in an environment of anticipated inflation, even the debt financed outside the banking system will assume near-money characteristics.

In the absence of a surplus, the Treasury is forced to search out new investors to replace those who are liquidating their debt holdings at the very time that the private credit demands are likely to be heavier. The task of the Federal Reserve in seeking to restrain the growth of inflationary demands for credit again becomes increasingly difficult. Some observers view these consequences as producing interest rates far beyond previous peaks.

One of the most serious consequences of protracted and heavy deficit financing is that, as a result of the continuance of inflationary forces and attitudes, growing compartmentalization of private credit markets will develop. Demand for credit for strong borrowers remains heavy.

The persistence of inflation—with its perverse effects on cost-price and income relationships—is likely to result in an inability of the weak borrowers to finance their requirements at the same time that credit demands of the stronger borrowers may escalate rapidly. The phenomenon is not primarily a matter of interest rate differentials, but rather one of credit-worthiness of borrowers adversely affected by the economics of inflation.

FREEDOM OF VALENTYN MOROZ

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, communications from constituents and friends active in the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., indicate to

me that Valentyn Moroz, a Ukrainian patriot and now prisoner of the Soviet Union, has been removed from prison and transferred to a psychiatric ward, probably in the Vladimir prison.

After the hunger strike and expression of support and concern in behalf of this brave man from all over the world, it appears that the Soviet Union now seeks to use scientific methods and drugs in the disguise of hospitalization to destroy this leading Ukrainian intellectual, break his will, and to eliminate one of the few remaining voices of freedom in the Soviet Union and the Ukraine.

Public opinion in the United States and the world does not tolerate this. The outrage of free men must be heard demanding not only the emancipation of Valentyn Moroz but also returning to freedom the social dissenters everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

INDIVIDUALISM AND THE "RIGHT TO READ"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently I chanced to read a statement by Dr. Joseph Kitchens, assistant professor of history, Georgia Southwestern College, relative to the decline in a student's ability to read and write. Dr. Kitchens points up that we have to face the fact that we are crippling our youth by not insisting they learn to read and write properly. As Professor Kitchens states:

To be crippled in one's ability to communicate in writing is to be denied a freedom, creativity and privacy that should be the right of all.

I wholeheartedly agree and commend his article to the attention of my colleagues. The article is taken from the Georgia PTA Bulletin for June 1975:

INDIVIDUALISM AND THE "RIGHT TO READ"

(By Joseph Kitchens, Ph. D.)

In recent months, several news magazines and scholarly journals have carried articles expressing concern over a surprising phenomena—an apparent nationwide decline in literacy. A prestigious national testing service reports a decline in the verbal skills of students entering our colleges and universities. Many states, including Georgia, have instituted standardized testing procedures to insure that college graduates will possess a minimal knowledge of grammar and composition. In this day of "open door" admission to most public-supported institutions of higher learning basic language skills are no longer a prerequisite for enrollment and a growing percentage of the colleges' inflation-riddled resources are being diverted to finance remediation programs in the language arts. Colleges are increasingly assuming responsibility for equipping their students with skills the teaching of which was once thought to be the special domain of "grammar" schools. Why are we faced with this mounting concern over basic literacy in a nation that has long accepted the necessity of basic primary education and devoted its resources to provide it?

Explanations are available, if not completely satisfactory. Many point to the electronic media as the culprit. Television, radio, motion pictures, the telephone and the tape recorder have lessened for many the necessity of either reading or writing. I think it fair to say that most Americans are primarily informed through these media. Indeed, such media are often used to enrich the educational environment. At least one explanation for the widespread use of electronic media in the classroom is, I fear, that teachers turn to them in desperation when their students are unable to make effective use of the traditional educational medium—the written or printed word. Helpful as audio- and visual media are, their use may compound the problem which may have stimulated their use in the first place—their students' inability to profit from teaching/learning experiences based on reading and writing. Informed by non-literate media both in and out of class, the students' interest in, and ability to use the written language declines. Proponents of such methods point out with persuasiveness, that students should be taught with the tools by which contemporary society communicates. Maintaining interest, an important prerequisite to learning, is certainly important. And it is demonstrable that initially at least, this can be done more easily with electronic media than with conventional teaching tools.

Equally plausible is the contention that "democratization" of the public institutions of higher learning has brought about an inevitable decline in the preparedness level of entering students. As new elements of our society, formerly denied access to higher education because of cultural, racial, economic or academic disadvantages, were brought into the college setting, some short-term reduction in standards was inevitable and perhaps even desirable. Unfortunately, what began as a humanitarian compromise by well-intentioned educators may be generating a self-perpetuating downward spiral in the quality of our college graduates. Several factors influencing the academic setting have made it difficult to return to rigorous standards. Among these are the "crunch" of inflation, the fading of social imperative for college education and the stabilization of the birth rate in the wake of the World War II "baby boom." These factors and others add up to a leveling off of college enrollment and in some instances, a disastrous decline. For administrators and faculty members, self-preservation becomes a prime consideration. Academic standards are often the victim. Although some colleges have made a belated commitment to teaching the basic literacy skills that apparently went unlearned in the primary and secondary schools, the prospect for their being able to curb the decline in literacy are not bright. Too much contrary pressure is brought to bear on them by social, economic and demographic forces.

Observers, even professional ones, who favor more rigorous training in the communications skills not infrequently receive a cold shoulder from their colleagues and society at large. Often, they are accused of holding to an outmoded concept of education, or worse, of being elitists. Such scepticism seems to be based on the assumption that (a) they are hopeless traditionalists enamored of Victorian rigor and propriety, (b) that they are snobs, who are determined to use literacy as an arbitrary bar to keep minority groups and the poor out of college, or (c) both. What real justification exists, they ask, for the primacy of reading and writing in the educational process?

I believe the answer is that reading and writing are such highly adaptable and versatile means of communication and expression. As such they assure our adaptability as individuals and a fuller development of our interests. Electronic media alone do not provide the means for securing our own unique-

ness. We are restricted in the pursuit of things which interest primarily ourselves when we rely on mass communications. This is, of course, true of books as well, but to a lesser degree. Written communication is still the most versatile resource for our own personal educational needs. To be crippled in one's ability to communicate in writing is to be denied a freedom, creativity and privacy that should be the right of all. The "Right to Read (and Write)" is no atavism. We need these capabilities now especially. Youth in the Sixties rekindled our desire for individuality and unique personal expression. Tragically, there is some evidence that this same generation is somewhat less literate than its predecessors. If we are to fulfill that generation's hope for a fuller life for its children, we must insure that they are able to secure it, at least in part, through reading and writing effectively. Support the primacy of literary skills in our public schools. We all will be the beneficiaries.

HUD VERSUS HOUSING ENFORCEMENT

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, there is a national housing scandal in this country that has cost our Government billions of dollars, tens of thousands of destroyed houses, and the decay of hundreds of good neighborhoods. The true dimensions of the disaster are buried under the red-tape in the files of FHA and HUD.

The Chicago Tribune has conducted an outstanding 7-month investigation of the housing scandal involving FHA and mortgage companies, so thankfully the disaster is not as buried as it once was. Today I want to share with my colleagues a recent Tribune editorial on what Chicago housing administrators are up against when they are dealing with the Washington bureaucracy. I am afraid it is not an atypical situation.

I think my colleagues are as deeply concerned as the taxpayers who are, as usual, bearing the brunt of this ineptitude. Damaged and destroyed homes are bought by the Federal Government for billions in tax dollars and then sold for next to nothing.

Let me give you a specific example the Tribune reporters cited in their articles: A \$20,000 home in Chicago was sold at auction by FHA for \$501. Of course, there were some drawbacks for the buyer. Vandals had knocked the doors wide open. All windows were broken, fixtures were smashed, sinks, bathtubs, toilets and boiler had been stolen and wet and stinking trash was littered throughout the house and yard. So the taxpayer lost close to \$20,000 on this deal. The average loss to the Government on each FHA foreclosure is more than \$13,000.

In the instance cited above, the FHA said it had to give away the house, because it was so badly damaged; the demolition costs were not much less than the worth of the lot the house was sitting on.

There are FHA regulations requiring protection of vacant buildings by the mortgage companies, but they do not seem to carry much more weight than

the paper they are written on as far as the mortgage companies are concerned.

In another example of the complete breakdown of the housing program the Tribune reported that a mortgage company in Chicago in turning over a house to FHA stated that the house was "vacant, clean, and secure." It was a house on which FHA had paid over \$15,000 in mortgage insurance. The reality of the situation was far from "secure." There were holes in the roofs and floors, the plaster walls were battered in, plumbing was never turned off and drained, causing warping and rot. Vandals with free access to the house had strewn garbage and trash throughout the house.

Is this any way to run a housing program? And why are such abuses occurring? I think my colleagues will find this editorial a cogent and informative analysis of the situation, and I hope its message is heard loud and clear all the way at HUD. It is time to put an end to this waste and to construct a decent and responsive low- to moderate-income housing program that works:

HUD VERSUS HOUSING ENFORCEMENT

Leading bureaucrats of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington have decided why their agency works so badly: The trouble is those local officials who keep trying to make it work better. To meet this problem, Washington has ordered such officials to lay off, stop trying to crack down on the easy-money housing racketeers, and become just as flabby as their superiors at protecting the public interest.

This take-it-easy policy is the more striking in view of The Tribune's investigative series which detailed the ruinous waste and deterioration—totaling some \$4 billion over seven years—that have resulted from HUD's nonenforcement of its own rules.

The orders to lay off were received two weeks ago at HUD's regional offices in Chicago, and have led to a fascinating situation. Our local officials, to their lasting credit, say they're not going to obey them.

Within this giant federal agency, it seems, battle lines are being drawn between officials who want HUD to work as Congress intended and those who don't. The outcome may decide a fundamental question of government: whether federal agencies are primarily meant to benefit the public, or the payrollers who run them.

The orders came after a task force from Washington visited the Chicago offices of HUD and its subsidiary agency, the Federal Housing Administration, last May. The visit apparently was prompted by complaints to HUD in Washington from a mortgage company doing millions of dollars in FHA business here.

On June 16, the task force issued a report that supported the complaints and in effect criticized the Chicago office and its director, John L. Waner, for doing their job too conscientiously. It said Mr. Waner had been checking up too thoroly on mortgage companies, developers, and home buyers making use of FHA-backed mortgages, and had been taking excessive care to inspect FHA-insured homes for structural, electrical, plumbing, or heating defects. Hundreds of such homes in the Chicago area have been abandoned because of undetected defects which the buyer couldn't afford to repair. Yet the report said local requirements for certification inspections were "unfair" to mortgage companies and prospective sellers.

The report also criticized the Chicago FHA office for running stringent credit checks on applicants for FHA-insured homes. Its author, George O. Hipps of the national HUD office, conceded that the checks had turned

up a number of fraudulent applications, but said the office was hampered by the large number of rejects. The "unnecessary" documentation required by the Chicago office, said Mr. Hipps, "slows the processing." He concluded:

"The attitude . . . is one of suspicion of the mortgagee, the broker, and the applicant. The noted deficiencies are indicative of processing in the Chicago office which causes dissatisfaction with the single-family housing program. In addition, it reflects a negative and suspicious attitude and a misunderstanding of outstanding instructions."

The source of this dissatisfaction seems clear. A highlight of the inspection tour was a meeting May 16 between task force members and 30 industry representatives, including mortgage bankers, builders, and developers. Local HUD and FHA officials were barred from this meeting, possibly for fear they might be tactless and show proof of consistent violations by some lenders.

The June 16 report, and the subsequent orders from Washington, leave little doubt that HUD's top echelons do not want to hear about the need for reforms; they want go-along people who won't make trouble for industry or their fellow bureaucrats. This throws some doubt on Mr. Waner's future. As we write, a new detachment from Washington is in Chicago grilling Mr. Waner and other local officials on where The Tribune got its information for the series on FHA scandals. Apparently HUD has its "plumbers" too, just like the Nixon White House.

In our view, Chicago area residents can be grateful that John Waner is in charge of federal housing programs here. In his four years in office, he has proved himself a tough, dedicated administrator willing to fight tirelessly to make things work—actually provide decent housing for those who need it. His record, under immense handicaps, is excellent.

If he and his able staff are now to be disciplined for trying to protect the public interest in defiance of official policy, HUD and its leaders will have showed which side they're on. It isn't the public's, and the public can be expected to take note of it.

WEST POINT DAM

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the great American poet Robert Frost once said that "in order for a place to be great, you must start with a good piece of geography." What better way to salute the years of effort by those who made the West Point Dam and Reservoir on the Georgia-Alabama line a reality?

Indeed, they started with a good piece of geography and, through years of hard work and patience, built a landmark. I am proud it is part of my district. But I am even prouder to be so closely associated with the many people, both in Georgia and Alabama, who worked diligently to bring the West Point project to fruition.

Prior to the actual dedication of West Point, there was a ceremony during which the cornerstone was laid, on June 6, 1975. The speakers there were most appropriate, for the project meant much to them.

Former Congresswoman Elizabeth Andrews of Alabama, whose late hus-

band, the distinguished Congressman George Andrews, put forth so much for the project, is a gracious lady whose fashion of dress complements the elegance of her being. And R. Shaefer Heard, who is known far and wide as "Mr. West Point Dam," has earned that title and can wear it with pride because his had indeed been a guiding hand since the conception of this massive project.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I submit their remarks as a gesture of my own personal pride in West Point and a tribute to these two wonderful people:

WEST POINT DAM

(By Mrs. George Andrews)

My gratitude is as deep and as wide as the Chattahoochee today. First, let me thank you for allowing me to complete George's 14th term in Congress. I was able to complete some things near and dear to him, and for this I am most grateful. It was a great honor to George and to me. I also want to thank you, especially the committee, for remembering how much this project meant to George. As I scanned his scrapbook after Mr. Lanier called me, I realized again how long this project had been in the making. George praised it, pleaded for it and fought for it his entire 28 years in Congress.

Across the Archives Building—in Washington, D.C.—is inscribed these words: "What is Past is Prologue".

I'm sure you've heard the joke about this that is supposed to be true:

A typical tourist asked the cab driver as he drove her up Pennsylvania Avenue, "What is past is prologue—what does that mean, driver?" Drawing from the wealth of knowledge that the cab driver always has, he replied: "It means you ain't seen nothing yet!"

I'm sure if we could look into the years ahead to the year 2000, we'd agree that we "ain't seen nothing yet!" We haven't seen yet the great progress that this great waterway will bring to our areas. However, we have come a long way since the project was begun with the Jim Woodruff Dam back in 1947.

Then came a long dry spell, money-wise, and the project was at a standstill. The Woodruff Dam could yield only a fraction of its benefits until the other dams were completed.

The President and the Office of the Budget insisted that no new projects could be started, and the Appropriations Committee would not build the other dams. However, friends of the Tri-Rivers project never gave up. They insisted that since the Woodruff Dam was nearing completion—it was a continuing project.

I'd like to quote from George Andrews' speech at the ground-breaking ceremony at what is now (and for this I am deeply grateful) the George Andrews Dam in 1955—20 years ago:

"GEORGE ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I can truthfully say to you today that this is one of the greatest days I have ever known since becoming a member of Congress in 1944, 11 years ago.

"Long years, years that have been filled with back-breaking problems. One of the great desires that I had when going to Congress was to see the greatest natural resource that we have in this section of Alabama developed—the Chattahoochee River. I'm thinking today of the many hours of long, hard work that those who have advocated this project experienced through those years. I am thinking of the many trips that mayors, members of Chambers of Commerce, members of City Commissions made to Washington. I am thinking of the disappointments that

they experienced—year after year having the Appropriations Committee and the Congress and the Budget Bureau say NO, no money for Fort Gaines. But you know anything worth having is worth fighting for. The fight has continued through those years and has grown with intensity.

"During the last session of Congress, I offered an Amendment in the Full Appropriations Committee which carried by one single vote, and that one vote will enable us today to blow the dirt to start construction of the Fort Gaines Lock and Dam. It seems to me that the best things that happened in my life have been by close, close vote. I went to Congress in '44 with 44 votes. We'll break ground today with one vote.

"But I like to think of the great benefits that will come to our section of the country when this great project has been completed—navigation, plenty of hydro-electricity, flood control, recreation. Let me read you briefly what General Itschner of the Engineers wrote me back on the 27th of May of this year, speaking of the navigation features of this project. 'It is now estimated that 1,277,000 tons of traffic will develop on the waterway when the system is complete, which is more than twice the previous estimate.' Navigation, hydro-electricity, commercial water. You and I know that unquestionably industry is coming South. Coming where? To Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Georgia. Our project is right in the heart of that district. We have everything on this earth to offer an industrialist who is seeking a new site for his plant in the Chattahoochee Valley. We can say with confidence and without fear of contradiction to an industrialist who is seeking a new site, 'You tell us what you want; we have it in the Chattahoochee Valley'. With Camp Rucker becoming a permanent Fort, with the development of the Chattahoochee Valley, I say with a great deal of pride that we're on the go in Southeast Alabama and I predict with utmost confidence that 15 or 20 years from today, the Chattahoochee Valley will be one of the greatest industrial empires that can be found anywhere in these United States.

"And now, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present to you my colleague from the 2nd District of Alabama, who has been of invaluable aid to us in this fight in Washington, Hon. George Grant. Come around, Mr. Grant."

Before I leave that ceremony in 1955 I'd like to quote from another speech that was made that day—by a great Georgian—the late Senator George. Quote: "My philosophy is that free government, representative government, must meet the test over and over again of translating into tangible form for the betterment of the people the natural resources of our several States—The great function of free government is to translate the bold declarations of purposes and the great natural resources into a better life for all the people. I hope to see personally at least one other dam on the Chattahoochee and that is a dam which will give adequate protection to West Point and will benefit the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida."

Neither Representative George (Andrews) nor Senator George were allowed to be here today—but their efforts along with hosts of others too numerous to mention here were the foundation upon which we shall continue to build into the future. By the year 2000 when this capsule is opened great changes will have occurred. The great States of Alabama and Georgia joined, not divided by the Chattahoochee and linked to the great State of Florida will have made great strides in the economic world. The system's contribution to recreation, flood control and the energy crisis will be tremendous.

In the great Chamber of the House of Representatives in our Capitol where the money for this great waterway was appropriated there is a marble plaque engraved with Daniel

Webster's words: "Let us develop the resources of our land; call forth its power, build its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

I believe that the patriots of the year 2000 will look back on this day with pride. We owe a great debt to those whose efforts have made it possible. Let us today rededicate ourselves to continuing service of our country so that by the year 2000 we will be judged "worthy to be remembered".

REMARKS BY: R. SHAEFER HEARD

Someone asked me why I got interested in river development. I have heard it talked ever since I was a boy about a flood control dam on the Chattahoochee above West Point. The flood of December, 1919 I was trapped on First Avenue from Monday afternoon until Friday afternoon upstairs in my Aunt's home on First Avenue, with 12 others. We had an oil stove, but not much food, and the City water main was broken on the river bridge which washed away and we had no water to drink. It was December and the weather was cold. We had to go to bed to keep warm, and we had to ration our food. We were thirsty so I went down stairs and dipped up the red river water—we strained it, boiled it, and made coffee on the oil stove. If you have never been without drinking water you do not know what it is to do without it. The coffee tasted pretty good.

From that experience I said to myself, "I wish I could do something to help the flooding in the Valley."

In 1928, the late Mr. J. Smith Lanier of West Point; Mr. W. B. Hardaway of Columbus; and Mr. F. H. McDonald of Atlanta, with the assistance of the late Mr. George H. Lanier, then President of the W. P. Mfg. Co., West Point, Ga., obtained a permit from the Federal Power Commission to construct a dam on the river above West Point. Land was purchased and in 1929 the permit and all the land was sold to the Georgia Power Company by the owner—W. P. Mfg. Co., with the understanding that the Georgia Power Company would build a dam in 1931. Following the 1930's was the great depression, and then World War II, which stopped all such projects. Of course the Georgia Power Company could not build a dam at that time. Things rocked along after the war and nothing was done, so in 1956 I brought it up before the City Council of West Point. (I was elected Councilman in 1955). Since Georgia Power Company owned the permit we took it up with them and they advised that they were not interested in building a dam on the Chattahoochee above West Point. After this was cleared I organized a group to go to Atlanta and contact the Chamber of Commerce with the idea of enlisting their help to obtain a dam. The group besides myself as chairman included the then Mayor of West Point, Tom Morgan; Councilman W. P. Jackson; Frank Davis and Davis Haines. We visited the Chamber and Mr. Frank Shaw sent us over to see Mr. Burton J. Bell, TLO of the South Atlantic Division of the Corps of Army Engineers. Mr. Bell was very cordial and he said "we have not heard one word from West Point about a dam in years". His next remark was "don't you know that the squeaky wheel is always the one that gets greased"? He further said that the "Engineers had not heard any one down the river squeaking". He then explained the procedure by which such a project for the Federal Government to undertake. Incidentally I had earlier written to our Congressman John J. Flynt, Jr., about a dam on the river above West Point. He advised that such a project as a multi-purpose dam on a river was a long and rough road, but he would be glad to investigate it.

When Mr. Bell said "the squeaky wheel is

the one that gets greased" that gave me my cue. We started a squeaky campaign until we had a listening ear in Washington.

On February 7, 1957 Congressman Flynt introduced a resolution for the Engineers to study the feasibility of a dam above West Point for flood control, power, recreation, aid to navigation and other benefits. Congressman Flynt told me that to his knowledge it was the first resolution introduced in Congress for the Engineers to make a study of the middle reach of the river for a multi-purpose dam above West Point. This resolution was approved. Congressman Flynt also told me to keep in close touch with the Engineers and when I mentioned it to Mr. O. G. Skinner he carried them to Crystal River, Florida on fishing trips several times, also he gave them a steak dinner at his recreation house. To make a long story short the first step was a public hearing and Congressman Flynt set the date December 3, 1958 and requested me to make the local arrangements. The Mobile District Engineer Colonel Love had charge of the hearing. In November just before the hearing we organized the Middle Chattahoochee River Development Association and I was elected president. I sent over one thousand names to the Mobile office to send invitations to the hearing. To say the hearing was a success is to put it mildly. We had nearly one hundred endorsements with only three opposing it. The Engineers in their report of November 30, 1961 stated that the study was sponsored by the MCRDA, Congress finally authorized the dam in October, 1962 and it was funded within two weeks when the late Senator Russell tacked on to the bill a request for \$100,000.00 planning money. In my trips to Washington (about one to three times a year) I was active in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and in the early part of 1962 I appeared before them and they endorsed the project which gave us a push up the hill. I was the only one there representing the Chattahoochee River. Ground was broken on April 16, 1966, and I had the privilege of helping General Walker, Congressman John J. Flynt, Jr., and the late Congressman George Andrews touch off the blast which started the construction of the dam. These two Congressmen helped more than anyone else in Washington in getting the dam.

The first concrete was placed on November 13, 1968 and again I had the privilege of helping the Savannah District Engineer Barnes and Congressman Flynt place the first bucket of concrete. In November, 1974 I had the privilege of pushing the button to open the first tainter gate. Now you see the finished product, a thing of beauty.

In the capsule is a brief history of the dam in more detail, a letter from the West Point Lions Club, the first organization to endorse the dam and have the first program on the dam at the Club, a letter from the MCRDA, the sponsors of the study by the Engineers, newspaper of the ground breaking and many other items of interest to be read in the year 2000. We thank every one that had a part of making the dream come true. Personally I am very proud of the dam and the benefits we will derive from it.

1984?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, writing in the Chicago Tribune last month, columnist Joan Beck offered a thought-provoking and somewhat frightening article on a disturbing trend in America.

She notes that now, for the first time, more Americans are being supported by taxes than are working in the private sector of the economy.

If this trend is continued into the future as she posits, it is indeed frightening. But there is still time to reverse our direction, if those of us in the Congress have the courage.

So that we may all have a chance to think about it, I insert the column to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 6, 1975]
THE YEAR THE SCALES TIPPED TOWARD 1984
(By Joan Beck)

WASHINGTON, 1984.—The tipping point came about mid-1975, altho few people recognized it as such at the time. And the tipoff was a study by economists at the Ford Motor Co., which showed that there were more people being supported by taxes in the United States [80,655,000] than there were people working in the private sector of the economy to pay the taxes [71,650,000].

Among those who were living on the tax dollars of others, the Ford economists counted the adults on various welfare and retirement programs, government employes, military personnel on active duty, and the disabled and unemployed.

For a while, it looked as if the statistics would be reported only in a few one-paragraph newspaper stories and then slip into oblivion. But there were some who understood that a new American majority was being created and began to exploit the fact for their own political and professional purposes. That tipped the balance more, slowly at first and then at an accelerating rate in the early 1980s.

Politicians mapping strategy for the 1976 elections were among the first to realize that tax beneficiaries now outnumbered taxpayers—and not only could, but would, outvote them. Most of the successful candidates that year based their campaigns on some variation of the theme that government must do more for the people as a matter of justice and right.

So there was little surprise when one of the first major pieces of legislation passed by the new Congress early in 1977 was a universal health care bill, much more liberal than any previously proposed. It not only provided free medical and dental care for everyone, but it also pulled millions of physicians, nurses, dentists, hospital workers, and other health care personnel out of the private sector of the economy and made them dependent on taxes.

With the health care people came professional organizations and lobbyists, almost as skilled in manipulating legislators as the military and determined to fare well on government largess. These became models for other pressure groups of tax beneficiaries (some starting on a small scale in the early 1970s) such as retirees, welfare recipients, government workers, and the unemployed, all under the banner of justice and constitutional right. It became impossible to cut back on any government program, and legislators, knowing they were adding to a growing new majority of voters, continued to create new social services.

Taxes increased, of course, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, especially with the impact of the new health care bill and increased Social Security benefits. Some corporations were compelled to cut labor costs considerably and others went out of business.

Many young people found it difficult to get a job. Those who did were appalled to experience first-hand the tax bite on their pay checks, and some quit working completely, adopting the increasingly popular no-work ethic. They learned to live on a combination of food stamps, subsidized housing, free medical care, and barter.

By 1980, a new Ford Motor Co. study showed that tax beneficiaries outnumbered taxpayers from the private sector of the economy by 121,590,000 to 41,392,000. There may be fewer than 21 million taxpayers left now, whose income is not derived from taxes paid by others; even the Ford economists themselves have become government employes, as Congress created first a national energy supply agency and then last year increased its regulation of the auto industry to the point of nationalization.

The national debt now stands at \$13 trillion. The dollar is worth 11 cents in 1973 terms. The gross national product has declined for each of the last eight years. Real personal income has gone down for seven. And increasing numbers of troubled congressmen are wishing they had done more to nourish and protect the American taxpayer in the private sector of the economy before he became an endangered species.

REVENUE SHARING—A BLESSING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the Midland Daily News, the largest paper published in my district. The editorial, entitled "Revenue Sharing No Disguised Blessing," enumerates the many benefits which this program has meant for Midland, Mich., and typifies the sentiments of many local government officials within my district.

We should take note of the wide spread support for revenue sharing which has been emanating from local government and most recently from the U.S. Conference of Mayors. We can greatly facilitate their future fiscal planning with early congressional approval of the State and Local Assistance Act of 1975 which I have cosponsored and which provides for a 5%-year extension of general revenue sharing. In addition we should seriously consider expanding the program with more money and removing the restrictive measures which currently dictate how the funds must be spent.

Local government knows what measures will best serve the needs of its citizens at the local level. They should be the ones to decide how the money is spent.

The article follows:

[From the Midland Daily News, Dec. 23, 1974]

REVENUE SHARING NO DISGUISED BLESSING

(By Phillip L. Schneider)

As 1974 mutters the last of its economic disasters and wheezes toward the finish line, and as the new year slinks closer with forbidding gloom, we find welcome relief by slipping behind one of the few financial blessings remaining.

As December folds, two years remain in the mammoth federal experiment called revenue sharing. It is time to start thinking about renewing the program and to closely study its track record. Since 1972 the Office of Revenue Sharing has funneled over \$15 billion to nearly 39,000 units of government across America. When the trial program ends over \$30 billion will have been spent. The money, earmarked from federal income tax

payments, is returned to state and local governments on the theory that, since officials at these levels are closer to the people, they are more acutely aware of local needs.

Program administrators have done an extraordinary job funneling such large sums of money to grateful, efficient recipients. Graham W. Watt, director of revenue sharing, handles the massive funds with a total staff of less than 70 people—including professional and clerical workers. Unlike most government bureaucracies, where much of the money is wasted in a needless maze of personnel and paperwork, revenue sharing money gets maximum results with each dollar spent.

During the two years that revenue sharing checks have been arriving in cities like Midland, the funds have maintained essential public services and, in many cases, at the same time relieved pressure on local taxpayers. For example, in fiscal 1974-75, which began July 1, the city of Midland will receive about \$476,785—a total of about \$1.2 million. The money, like that before it, will pick up the tab for projects that ordinarily would have forced tax hikes, necessitated budget cuts in other areas or would have remained dormant.

Since the program began, city councilmen have designated revenue sharing funds for: a new municipal service center (\$1.3 million); a northwest fire station and a new truck (\$275,000); an economic development program (\$50,000); and miscellaneous park improvements and developments (\$99,000).

County commissioners have also invested wisely in: road equipment, leading to a 40 per cent increase in road restoration programs (\$116,274); improvements in Veterans Memorial Park near Sanford (\$58,000); additions to Pine Crest, the county nursing home (over \$185,000); four parcels of land in the city for future county use (\$208,177); and improvements at the county fairgrounds (over \$50,000).

The list of projects for which revenue sharing money has either been spent or allocated goes on and on. Revenue sharing has obviously left a savory taste in the mouths of local budget tenders. The resulting programs have generated uncalculated benefits reaching far beyond the monetary amounts invested.

Across America cities big and small are harvesting the benefits of revenue sharing. Atlanta and Chicago are using the money to pay firemen's salaries. Houston bought 20 garbage trucks, a fire pumper, an air pollution helicopter and a police helicopter hangar. New Orleans' mayor says that without its \$18 million annually, the city would be broke. Detroit would be in an equally desperate situation without its \$43.1 million each year.

With the program spreading so many benefits from coast to coast, it is almost inconceivable that such a landmark among so many other foul-smelling projects would not be renewed. Yet, city officials across the nation are worried that Congress might not extend the program beyond its December, 1976 expiration date. Ready to cling to their funds to the bitter end, these officials are busy forming lobbying strategies and mounting an intense two-year pressure campaign.

As Midland Mayor Gene W. Holthofer noted in recent testimony before the Michigan Municipal League's Finance and Taxation Committee:

"Expanded and improved public service has been our key concern. Three decades of failure to provide proper facilities for the city's public works, traffic department, parks maintenance and water distribution is coming to an end. . . . Without the capital represented by revenue sharing to invest in the public's future, the community level of public service would have deteriorated.

" . . . Revenue sharing's continuation is important for each community to continue to address unmet public needs with the flexibility this program offers."

Fortunately, the local examples of this program's tremendous benefits are sure to have a strong impact on one of the politicians in a key place to influence the fate of revenue sharing. As ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. Elford A. Cederberg, R-Midland, carries a lot of weight when he speaks of budgetary concerns. If he wisely lends his active support to the continued health of revenue sharing he will earn hearty thanks from thousands of city officials across America.

NORMAL "TWEED" WEBB

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the pantheon of American Sports immortals contains a good many figures who have not become household names across this Nation. But national notoriety is never an accurate measurement of a dedicated sports enthusiast's contribution to his chosen field.

Mr. Speaker, one such sports great is Normal "Tweed" Webb, baseball player, organizer, reporter, and historian of unique and special talent, charter member of the Amateur Baseball Hall of Fame. "Tweed" has recently retired from active duty, but for all the many whose lives he enriched, from Elston Howard to Luke Easter to Sam Jethroe to all his anonymous readers and admirers in the St. Louis area, he shall always occupy a special niche in our memories.

Mr. Speaker, for the enrichment of my colleagues in the House, I commend to their attention material which describes a man they would be most fortunate to know, Normal "Tweed" Webb. I now insert these pages in the RECORD:

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat]

ROBERT L. BURNES, THE BENCH WARMER

James "Cool Papa" Bell, star of the old Negro National League and inducted into the Hall of Fame of Cooperstown, N.Y., last August, will be honored by the Old Pros Unlimited of Chicago at their annual soiree June 28.

Sharing honors with Cool Papa that night will be his long-time buddy, Normal "Tweed" Webb, who is a member of the Amateur Baseball Hall of Fame.

Incidentally, black baseball historian Webb recently picked an all-time Negro all-star team . . . and we were prepared to go into deep argument with him . . . because his list omitted such names as Bell, Josh Gibson and Satchel Paige . . . but then we noted that Webb had said it's a team of players who are not in the Hall of Fame . . . Okay, Tweed, no arguments.

On his team are such famous names as Willie Wells and Mule Suttles of the old St. Louis Stars . . . Oscar Charleston of Pittsburgh, Ray Dandridge of Newark.

TWEED FORMING WRITERS' CAMPAIGN FOR RUBE FOSTER IN THE "HALL OF FAME"

Tweed has followed baseball since he was a boy for Rube Foster's team when they cavorted at Kuebler's Park over on North Broad-

way (1917). In 1926, Webb played shortstop for the Wayne Pirates in the Negro National League.

He was official scorer for the Black Big Leagues for some 17 years.

Webb, the moving force behind efforts to catapult the Cool Papa in the Hall of Fame in 1974 makes it crystal clear that he feels that Foster should be included with him. Said the man who has compiled data as it relates to Negro baseball for a period that spans in excess of a half-century, "Andrew (Rube) Foster is the most brilliant figure the great national sport has ever produced. He should have entered the Hall of Fame behind Satchel Paige. . . . I feel that the special committee had better wake up!"

"Rube Foster was a great man, a truly outstanding athlete . . . to leave this man out of the Hall of Fame would be a big joke." The assertion is that of Normal (Tweed) Webb, renowned historian on black baseball history. The remarks were made in an interview.

He reeled off reasons for the support of Foster: "(1) He was greatest pitcher (up to 1910); (2) he was greatest manager . . . in the class with John McGraw of the New York Giants and Connie Mack of the Philadelphia Athletics; * * *

HOW GREAT WAS RUBE FOSTER, FORMER PITCHER, MANAGER AND PRESIDENCY?

(By Normal "Tweed" Webb)

'POP' LLOYD

In my "Hot Stove League" column on March 28, 1965 I wrote the following:

"Scores of old time baseball players and fans last week attended the funeral services for John Henry 'Pop' Lloyd, former slugging shortstop for such teams as the Bacharach Giants, Cuban Giants, Philadelphia Giants, New York Black Yankees, Hillsdale Stars, Leland Giants, Lincoln Giants and the Chicago American Giants, managed by the great Rube Foster.

"He played from 1905 through 1931 in the Negro Leagues. In 1942, at the age of 58, Lloyd retired from semi pro ball in Atlantic City as a manager and first baseman, still hitting the ball hard.

"He died in March 19, 1965 there. He was born in Palatka, Florida on April 25, 1884. He was 5'11 and weighed 180 pounds.

"One of baseball's immortals, Pop was born 50 years too soon. During his life he established all kinds of records but the goal he sought more, playing in the big leagues, eluded him.

"In 1912, the late John J. McGraw, Manager of the New York Giants, tried to get John Henry into the majors but was unsuccessful."

WILLIE WELLS

Willie "Devil" Wells, one of the greatest shortstops in the old Negro Leagues.

Wells made his debut here with the famous St. Louis Stars in 1924 and played with them through 1931 when they disbanded. The 5'7", 160 pounder was recognized as a masterful shortstop who possessed good speed, fine hands and an accurate (though not strong) arm.

He was especially adroit at going back and hauling in Texas Leaguer bids.

Wells broke in with San Antonio in 1923. He played in the winter league in Cuba for thirteen years with his travels taking him to Puerto Rico, Mexico and even in Canada.

After leaving St. Louis and the Stars he had tours of duty with the Kansas City Monarchs, Chicago American Giants, Indianapolis Clowns and the Newark Eagles. . . . all powers in the>NNL.

Devil had a career mark of .320. He is weighing the possibility of coaching the Houston Tillotson College Baseball Team also.

TWEED REFLECTS 60 YEARS OF RECORDS BLACK GREATS OF YESTERYEAR

(By Normal "Tweed" Webb)

How great was the late "Rube Foster," former pitcher-manager and president of Negro baseball?

"Andrew (Rube) Foster was the greatest pitcher, manager and president we ever had in yesteryears, the era before Satchel Paige days. I have seen all the black greats of yesteryears since 1912 and have been a keen baseball observer for 55 years. Foster was the Father of Negro Baseball and organizer of the Negro National League in 1920."

Those were the words of Normal (Tweed) Webb, black historian and long time St. Louis Argus baseball reporter, made at the home of James "Cool Papa" Bell, 3034 Dickson last week. "Bell was the fastest player in black baseball history," Tweed added.

Tweed presented Black Big League Baseball in Review. His charts and old "Hot Stove League" column write-ups revealed historical dates, statistics and records. A lively discussion of "Hall of Fame" players before the Jackie Robinson days by "Cool Papa," Tweed and St. Louis Post-Dispatch Sports Editor, Bob Broeg, lasted 2 hours.

Broeg paid a tribute to Webb for his long time service to the Tandy League.

In Tweed's short talk, he chronicled many of the yesteryear black greats, Rube Foster, Satchel Paige, "Cool Papa" Bell, Smokey Joe Williams, Josh Gibson, Bizz Mackey, John Donaldson, John Henry Lloyd, Willie Mays, Jud Wilson, Bruce Petway, Bullet Rogan, Ben Taylor, Bingo DeMoss, Oscar Charleston, Bill Drake and Jelly Gardner.

"The Chicago American Giants under the management of Rube Foster from 1910 thru 1922 was the greatest black team I ever saw," said Tweed.

"The Giants regular line up was Leroy Grant, 1B; Bingo DeMoss, 2B; Bobby Williams, SS; Dave Malarcler, 3B; Jimmy Lyons, LF; Carlos Torrienti, CF; Jerry Gardner, RF; and Frank Duncan, C. However, Rube had under his wing, or had use for the services of other greats down thru the years, such as Oscar Charleston, John Beckwith, Pete Hill, John Henry Lloyd, Joe Mendez, Bruce Petway, Joe Green, Walter Ball, Jim Taylor, Jim Brown, Home Run Johnson, and many more."

Webb brought along score books and scrapbooks concerning more than 60 years of play, including a magazine from Sumner High School principal John D. Buckner. Broeg received an early History Book on major league baseball from Tweed—records up to 1910.

FEW HISTORICAL DATES

August 10, 1927, The St. Louis Stars played to the largest crowd that ever witnessed a regular Negro National League Baseball Game. Approximately 14,000 fans jammed the stands, including yours truly. We saw first baseman Willie Bobo knock a home run over the car—shed that beat Rube Foster's Giants, 1-0. Here!

May 30, 1944, during World War II, the Indianapolis Clowns and the Cuban Stars drew a record 31,000 fans.

July 4, 1941, the first all Negro game was held at old Sportsman park between the Chicago American Giants and the Kansas City Monarchs. Over 21,000 fans attended the game as the Monarch won, 2-1.

October 7, 1919, Smokey Joe Williams, greatest black fast ball pitcher, came East to pitch for the Lincoln Giants against John McGraw's New York Giants in an exhibition game. He hurled a no-hitter against the Giants' line up of Burns, Kauffmann, Young, Zimmerman, Fletcher, Doyle, Holke, and

Kenney, with Savage Speed fanned 20, however, losing, 1-0, because of miscues by his infield.

In Tween's 44 years of service to Tandy Baseball League before he retired in 1966, he has had a hand in grooming such local big leaguers as Elston Howard, Big Luke Easter, Al Smith, Sam Pendleton, Quincy Troupe, Ted Savage, Sam Jethroe and Nate Colbert.

NORMAL "TWEED" WEBB'S RECORD BOOK

Normal "Tweed" Webb, long time St. Louis Argus Baseball Reporter and Scout, who campaigned for the admission of Blacks into the major leagues before the "Jackie Robinson Days" and whose effort led to James "Cool Papa" Bell's election to the Hall of Fame.

A prominent figure in amateur and Pro Circles, is one of the most admired and respected Black Baseball Historians in America. A self-employed Sign Painter, "Tweed" turned down many offers to be a professional baseball player!

Webb helped organize numerous baseball leagues in his distinguished career and was proud of having a hand in grooming major leaguers such as Elston Howard, Nate Colbert, Luke Easter, Al Smith, Sammy Jethroe, Quincy Troupe, Sam Pendleton, who got their start as sandlotters here! "Tweed" has followed baseball since he was a Bat Boy for Rube Foster's Chicago American Giants when they played at Knuebler's Park over on North Broadway in 1917, the home of the St. Louis Giants.

Our honored member is active in many baseball organizations. He is a charter member of the Amateur Baseball Hall of Fame, organizer of the Old Time Negro Baseball Players Association and Tandy Baseball League. He is researcher for Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y. and member of Society For American Baseball Research. In addition, he is public relation Board member of the Mathew-Dickey Boy's Club.

1974 BIG YEAR FOR TWEED

On March 21, he was among first 10 players inducted into the newly Amateur Baseball Hall of Fame. On July 29, he, "Cool Papa" Bell and Satchel Paige appeared on Joe Garagiola's Baseball World Show on NBC-TV. He saw "Cool Papa" inducted into the Hall of Fame. Another great Day Tweed talks about—July 12, 1964, then Captain Tom Brooks set up the "Normal 'Tweed' Webb Day" before 10,000 fans at Tandy Park's East-West game with over 200 old time baseball players in attendance.

Webb usually referred to as "Mr. Tandy League", started his Tandy career as a shortstop for the Old Black Sox, managed by his father, Sherman Webb and has held positions as Captain, Manager, Vice President, Secretary, Announcer and Official Scorer in 44 years of affiliation with the league. In 1934, "Tweed" refused the presidency. He ended his active amateur career with a .350 batting average—perfect bunter and hit and run man. Played with such championship teams as Broomer Tailors and Pullman Shop. In 1933, he managed the Harper Potter Roofers and later played on other Tandy Teams before retiring in 1936. In 1926, Webb played shortstop for the Fort Wayne Pirates in the Negro National League and was official scorer 17 years in Black Big Leagues.

In his retirement, he limits his baseball reporting to just special events: Deaths, Sickness, Mathew-Dickey Boys Club and Historical Dates, etc.

Tweed calls his neighbors of the 4500 and 4600 block of Enright Avenue, "the greatest people in the world."

A ROCKY JOB OF REPORTING ON ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, if the Rockefeller Commission on CIA activities had any public credibility to begin with, it lost that when Vice President ROCKEFELLER characterized its recent report as revealing of no major transgressions committed by the CIA. Certainly the first and essential step toward appropriate remedial action is a painfully honest and full public admission of what all our foreign intelligence apparatus. Instead of admission, we got a dose of gloss from the Vice President, gloss so transparent as to be inconsistent with his own commission's admittedly incomplete report.

Mr. Speaker, political satirist, Art Buchwald, recently published in the Washington Post a column that takes a well deserved poke at the Vice President and the Commission he headed. Though laughable, I deeply hope the serious underside of his humor is not lost on us or the American people. With that caveat in mind, I now insert Mr. Buchwald's column in the RECORD:

A ROCKY JOB OF REPORTING ON ORGANIZED CRIME

(By Art Buchwald)

The Don Corleone Commission has just handed in its report on organized crime to the President.

Don Corleone, the godfather of the report, told newspapermen, "We have done the most thorough and comprehensive job of any commission ever appointed by the President, and we have come to the unanimous conclusion that, while a few laws were broken by organized criminals, there were no massive violations."

"Organized crime in the United States may have done some things in contradiction to the statutes, but in comparison to the total Mafia effort they were minor."

Don Corleone was asked if his commission had investigated the close ties between the Mafia and the CIA.

"We have heard some witnesses who have testified that the Mafia and the CIA worked closely together on several projects. But it is our opinion that this was on a lower level and none of the Mafia chieftains had ever approved of an activity involving the CIA. We would never condone our soldiers trafficking with spies and the counterintelligence people."

A newspaperman wanted to know if the Mafia was aware of any assassination attempts involving CIA personnel.

"On occasion there was talk of assassination, but the Mafia bosses rejected it out of hand when they found out it was illegal. There have been charges in the media that organized crime worked closely with the CIA. What the average person does not understand is that, in order to do its job and protect the country's interest, the Mafia has to work with many unsavory people."

"We work with politicians, the police, informers and, I'm sorry to say, even legal businessmen. But you will never have a strong organized crime force in this country unless you can use every weapon at your disposal."

The next question Don Corleone was asked

by a reporter was, "Did the Mafia promise the CIA anything in exchange for its co-operation in the illegal acts that were discussed?"

"I can say unequivocally that where we enlisted the CIA in our activities nothing was promised in exchange. Our feeling has always been that the CIA offered its help out of patriotism for the country, and it would have been a mistake to reward them by letting them in on any of our rackets."

Don Corleone held up the report to the newspapermen and said, "I think you are going to be surprised and pleased by the comprehensive nature of the material that is in here. We left no stone unturned to find out if organized crime figures in this country went beyond their mandate. We called 51 witnesses including the bosses of every major city in this country and, while a few of them admitted to minor traffic violations, we could not find one bit of evidence implicating any of them in gambling, drugs or white slavery."

"Will the information on the Mafia's connection with assassinations be made public?" the godfather was asked.

"It would be a mistake to release this information as it is confidential and not in the country's interest. If the President decides the people should know, he has it in his power to declassify the report. But great harm could be done to organized crime if its relation with the CIA was leaked at this time."

The final question asked was, "Don Corleone, do you think there is any conflict of interest in the fact that your commission was made up of people who have been involved with organized crime for years?"

"On the contrary, we're the only ones capable of understanding it. We leaned over backward to get at the truth and when you read the report you will be amazed at what a great job we did. This is not to say we haven't recommended any reforms. For one thing we have strongly urged that, if the CIA contacts any of our people in the future, the godfathers must be informed of it immediately."

GUERRILLA ACTIVITIES CHARGED AGAINST PUERTO RICAN SOCIALIST PARTY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, radio broadcasts from Santo Domingo, the capital of the Dominican Republic, reported that three Puerto Ricans had been arrested earlier in the month and were awaiting trial on charges of having smuggled three Dominican guerrillas into the island Republic from Cuba by boat.

The three men, all members of the self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninist revolutionary vanguard Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP), included Angel Gandia, a member of the PSP's elite Central Committee; Johnny Sampson and Raul Garcia. The three Dominican guerrillas, to date still at large, were identified as Claudio Caamano Grullon, Toribio Pena Jaquez and Manfredo Casado Villar.

The detained PSP members are being represented by three Puerto Rican lawyers—Noel Colon Martinez, Gilberto Concepcion Suarez and Carlos Gallisa—and David Scribner, an identified mem-

ber of the Communist Party, U.S.A., long active in the National Lawyers Guild.

Dominican Armed Forces Secretary Maj. Gen. Juan Rene Beauchamps stated that the three men were under military custody, and alleged that they had confessed to having taken the three guerrillas, who formerly lived in Cuba, to the southern coast of the Dominican Republic. The team of lawyers held a press conference on June 20 and claimed their clients had been kidnaped from their boat.

Juan Mari Bras, secretary general of the PSP, issued a statement denouncing the action of the Dominican Government and asserting:

We insist that our three comrades kidnaped by the Dominican Government have committed no crime, nor is there any truth in the confessions forced out of them. They have been kidnapped, jailed and tortured for being members of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. Their captors are actually persecuting our continued activity for the independence and national liberation of Puerto Rico.

On Monday, June 30, David Scribner and Florencio Merced Rosa held a press conference in New York City. Florencio Merced, a member of the PSP Political Committee, is one of the PSP's more active international travelers. In January 1973, Merced was in Havana "to coordinate from Cuba an international campaign of solidarity with the Puerto Rican political prisoners." In June, Merced headed a PSP delegation to Communist North Korea.

Scribner described some of the measures he had taken to apply pressure on U.S. Embassy and consular officials to persuade Dominican authorities to release the three revolutionaries. Scribner leveled the usual charges of torture and U.S. "complicity" during the press conference.

Speaking for the PSP, Merced claimed the arrest of the three PSP members "is a conspiracy between the Balaguer regime and U.S. colonial authorities." Merced further charged that the detained men "practice fishing as a sport" and had become lost when taken into custody by Dominican authorities.

An atlas indicates it is some 50 miles across open seas from the Puerto Rican Island of Mona to the nearest point on the Dominican shore, and it is at least another 60 miles west along the shore to the city of La Romana where they were detained.

The Puerto Rican Socialist Party, a self-styled "revolutionary vanguard," has proclaimed it bases its "programs, organization, theoretical analyses and practices in Marxist-Leninist theory," and that it believes "a dictatorship of the proletariat will destroy the bourgeoisie and obtain control of the means of production to then organize the economic development of the country."

Furthermore, the PSP's political declaration at its 1973 U.S. Zone Congress stated:

Of the third world, the Puerto Rican people are the principal classical colony of the U.S., its main prop and military fortress. The Puerto Rican people have the possibility—and responsibility of— . . . transporting the third world's war of liberation to the very heart of the North American cities.

In 1967, PSP founder and general secretary Juan Mari Bras said:

Just as imperialism uses Puerto Rico as a bridgehead for its penetration into Latin America, so will the Patriotic Vanguard of Puerto Rico offer itself as a bridge over which world revolution can penetrate into the United States.

Throughout its 15-year career [first under the name Movimiento Pro Independencia (MPI)], the PSP leadership and membership have been involved in a wide variety of violent acts, ranging from antidraft riots at the University of Puerto Rico in which police officers and students were killed through bombings, arson and bank robbery.

The PSP has from the beginning placed itself under the tutelage of the Cuban Communists who have trained, according to FBI figures, more than 135 Cuban revolutionaries in guerrilla warfare, sophisticated sabotage and the use of explosives.

In this connection, the FBI is currently seeking one Filiberto Ojeda Rios, 41, characterized as a Puerto Rican-born Cuban-trained espionage agent, for questioning in the January 24th FALN bombing of the Fraunces Tavern in New York City in which four persons died and nearly 50 were injured. Rios has been sought by the FBI since he jumped \$100,000 bail in San Juan, P.R., 5 years ago after his arrest in connection with the bombing of hotels and other institutions there.

Reporter Ronald Koziol reported in the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1975, that:

Rios is considered a major link to at least a half dozen Puerto Rican extremist groups seeking independence from the United States.

Koziol continued:

Confidential U.S. intelligence reports, made available to The Tribune, traced Rios' alleged spying and terrorist activities back to 1961 when he was recruited by Cuba to spy on American military installations in Puerto Rico.

The PSP newspaper, Claridad, and Puerto Rico Libre, the monthly newsletter of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, whose executive secretary is Alfredo Lopez, a member of the PSP U.S. Zone Political Committee, again charge that law enforcement surveillance of the PSP's revolutionary activities amount to "political repression."

Does Sr. Lopez seriously wish to suggest that it is improper for the FBI to take an interest in an organization which proudly proclaims its Marxist-Leninist revolutionary intent, which flaunts its cooperation with and dependence on the Cuban regime, and whose leader states that:

Armed struggle as a sort of urban guerrilla is definitely present in the struggle for independence in Puerto Rico in an irreversible way.

Alfredo Lopez has devoted a column in the most recent issue of Puerto Rico Libre to my analysis of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1973, in which he wrote:

McDonald's report consists of a well-researched analysis of the Puerto Rican So-

cialist Party's United States branch and a two-page rundown of the composition and activities of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee.

McDonald identifies many of the Committee's National Board Members, lists our whole national staff and details many of our activities, including the very recent tour by Pedro Grant sponsored by our committee. It makes one start to think. * * *

Lopez continued:

It's clear from McDonald's analysis, which spends many paragraphs saying that the importance of our committee, and the issue of Puerto Rico, is that it unified the left, that whoever did that analysis—the FBI perhaps—understands the dangers of the committee, and the dangers of left unity in this country.

It is clear that they all understand the international importance of the issue of Puerto Rico as a fundamental point in the strategy against American imperialism when they speak of the International Conference in Havana.

One would in general expect the sort of unprincipled, elitist personal insults Lopez has gratuitously inserted elsewhere in his column from the PSP's ultra-militant rival, the Popular Socialist Movement (Movimiento Socialista Popular—MSP) rather than from PSP. After all, Lopez was not attacked personally in any way although the ideologies and activities of his groups were analyzed. No doubt such is to be expected of a man whose party has rejected the electoral process for Leninist conspiracy.

It is of interest to note that Alfredo Lopez, now a leader of the "nominally Maoist" Puerto Rican Socialist Party, has an extensive background of activity with pro-terrorist factions of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), a rival Trotskyist Communist organization.

Lopez was formerly a member of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency (POT) of the Socialist Workers Party. The POT faction supported the militant pro-terrorist stance of the leadership of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the principal international coordinating body for Trotskyist Communists.

The POT faction, of which Lopez was a member, was defeated at the 1971 SWP national convention, the majority of the SWP leadership believing that at this particular time, and that under these particular conditions, the use of terrorist tactics and urban guerrilla warfare in the United States is unwise. However, the SWP leadership have made it clear that they reserve the option for terrorism in the future.

Many members of the POT tendency then left the SWP. Those POT members who remained within the SWP then organized into yet another pro-terrorist faction, the Internationalist Tendency.

Alfredo Lopez has retained his close associations with, curiously enough, both the present SWP leadership and the IT, to the extent that on March 24, 1974, he met with two IT leaders, Hedda Garza and William Massey, and questioned them as to decisions taken at the 10th Congress of the Fourth International held the previous month in Stockholm, Sweden. Massey had been a delegate.

At the 10th Congress of the Fourth International, the pro-terrorist leader-

ship defeated all attempts to modify their position supporting the use of violence now as a revolutionary tactic. Massey supported the pro-terrorist resolutions at the congress.

Because the meeting between Lopez and the IT leaders had been organized outside the SWP chain of command and not through the executive committee of the SWP's New York local chapter—Lopez became one of the factors leading to the SWP's expulsion of many of his IT friends in July 1974.

Lopez had told Dick Roberts who had been assigned by the SWP to maintain contact with the PSP that he would be meeting with Massey and Garza. Lopez then later confirmed that the meeting had indeed taken place and the topics of discussion to an investigator from the SWP's security unit, the control commission.

It is interesting to note the criticism recently leveled at the PSP by its newest rival, the Popular Socialist Movement, at a heavily attended meeting on June 28th at New York City's Washington Square Methodist Church, site of innumerable leftist meetings.

The MSP delegation, headed by its secretary general, Luis Angel Torres, a member of the Puerto Rico Legislature, was sponsored by El Comité—Movimiento De Izquierda Nacional Puertorriqueno—a Maoist-oriented organization from New York City's Upper West Side; and other non-Puerto Rico Maoist groups including the Congress of African People—CAP; the October League—OL; and Workers Viewpoint.

Like most of the U.S. Maoist groups, the MSP is working toward the creation of a "genuine Marxist-Leninist party" in Puerto Rico. Among the points made by Torres at the meeting was that the "fundamental method" for achieving liberation is "armed struggle" and "protracted revolutionary war."

The Maoist weekly Guardian of July 9, 1975, reported:

Torres characterized the strategy of the Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP) as "militant pacifism" and charged that it relied principally on the election process. He characterized the strategy of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) as being aimed as "insurrection," but without a coherent plan for making this into a protracted struggle.

Torres' Popular Socialist Movement was formed in November 1974, by a group of ultra-left dissidents from the Puerto Rican Independence Party (Partido Independencia Puertorriqueno—PIP). The MSP is involved with the PSP-controlled United Workers Movement—MOU—and asserts that its main base is in the Puerto Rican working class.

The PIP's leader, Ruben Berrios, who has served in both the Puerto Rican House and Senate, obviously disagrees with Luis Angel Torres' dismissal of PIP's policies as "militant pacifism." In a speech at San Juan on November 24, 1974, shortly after the Torres faction had left PIP, Berrios described PIP as "a flexible, revolutionary mass party composed of and led by the working class of Puerto Rico." Berrios added:

We believe in socialism but socialism with a human face.

It is noted that the PIP and PSP have exchange members on more than one occasion through factional splits. In January of this year, Carlos Gallisa, a Member of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives, formally joined the PSP. Gallisa had been elected to the legislature originally as a member of the PIP, but broke with Berrios in 1973. He remained in the legislature without party affiliation, but appeared at many PSP functions and presented the politics of the PSP in his legislative program. "El Caballo" is now one of the team of lawyers representing Angel Gandia and two other PSP members detained in the Dominican Republic for alleged guerrilla activities.

In his column, Alfredo Lopez expressed a "gut feeling" of rage brought on by public discussion of the public activities and statements of his "revolutionary vanguard" party. With self-righteous rhetoric he asked:

Who the hell do these people think they are? What makes them think they have a right to spy on people * * * ?

First, Mr. Lopez should be aware that the verb "to spy" means "to watch secretly or to obtain information in a clandestine manner." He must be well aware that my scrutiny and analyses of his organization's activities are very public.

Nevertheless, the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, have not merely the right, but the duty, to keep a close watch on an organization which offers itself "as a bridge over which world revolution can penetrate into the United States," whether its activities be in Havana, Pyongyang, and Prague or in Hartford, Philadelphia, and Ponce.

In the words of former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg:

The Constitution of the United States is not a "suicide pact." The Nation has the right and duty to protect itself from acts of espionage and sabotage and from attempts to overthrow the Government.

A TRIBUTE TO GEN. JOE BARTLETT

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to the many friends and admirers paying tribute to Brig. Gen. Dorsey J. Bartlett. His official "pinning" this Friday by Marine Corps Commandant Louis H. Wilson marks another milestone in what is one of the most exemplary public careers of which I have knowledge.

The public and official record of Joe's career—both with the U.S. Marine Corps and his 34 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives—has been duly noted and deservedly praised, both here and in the other body.

Joe's ability, dedication, warmth, personality, and integrity have been widely praised, and rightly so. Men who have had the privilege of knowing Joe many times longer than I have described the unique accomplishments and attributes of which we are all aware. To all of these I would enthusiastically add my endorsement.

What I personally would like to mention is the quality of the assistance, counsel, and friendship that this busy man so freely offers to all, but particularly to the younger Members of this body. As one who first entered this Chamber in 1972, filled with great resolve but little knowledge of the customs, rules, and procedures, I have a great appreciation of what Joe Bartlett has done to ease the entry of a generation of new Members.

For this assistance I shall always be grateful and of his friendship I shall always be proud. On the occasion of this well-earned honor, I wish to add my congratulations and best wishes to "General Joe" Bartlett.

CHILD CARE

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as is known, I have worked for a number of years to improve the quality of life for America's children.

Recently, Geoffrey Peterson, who is administrative assistant to Senator RIBICOFF, spoke in Stamford, Conn., about the need for comprehensive programs to meet the health, nutrition, and day care needs of children. Geoff has been working on Finance Committee legislation for Senator RIBICOFF and played a major role in our attempts to reform America's welfare programs.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHILD CARE CENTER OF STAMFORD

"America's children are the forgotten Americans of our time." On the 10th Anniversary of the Head Start program, the sad fact is that children in America do not have a head start. They are ignored.

Whether you look at health care, education, nutrition, or day care, children seem to fall at the bottom of our national priorities.

No wonder that America ranks below a dozen other countries in infant mortality.

No wonder that health programs fail to provide adequate protection for infants and for diagnosis and prevention.

No wonder that hundreds of thousands of youngsters must fend for themselves—their latchkeys the only day care they have.

No wonder 60,000 children each year are known to have suffered child abuse.

America's answer has been vetoes and cutbacks. Ex-President Nixon vetoed the Comprehensive Child Care Act in 1971, likening it to a plot to socialize America. This was nonsense. The tragedy is that 33 million children under 18 in America need care and

supervision of some kind. And six million preschoolers need care. Unfortunately, there are little over 4 million available day care spaces nationwide and less than one million of these meet acceptable standards. This is a national disgrace.

"There are 13 million poor children eligible for the Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program under Medicaid which was enacted into law by Senator Ribicoff in 1967. Today, fewer than 3 million of these children have received this health care, despite our repeated prodding of the federal and state governments." There is no excuse for this. The need for such a program is overwhelming.

Look at the statistics:

According to a Presidential study—

Retardation is found in 3% of all births;
5 out of 7 physically and mentally handicapped children receive no help at all;

12 million children need special care for eye conditions;

50% of all children under age 5 have never been to a dentist; and

2 million children need special care for orthopedic handicaps.

Even the most callous budget-cutter must realize that an ounce of prevention is less costly than a pound of cure.

Let's look at nutrition. Millions of children go to bed hungry and go to school without food in their stomachs.

President Ford has an answer for them—in his 1976 budget. He wants to:

(1) eliminate diet supplementation for 650,000 low-income, women, infants and children,

(2) eliminate 2½ billion school lunches for children from middle income homes,

(3) eliminate the school milk program for tens of millions of young children,

(4) eliminate all meals for any child in a day care center or Head Start Center, and

(5) take away school breakfasts from over 1½ million children each day.

And the President has tried to cut back food stamps. But, Congress stopped him. And I hope they'll stop him in his other cutback efforts.

I think it's time to reorder our priorities drastically.

It's time for a comprehensive program for children. This is what I would propose.

First, we should create a children's trust fund to protect children's programs from the ups and downs of the federal budget process. Congress and the President could not cut these funds. Money deposited in the fund could be used only for a list of enumerated children's programs. The highway lobby has its fund, the airlines have their fund, and energy may soon have its fund. The needs of children certainly merit creation of a protected fund for their programs. Senator Ribicoff has introduced the Children's Trust Fund bill in Congress. But he stands alone.

Second, let's create a national health insurance program for children—a kiddiecare plan. This junior Medicare proposal would place heavy emphasis on diagnosis, early prevention and treatment of illness in children. It may be many years before America will have a full national health insurance program. Let's start the task with a first step—health care for children.

Third, enactment of an expanded version of the comprehensive day care legislation introduced by Senator Mondale and cosponsored by Senator Ribicoff to upgrade our child care programs. We need more day care but it must be high quality. Standards must be monitored and enforced.

Fourth, creation of a tax credit for the cost of day care. While the tax cut bill liberalized the child care tax deduction, it does little to help those who do not itemize their deductions. If a businessman can deduct his two-martini lunch, how can we justify denying a similar credit for those who must pay

for day care? More and more people are in need of these services. Today, one out of three mothers are in the work force compared to one out of eight in 1948.

Fifth, expansion of nutrition, education, and Head Start programs now in existence with funds sheltered in the Children's Trust Fund.

Sixth, we need advocates for the cause of children.

Stamford and Connecticut are fortunate. They have Jeanne Ellis. She is a well-respected voice in Washington. But, the voice of big business and defense too often drowns out the Jeanne Ellises. All of you have a role to play in letting your Congressmen and Senators know how you feel.

You have friends in Washington. Senator Ribicoff is one of them. As his chief aide, I have worked on his child care legislation. I was proud that the first piece of legislation that I worked on that passed Congress when I came to Senator Ribicoff in 1971 would have set quality standards for day care. Unfortunately, it was vetoed by President Nixon. We have made some progress since then. But, it is not enough. Your help and support and the help of others like you throughout the nation can make a difference.

Let Senator Ribicoff and Congress hear from you. We are on your side.

HANDGUN DEATHS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, according to a report by the National Coalition to Ban Handguns:

The total number of gun deaths in all other free nations is exceeded by the number of gun deaths in the United States alone.

The report goes on to state that—

More people are murdered by handguns every 39 hours in our own country than were murdered by all firearms in England throughout the year of 1972.

The reason for such startling statistics lies in the fact that the United States has failed to pass any effective legislation controlling the sale and use of small, concealable handguns. Despite the support for such a bill that I and others in the House and Senate have given, meaningful legislation has not yet been enacted, and the number of fatal shootings in which such guns are involved continues to rise at an alarming rate. An editorial broadcast over WMAL-Radio on April 22 illustrates the distance that America lags behind other countries in enacting effective gun control:

We could learn a lesson from the Japanese.

If you are still not convinced strict handgun control would cut the country's crime rate in general and our homicide rate in particular . . . consider this rather startling comparison.

The population of Washington is less than 750,000. In 1974 there were 258 deaths caused by handguns. The City of Tokyo has almost 12 million people . . . 16 times the population of Washington and yet in 1974 there was not one single handgun death in Tokyo . . . not one.

There is strict handgun control in Tokyo. Possession of handguns, except in very few cases . . . is forbidden. The laws have been on the books for almost thirty years . . . ironi-

cally, the result of post-war occupation by Americans!!

We have given to Japan what we cannot give ourselves. Here, the handgun is given free reign. One of the most civilized countries in the world has the most uncivilized attitude towards guns.

The Japanese have shown us gun control does work. Isn't it time we demanded it for ourselves?

TAX DEDUCTION FOR UTILITY TAXES

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, each year, the residents of Norfolk and Virginia Beach, Va., pay millions of dollars in consumer utility taxes. These taxes, which are assessed by localities and collected by the utility companies, were once deductible from Federal income tax returns. The Revenue Act of 1964 substantially amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, making consumer utility taxes generally a nondeductible item. These taxes are by no means a pittance. Virginia Electric & Power Co., for example, collected over \$9 million in consumer utility taxes for the city of Norfolk in 1974 alone. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Veeco is not the only utility charged with the collection of these taxes.

We all feel the pinch of rising utility bills each month. This is the unfortunate consequence of our Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy. What is equally unfortunate for the consumer is the fact that regressive utility service taxes rise as a function of utility bills. Since the bulk of State and local taxes is deductible from Federal income tax returns, it is difficult to understand why consumer utility taxes are treated differently. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the citizens of this country are entitled to some relief in this area. For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 8133, which would allow Federal income tax deductions for State and local consumer utility taxes.

Aside from being regressive in nature, consumer utility taxes are levied on a service that is rising rapidly in cost itself. This presents a very real hardship for those citizens at the lower and middle portions of the income spectrum. The tax is further complicated by the divergence in local rates. The tax burden for public utility service in one community may be significantly higher than another community in the same State. The city of Norfolk, for instance, levies consumer utility taxes on residential properties at a rate of 25 percent of the first \$50 and 15 percent of all beyond \$50—with no ceiling—while Arlington County has no tax of this nature. Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that this tax should be repealed, only that a reinstatement of its status as a deductible item on Federal income tax returns would be prudent at this time. In this way, the average consumer could enjoy a certain amount of relief from spiraling utility expenses,

while allowing localities to maintain their necessary revenue levels. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will see fit to act on H.R. 8133 favorably and with the speed the public deserves.

GOVERNMENT DATA PROCESSING POLICY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at a conference on Federal Government Data Systems held recently here in Washington for members of government and industry, the keynote address was delivered by Dr. George E. Mueller, chairman of the board and president of System Development Corp. in my district in California.

As the former Associate Administrator of NASA's manned space flight program, Dr. Mueller has considerable experience in governmental information requirements, and in his current position with SDC, he is able to provide a valuable industry perspective on these same requirements.

I wish to call his address to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, which I believe they will find particularly interesting and informative.

The text of Dr. Mueller's speech follows:

GOVERNMENT DATA PROCESSING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Newman, thank you for inviting me to open this milestone conference on the next decade in Federal Government Data Systems. I am both pleased and honored to be here.

During this conference, both the government's views as a major buyer and private industry's views as vendors will be discussed. My years at NASA as a buyer and more recently at SDC as a seller, have raised fundamental questions in my mind regarding our procurement system—and suggest some possible solutions. Let me first discuss several problems relating to the government/industry interface and then conclude with a suggestion for greater industry participation in the generation of the Federal Government's ADP-related policies and procedures.

During the past three decades, the Federal Government has been a primary support to development in the computer industry. Rapid technological improvements in hardware and software as well as increased industrial diversity and competition have resulted from the Federal role as major customer and funder of research. We all recall that within NASA, Houston contributed to the development of IBM's OS system, that Huntsville contributed to the EXEC 8, and that Kennedy helped develop the operating system for the GE 635—now known as GCOS. The effect which the Federal Government will have on the computer industry over the next decade, and whether it can continue to have a major positive influence on industrial growth are two of the important questions to be explored at this conference.

Federal influence—for good or bad—can result from its status as a key customer, by legal constraints imposed on the industry or on users, and through the support for research and development that will generate marketable products.

Today, the Federal Government represents 12% of the U.S. ADP market. It is a very

large but no longer critical customer in most segments of the computer industry. Also, since government contract R&D is no longer the major source of funds in most areas of ADP technology, the Federal influence on basic ADP products and services is more likely to be shaped by legal constraints on users and suppliers than through positive contributions to progress. Recent privacy rules are an example of such an influence.

There are problem areas in procurement policy and procedures as well as aspects of the privacy area that require solutions. I suggest that one solution may lie in Data Processing professionals becoming more heavily involved in government policy development.

One problem area, Federal Government competition with the private sector, raises a very basic question: When should the government turn to industry to perform a job rather than performing it itself? OMB Circular A-76, which has been the policy guidance in this area, needs both further clarification and greater enforcement.

It states, "The guidelines in this circular are in furtherance of the Government's general policy of relying on the private enterprise system to supply its needs."

GSA's FMC-5 which establishes ADP procurement policies for equipment and services, states, "It is the general policy of government to rely on the private sector for its goods and services except when such action is not in the national interest."

OMB statistics show that only 17% of Federal ADP costs are for outside services and 31% for supplies and equipment, leaving 52% for in-house activities.

Circumstances have changed significantly during the last decade as the data processing industry's resources have expanded. Whole new service areas have grown in capabilities and size. Many of the regulations, laws and policies governing Federal ADP procurement were written many years ago in a period when this very volatile and expanding industry comprised a totally different mix of products and services. Today, a vast array of services outside of hardware are available within the commercial marketplace. I believe that both Federal and state governments should look at ways to use these capabilities to their fullest to improve government services.

For example, different Federal agencies with similar requirements and capabilities vary widely in their use of both facility managers for their computing centers, or software services contractors for their major development projects. In addition, the National 1974 report on Reliance on the Private Sector by the Federal Government for Data Processing Services, discusses instances where a governmental agency in direct competition with the private sector, acquired additional capacity in order to serve non-mission requirements for other agencies.

To increase usage of outside services I believe most procurements should be changed from component purchases to turn-key systems procurements based on requirements specifications. This is already a common practice in NASA.

We should set a reasonable and attainable goal of having 40% of governmental data processing activities performed by the private sector by 1980, through outside services.

Privacy requirements represent another difficult problem area. My own philosophy is somewhat different from that generally proclaimed by critics of data processing who emphasize the potential negative impact of computer-based systems on privacy. I maintain, that properly managed and designed, a large integrated computer-based data system approach, when compared with past manual systems, can and will protect the privacy of the individual while improving system efficiency. My optimism regarding the privacy aspects of large integrated systems is based on the simple fact that current decentral-

ized, manual systems have not met privacy requirements. The costs of providing adequate safeguards for manual systems and monitoring their continuous application is too high to be practical.

Large, centralized, automated systems, in addition, provide benefits in the form of cost reductions and security levels that can be varied to meet user needs.

In a centralized, automated system environment it is relatively easy and practical to have separate privacy organizations to set security guidelines, provide required procedures and continuously monitor large installations. The requirements for notice, accuracy, relevance, access and purpose limitation can all be better controlled and screened in a properly designed large facility, with full-time security, privacy and audit staffs, than in small installations of manual or computer-based systems. Meeting these requirements on a routine level requires only an expansion of currently available data management and control systems using available software technology.

In the security area there are admittedly major unresolved technological problems. The prevention of accidental or intentional unauthorized disclosure, modification, or destruction of data requires very different procedures to protect systems from penetration by the sophisticated outsider than from the dishonest insider.

SDC's past work in security for the defense community, has always assumed that we were protecting against a skilled, technologically sophisticated penetrator with access to his own carbon copy of the system in question. Emphasis was placed on operating system controls, certifiably secure systems, and the like. In these areas we are still several years from satisfactory solutions. Protection against the sophisticated outsider for multi-access, communications-oriented computing is still a problem.

In the private and civil government sectors where the privacy regulations apply, a different set of assumptions is required. Experience has shown that in these areas the greatest threat is the dishonest, but authorized, user of the system. Today, the security levels possible through the use of newer data management systems and high quality password management are equal to those attainable in only a few of the highest quality manual systems.

This does not mean that skilled penetrators are not a threat. Rather, it means that skilled penetrators are not a highly probable threat. Justice Department statistics indicate that there were approximately 340 data processing related security violations in 1974 in the private sector. Of these, only two were committed by programmers both of whom were authorized to use the system. All of the violators misused that to which they were already authorized.

Incidentally, the average economic impact of each violation was over a half million dollars. More importantly, there was no reported major economic or operational impact in 1974 in the private sector resulting from a technically sophisticated attack on a computer system.

Certainly, there is a difference between the computer security problems of the private sector—in which impact is measured in dollars and those of the non-defense related government sector where the costs of disclosure are more often social. The solutions to both of these classes of problems are similar, however, in that both are targeted at the same class of penetrator—the insider. Against such insiders, current disclosure accounting and journalization methods can satisfy the requirements of the privacy legislation, as well as provide a level of security adequate for most civilian agencies.

Finally, there is the issue of Federal Government procurement procedures and their impact on both the buying agency and the

selling company. In order to set a framework for the several agency speakers tomorrow, I would like to identify three levels of data processing product or service procurements—the standard item procurement, the custom item procurement, and the turnkey procurement—and mention a few key evolving problem areas.

GSA's present practice is to enter standard items into the GSA schedules and to utilize non-schedule GSA ADP procurement procedures for custom and turnkey items. Because of the effort and time required to utilize the general procurement procedures, GSA, user agencies and vendors have been expanding the products and services having GSA schedules and generating a rapidly increasing list of mandatory procurement contracts. For many established and standardized products, GSA schedules and mandatory contracts are clearly justified; what needs to be implemented is a mechanism for truly competitive periodic reevaluations so that improved items are quickly available to the user.

In the area of custom item procurement many of the proposed mandatory procurement contracts are for equipment and services having discrete and unique capabilities. Aside from shortening the procurement process and improving standardization there are few apparent benefits from mandatory contracts for these types of items. And there is a possible negative impact when agencies over-purchase technical capabilities or do not get the technical capabilities they need. With the advent in the marketplace of microprogrammable processors and flexible storage devices there is no reason that systems designed for the user's real needs should not be procured. Perhaps GSA should institute a schedule for "tailorable" systems where the basic components can be purchased from a schedule and the customizing can be supplied from a T&M fixed price schedule.

Use of the GSA non-schedule ADP procurement procedures for custom or turnkey items requires a great deal of effort on the government side for preparation of specifications, procurement, evaluator and selection. On industry's side, a great deal of effort is wasted in proposal writing and second guessing source selection boards. Additionally, turnkey procurements, which are becoming increasingly prevalent, are multi-technology and multi-function in nature. The complicated and lengthy procurement process for these complex systems separates the decision-making from the pool of technicians who could actually determine if the best-and-final configuration and services package will really produce an acceptable working system for the government.

As time passes, fewer and fewer companies will be able to afford these expensive proposal efforts, which only serve to raise the ultimate cost of their systems to the government. They will increasingly bypass government business, and competition will be reduced. Of particular concern is the requirement for "best and final" offers. In practice this results in an auction where the most knowledgeable contractor "wins" to the ultimate sorrow of both parties.

In conclusion, I would propose that the Executive branch establish a policy level post for data processing equivalent to the existing telecommunications policy post. This would help assure maximum effectiveness for the contributions made to our society and Federal Government operations from data processing.

The impact of recent Federal Government policies on data processing has not been fully realized. For example, last month's policy statement on Criminal Justice Information Systems' privacy and security by the Department of Justice requires dedicated equipment usage by the late 1970s. This is just about the time when secure new data processing equipment, software and proce-

dures that will not require expensive dedicated equipment should be available. As a data processing executive, I look forward to the large State CJIS systems that will probably be created to meet this policy and the significant business it will create for the industry. But as a taxpayer, perhaps the money could be better spent.

My plea is, therefore, use the data processing professionals available in both government and industry. Use them as staff, for testimony and to produce impact studies on such matters as the effect of privacy regulations on data processing users and vendors.

As we look forward to the next ten years, during which it is estimated the Federal Government will spend \$25 billion on data processing, we must work for a partnership in national service between the Federal Government and the extensive and growing resources of the computer industry—a partnership that will draw on the strengths of each.

**"PEACE WITH HONOR" HAS
BROUGHT NEITHER**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Oak Cliff Tribune of Dallas, Tex., by Ray Zauber points out some interesting ideas regarding this Nation's foreign policy. The times are ripe for a look at the United States' approach to foreign affairs.

Mr. Zauber's thoughts on the subject deserve careful consideration. I hope that each Member of Congress and the general public will read his words.

The editorial follows:

"PEACE WITH HONOR" HAS BROUGHT NEITHER

Peace with honor.

That phrase may often be evaluated in future years by historians. It could go down with Remember the Alamo, or Remember Pearl Harbor, in infamy.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's place in history will probably be subject of many colloquies as well. The erudite and idealistic, peripatetic and persuasive, arrogant and egotistical surrogate of Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford has made a monumental effort for peace.

Whether his long-range analysis of Communist intentions will stand the test of time must wait until history unfolds future chapters. The peace bought in Indochina by the Nixon-Kissinger formula has carried a ludicrous pricetag.

That we would evacuate our troops, withdraw our financial and military support, ground our bombers and leave enemy citadels unscathed when an armistice was being violated blatantly defies credibility.

After the lessons of Hungary and Czechoslovakia—and the futility of Korea—how could our negotiators possibly agree to a withdrawal which had no provisions for securing the terms?

The blood and treasure invested in Indochina to prevent the insidious spread of Marxism and new footholds for the enemy was a terrible price to pay. From all accounts of the debacles in Phnom Penh and Saigon, America merely walked away from the struggle leaving the Khmer Rouge and Vietcong to operate almost with impunity.

The Tribune has no answers for the solution to Southeast Asia or to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Citizens of this benevolent nation have long since wearied of this agonizing war.

Why American troops were committed to Asian soil—especially after Korea—was hard to comprehend. And why our politicians insisted on a limited confrontation which again provided sanctuaries for the foe was the ultimate cruelty to our fighting forces.

The United States had been warned since the 1930's that a land war in Asia would be disastrous because of the endless eastern manpower and the differences in human philosophy.

Life is abundant and cheap in Asia where the customs and mores are incomprehensible to the western world. The strange and rugged terrain which provided shelter to the native and living hell to our fighting forces also worked against our success.

While American soldiers and sailors have been extricated physically from the war-front, there will still be fiscal and humanitarian responsibilities to prevent starvation and genocide.

The liberal politicians refer to the impending ascendancy of Communists in Cambodia and Vietnam as liberation of governments. Liberation is a polite term for complete and abject surrender.

So the inexorable spread of totalitarianism in a world divided between tyranny and freedom continues.

America is apparently on a collision course to disaster.

CHILD CARE SCANDAL IN NEW YORK CITY EXPOSED—PART VI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the last in a six part series done by the New York Daily News on the scandals associated with the private care agencies of New York City.

Today's article reveals how the private child care agencies have repeatedly refused to cooperate with a new organization, CS-Spaulding, whose sole aim is to place foster children in adoptive homes. These child care agencies appear to be intent on keeping these children under long-term foster care. Part of the blame is to be delegated to the city child care system itself which gives a daily reimbursement to these agencies for each child under foster care.

Various methods are employed for preventing adoption of these children. There are many cases of children who could have been made legally free as infants but are kept in foster homes until their age makes adoption difficult. Frequently, the agencies use the excuse of emotional and physical handicaps for not releasing these children for adoption. However, according to the State adoption exchange, the majority of their prospective adoptive parents have actually indicated a preference to adopt a handicapped child.

This article also points out how incredible stumbling blocks are placed in the way of couples attempting to adopt foster children. They are put through a rigorous and often embarrassing series of interviews which try to expose their innermost thoughts and sexual relations. Many times these couples are not informed of their status and are kept in suspense for months. Reasons given for

rejection are oftentimes illegal ones, such as a woman being rejected because she was too fat or a middle-aged couple being turned down for being too old.

This deplorable situation again clearly cries out for reform. We have thousands of qualified adoptive parents who are prevented from adopting these needy children because of the present system. As one of the original sponsors of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, I urge effective legislation on this grave problem.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the sixth article entitled, "Adoption Agencies Work Hard—at Keeping Kids". I would like to add at this point that I intend to hold Congressional hearings on this subject during the upcoming recess.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., ADVERTISER BACKS FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the June 3, 1975, editorial appearing in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser that supports the goals of H.R. 3249, the Financial Disclosure Act which Congressman STEELMAN and I have introduced and which has been cosponsored by 130 of our colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, June 3, 1975]

TIME OF "GLASS POCKETS" OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS HERE

Legislation is pending in both the U.S. Senate and the House which would require public officials to make full public disclosure of their finances.

The Senate has twice approved such legislation only to have the bill die in the House. This year, however, there are 132 co-sponsors for the House bill, including Rep. Ken Hechler of Huntington.

The bills would generally require all elected officials, candidates for office and high ranking civil service and military personnel to file annual reports of their assets, liabilities, and other holdings over \$1,000 with the U.S. Comptroller General. The reports would be available to the public and the press.

Members of these persons' immediate family would also be required to file.

While many members of both the House and Senate have filed such reports voluntarily, it clearly is time to make such filings a requirement of service in any high government position.

Such a law would help determine cases where the personal interests of officials conflict with the interests of the public. It would also standardize the current tangle of guidelines and directives on disclosure in the various branches of government. And it would apply to many employees who do not normally come under public scrutiny and pressure concerning their finances.

A recent newsletter from Common Cause, a citizens lobby group, says a Government Accounting Office study found 42 employees of the U.S. Geological Survey had financial interests which conflicted with their official duties. The Geological Survey is the agency responsible for determining the value of

natural resources for federal leasing purposes, and several of the employees had interests in mining companies.

Such conflicts ill-serve the public. We urge passage of the so-called "glass pockets" legislation on financial disclosure pending before both House and Senate.

HEYWARD DAVENPORT: MODEL CITIES ADMINISTRATOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a leading community activist in New York, Heyward Davenport, has been appointed Model Cities Administrator. Involved in a wide range of programs and organizations in Harlem, Mr. Davenport brings energy and commitment to his new post.

I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent article from the New York Post on Mr. Davenport:

A MODEL VIEW

Heyward Davenport has been in his new office such a short time, he said the other day, that he had not yet figured out just what was where in his panoramic view. "Now is that the Manhattan Bridge?" he asked. "Or the Brooklyn?" With the geography settled in his mind he returned to his desk, leaving his interviewer with the feeling that he is not a man who spends much time gazing out of windows.

Davenport has had his 17th floor office at 2 Lafayette St. for just three weeks since his appointment as Model Cities Administrator, and he is still spending some time at the Social Services Dept., where he was deputy commissioner and where he is completing a project he began months ago.

He began his career as a case worker at Social Services, worked for a time for the Urban League, and eventually became executive director of the antipoverty agency, HARYOU-ACT.

For a time he was an assistant administrator of the City Planning Commission, a job he left to return to Social Services. At Model Cities he will direct the administration of a number of anti-poverty programs, some in physical reconstruction of slums, others providing a variety of social services for the residents of the newly rebuilt neighborhoods.

Davenport was born 42 years ago near Newberry, S. C., the eldest of three children of Leo and Beulah Davenport.

The family owned a "substantial amount of land," but it was not very profitable to farm and "we were not exactly prosperous," he says.

Young Heyward worked from the time he was 10, selling cosmetics door-to-door, farming an acre of cotton given him by his father, raising chickens. He walked four miles to school each day, and that memory makes him smile "whenever I hear about busing. We were passed every day by the white children in their buses."

He says now that the racism he experienced as a child was easier to bear because he was "in the wide open spaces. We had a lot of elbow room and I wasn't subjected to the daily sting of discrimination. I don't remember ever feeling embittered by it."

After graduation from an all-black high school in Newberry, he enrolled in Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, N. C., but left after two years to join the Air Force. "I thought I was going to see the world, but I didn't see much of it." In fact he spent

almost the entire four years in Texas, save for one brief stay in Alaska.

He was discharged a technical sergeant and returned to college.

He did well in his classes and, in his senior year, became a leader in the sit-in movement in Charlotte, a period he says "was the high point of my life."

Charlotte was one of the first Southern cities to desegregate its downtown restaurants, and Davenport recalls the time with pleasure and verve. "It was a very complex operation. The students still had to go to classes and getting them into Charlotte and back for their classes meant that car pools had to be organized. We arranged with black-owned service stations for gasoline and we would issue yellow cards to certain students with cars so they could get a certain amount of free gasoline."

The Charlotte police department was more enlightened than those in other Southern cities and there was very little violence, and so little bitterness that Davenport for a time considered using the reputation he had built during the movement as the basis for a political career. "I only came to New York to go to Columbia [where he got an MA in psychology] and I intended to go back to Charlotte."

To support himself and his family—he had married Barbara Hausley while he was in college and their daughter was born in 1960—he worked as a caseworker for the Welfare Dept. and attended Columbia part-time.

He rose fairly quickly through the civil service system, becoming a vocational counselor and eventually supervisor of the department's program in rehabilitative counseling. He also became active in a Harlem Democratic club and abandoned his plans to go back to the South.

The Davenports now have four daughters and live in the middle class sector of Harlem that is called "Sugar Hill." Davenport is vice-chairman of the local planning board, and says, "there isn't much sugar left."

With his new administrator status, at \$45,400 a year, comes a car and driver to bring him home to his office at about eight each morning and take him home again about seven in the evening. "I accept it as part of the role," he says.

In his spare time, which he says is scarce, he likes to read about foreign affairs. He has a lingering desire to write a book about experiences in the civil rights movement in Charlotte.

SYMBOL OF EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, recently five manufacturing firms in my district were awarded the Sears, Roebuck & Co. Symbol of Excellence Award.

This award is presented each year to recognize those manufacturers who maintain the highest level of product integrity and overall excellence in the manufacture and service of that product.

In a time when we hear too often of the bad news of our economy and have too much spotlight on the negative side of our free-enterprise institutions, I think it is important for us to give attention to the positive accomplishments of firms such as these five.

Therefore, I am pleased to take this moment to add by congratulations to those of the people in our district and to express our pride in the recipients of this

award this year: Bates Nitewear of Greensboro, Kayser-Roth of Burlington, Adams-Millis Corp. of High Point, Burlington House Draperies of Reidsville and Slane Hosiery of High Point.

THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an article in the June 14 New Republic, "What To Make of *Mayaguez*" by Roger Morris, raises some very critical questions about the future conduct of our foreign policy. Mr. Morris' thesis, which I support, is that the handling of the *Mayaguez* crisis was consistent with the muddled and impulsive policymaking that marked U.S. involvement in Vietnam and was a throwback to Nixon era foreign policy with its "sudden swings to savage unpredictability."

In clear violation of the 1973 War Powers Act, the Ford administration's orchestration of the *Mayaguez* incident was, in Mr. Morris' words, "quite possibly its most irresponsible act in office." The U.S. response to the *Mayaguez* capture was characterized by diplomatic confusion, inaccurate military intelligence, and sheer capriciousness. Most importantly, the *Mayaguez* experience has obscured far more urgent international problems which cannot be solved by force.

Because I believe Congress should reappraise its acquiescence in the *Mayaguez* incident, I would like to share Mr. Morris' perceptive article with my colleagues:

WHAT TO MAKE OF MAYAGUEZ

The *Mayaguez* rescue seems one of those events destined to shrink from banner headline to footnote. It has been easy to see the raids in terms of the vulnerable psychology of the Ford administration in the aftermath of the final disaster in Vietnam. A frustrated President acts forcefully to shore up his sagging domestic constituency and the country's international credibility. "Our thirty seconds over Tokyo, and it felt pretty good for a change," as one senior State Department official put it.

The Congress, press and public, all with visibly mixed feelings about Vietcong flags flying over Saigon, were glad to share in the therapy. "The main thing that has happened . . ." explained James Reston in *The New York Times*, "is merely that Uncle Sam went out of Cambodia and slammed the door . . ." Three weeks later Washington is again preoccupied with a messy, inglorious battle over energy policy, defense budgets and a sick economy.

Yet if the *Mayaguez* affair was a fleeting thing, it did provide a vivid illustration of some more enduring realities of American foreign policy. As an exercise in crisis management and credibility, it was, on closer examination, scarcely the success it seemed. As a political event it was remarkable for what did not happen after nearly a decade of dissent and legislation against arbitrary presidential action in foreign affairs. And in a sense, seen against other, less publicized but far more serious crises, the raids were an ironic symbol of Washington's growing

powerlessness to deal with the new international dangers of the post-Vietnam era.

Outwardly it was the way power is supposed to work. Shielded by fighters from the *Coral Sea*, a company of marines goes in, guns blazing, and the 39 hostages come out safe—an economy of force reminiscent of one of the more alluring Pentagon formulas of the 1960s, the "neat surgical strike." But was the operation neat or even surgical in the sense that it was the military force that extracted the crew? Running through the *Mayaguez* crisis was much of the muddled, impulsive policymaking that marked the worst and the most ineffectual of the US intervention in Southeast Asia over the last decade. Even taken on its own terms, the operation does not seem a reassuring demonstration of the force option in international politics.

As so often in the Vietnam war, there would be in the *Mayaguez* incident puzzling questions about Washington's ability or good faith in managing the delicate balance between diplomacy and force. Notes requesting the crew's release went to the Cambodian Embassy in Peking and to the Chinese government on the afternoon of May 12, within 12 hours of the seizure. Officials now say both notes were returned without response 24 hours later, though neither Secretary of State Kissinger nor President Ford apparently saw the return as a rejection of diplomacy. "It [the return] didn't mean anything," Kissinger subsequently told reporters off the record. "The Chinese have good Xerox machines."

Yet less than 24 hours later, on May 14—only two days after delivery of the notes and the same afternoon the US asked UN Secretary General Waldheim to intercede—President Ford ordered the raids. The assault began less than two hours before Phnompenh broadcast its "order" to the *Mayaguez* "to withdraw from Cambodian waters." Lengthy and propaganda-laden, the statement was obviously in the writing prior to the US attack. Four hours after the broadcast the crewmen were aboard the destroyer *Wilson*, having sailed in a small boat the 30 miles from Sihanoukville. Lost in the superfluous squabbles raging at the moment and in the later self-congratulation was the strong probability that the Cambodians had released the crew not under marine guns, but rather as a diplomatic decision.

After the crisis, however, the diplomacy of those two days was dwarfed by the details of the fighting. About the most important diplomatic communications presumably yet sent by the Ford administration, there was casual confusion. The President, said White House aides, had "no idea" whether the Cambodians had received the May 12 note. At the same time Kissinger was telling the press, without further comment or questions, that both messages got through and that the Chinese "counseled restraint" by Cambodia. It was not just a question of principle in giving diplomacy a chance. Even officials supporting the military action were worried that once a diplomatic solution was in process, the raids might have backfired disastrously. Had the crewmen not already been released, a Cambodian regime that had decided to give them up on its own initiative (or perhaps at Chinese prodding) might well have reneged under military coercion, particularly since the marine assault on Tang Island missed the crew entirely.

"It was almost a mini-Marigold," said one concerned official, referring to the code name of December 1966 secret peace negotiations that collapsed when US planes bombed Hanoi in the midst of promising diplomacy by the Poles. In any event, say several sources, Washington operated in the *Mayaguez* seizure with almost no diplomatic intelligence on the possible intentions of the new Cambodian regime. Lower level State Department officers with long experience in Cambodia were excluded from the center of crisis man-

agement, much as the handful of officials analyzing Hanoi or the Vietcong were absent from the critical decisions by Presidents Johnson and Nixon on the war. Gerald Ford in 1975, as his predecessors had so often before him, seems to have struck in Southeast Asia not as a last resort after exhaustive diplomacy, not in some genuinely informed calculus of the adversary's intentions, but by what must have been a largely intuitive judgment that he had no other choice.

Whatever the timing and motivation for the raids, the tactical military planning turned out to be as questionable as the diplomacy. For the umpteenth time in Indochina, in a bloody sequence from the Tonkin Gulf to the Tet Offensive, American forces were committed to battle with fatally inaccurate military intelligence. According to Pentagon officials the marine company landing to face savage resistance on Tang Island had only misleading, low definition satellite photos and no up-to-date reconnaissance. Whether Pentagon planners were inhibited by fears of alerting the Cambodians, or whether 48 hours was too short a time to organize the proper intelligence, the lesson for any observant government is that the United States is not especially adept at such operations. The precedent for *Mayaguez* in this respect was the futile Son Tay POW raid into North Vietnam. Like *Mayaguez*, Son Tay would have been "successful" only if the captors had decided to release the prisoners independently of the military action.

So too were there troubling doubts about Washington's command and control of the military strike. Official sources are unanimous that communications between Washington and the task force in the Gulf of Siam were nearly instantaneous, with constant radio contact. Yet at perhaps the most critical point in such a crisis—the moment when the objective has been accomplished and operations must be carefully measured to avoid embroilment exceeding policy—the administration's simplest communications failed. Between the Pentagon's receipt of the news that the crewmen were returned and the relay of that crucial message to the President, who immediately ordered the strikes to cease, there was a lapse of 21 minutes. It was during those 21 minutes that the carrier planes bombed the Cambodian mainland at an airfield near Sihanoukville.

In the official version of the mainland raid was to protect the marines still on Tang Island, though the logic of those tactics would have dictated either a preventive strike timed with the initial landings more than three hours earlier, or simple surveillance of the field to attack any Cambodian T-28s attempting to take off. The bombing was obviously a punitive gesture. But the explanation for continuing the strikes well after the crew had returned seems far more disturbing. "The momentum of the operation was too strong," said one high official in words redolent of August 1914, "to turn it back at that point." It was as if military "momentum" had somehow carried US planes to attack, for good measure, the Russian vessels after they had turned back from the blockade of Cuba during the 1962 missile crisis, or President Eisenhower had allowed the bombing of the Suez Canal in 1958 to cover the marine landings in Lebanon. Whether indulgence of loose bombing plans or inadequate civilian control, the Ford administration's handling of the mainland attacks in the *Mayaguez* crisis may quite possibly have been its most irresponsible act in office.

But then apparently Washington barely averted a still more bizarre step—the use of B-52 bombers if strong headwinds had not brought the *Coral Sea* into position for the operation by May 14. Confided to reporters traveling with Kissinger to Vienna four days after the crisis, the strategy in deploying

the B-52s would have been to "frighten" the Cambodian government away from making humiliating demands on the US. "It was the only means at our disposal [without the carrier]," Kissinger told the reporters, again off the record. Assuming this was more than posturing, the questions of objective and sense of proportion in such an option strain the imagination. How many B-52s? With what intensity on what targets, military, urban, rural? How long, in defiance of specific congressional prohibition, would it be before the Khmer Rouge, with their own hard-earned expertise in strategic bombing, surrendered the crew? Here it is 1975. The Indochina war is a bitter lesson learned. Yet we are suddenly back in June or December 1972, or February 1965, intent on intimidation beyond our interest and probably beyond our political capability to sustain.

All this must be fairly weighed, of course, against the administration's perspective on the crisis. The President and his advisers were no doubt in the grip of the *Pueblo* tragedy, whatever the differences between the two cases. They were anxious to avoid further "defeat" in Indochina, which they saw as demoralizing at home and emboldening enemies abroad. The operation was conducted, explained Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger in his baroque style, for "purposes necessary for the well-being of this society."

Moreover, the cultural gap inevitable in such encounters was probably deeper than ever; a Khmer Rouge reported to be emptying Phnompenh to create an isolated agrarian communism may well have seemed utterly irrational to a former congressman from Grand Rapids. And as always even the best and the brightest civilian officials are hostage in a crisis to the quality and candor of their military staffs.

But Washington's blunders, if thinly veiled by publicity, were neither academic nor excusable. To potential future players in the credibility and force option game—whether Arabs, Israelis, North Koreans, the Soviets or the Chinese, all of whom have to take a more precise view of such events than the American Congress or press—the demonstration may have been just the opposite of what was intended or is now widely supposed. Our crisis diplomacy can be seen as uncoordinated or hypocritical, our military intelligence chronically flawed, White House civilian command and control perhaps unreliable, escalation to B-52 strategic bombing an almost reflexive resort. These precedents might deter some governments with room to be cowed by our sheer capriciousness. More likely the *Mayaguez* presents a future adversary with the prospect of a diplomacy he cannot trust and a military operation neither side can measure, the ingredients not of credibility, but of catastrophe.

The loose control and excesses of the crisis were almost certainly easier amid the ready acquiescence of the Congress. Before it had basis to judge either the situation or US actions, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously endorsed the use of force. Except for Gaylord Nelson (D, Wisc.) and George McGovern (D, SD), who spoke out, and Edward Brooke (R, Mass.) who quietly sent the administration a list of questions, the Senate seemed generally prepared to be, as Sen. John Stennis (D, Miss.) put it, "as severe as necessary." The House followed suit, its bold freshmen for the most part suddenly mute in the mysteries of national security.

Few on Capitol Hill will quite say it, but President Ford violated the long-fought 1973 War Powers Act, the language of which expressly obligates the President to consult the Congress "before introducing US armed forces into hostilities . . ." "We were informed, not consulted," observed Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D, Mont.). But the Congress shows no disposition to investigate the crisis either

for its military-diplomatic implications or for the serious practical and Constitutional ambiguities it exposed in the war powers legislation.

The *Mayaguez* raids laid bare in that respect a reality in the politics of foreign policy that many liberals have denied or ignored. It is that the congressional majorities that produced the war powers and anti-bombing legislation of 1973-74 and even the broader assertion of foreign policy prerogatives in this session have not been anti-militaristic, or even anti-imperial in the sense of the gunboat politics of the *Mayaguez*. The specter haunting most of the Congress was not so much arbitrary presidential foreign policy as the great *faux pas* of that system—land embroilment in Indochina. Once that danger had receded, for most members the point was made.

"We took a bath in the Gulf of Siam," said one congressional aide about the *Mayaguez*. But the uncritical congressional acceptance of the crisis was only part of a larger surrender already in motion. The recent reversal of the Turkish military aid cutoff, the defection of liberals like Sen. Walter Mondale (D, Minn.) from support of the Mansfield amendment to reduce troops in Europe, the genteel co-opting of the Senate Special Committee on the CIA—all signal an abiding fear the Congress has of sustaining even its partial responsibility in foreign policy.

Perhaps the most insidious effect of the *Mayaguez* experience, however, was to obscure the far more urgent international problems facing the Ford administration, problems in which even efficient military force or good faith diplomacy appear increasingly useless. To the extent that the *Mayaguez* cast foreign policy in terms of US credibility, it slowed understanding that the real crises are mainly *within* rather than between nations, and therefore beyond our reach. Thus the collapse of NATO that *Mayaguez* was supposed to help forestall proceeds from political and economic instabilities in Portugal or Italy or Great Britain that not even Kissinger's brilliance can remedy. So also, the food and energy crises, which Kissinger flew off to Europe to address after *Mayaguez*, are at their core vast problems of domestic politics and social organization in both the industrialized and poor countries. No external force will bring the land reform or population control or technological transformations that will determine the shape of the world in the last quarter of the century. It was far more important for the future foreign relations of the United States, for example, that Kissinger recently proposed new concerted action in developing alternative energy sources and a one billion dollar world food reserve, even if his schemes cannot be imposed by Washington. But it was about the *Mayaguez* that columnist Joseph Kraft concluded "that the government can do some things and do them fairly well."

Even the Middle East, presumably a central audience for the lessons of *Mayaguez*, is becoming less amenable to such crisis management. The recent domestic turmoil in Lebanon, with far-reaching consequences for both the Palestinian guerrillas and Israel, is likely to be much more important than any demonstration in the Gulf of Siam.

Seen in a longer view the *Mayaguez* crisis still belongs to that Nixon era of foreign policy when sudden swings to savage unpredictability in using military force were thought necessary to maintain our security. Ironically it was a younger and more detached Henry Kissinger who warned in 1961 that, "to make of ambiguity a principle of conduct is to court disaster." But if the ghost of that earlier Kissinger pointed to the perils of the *Mayaguez* policy or cautioned against its self-deluding aftermath, no one seems to have heard.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE
GENERAL COURT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, the General Court of Massachusetts has adopted two resolutions which I believe are worthy of note and may benefit Members of other States, since the subjects of the resolutions are areas of particular concern to this Congress.

The first, a resolution memorializing the Congress to allow greater immigration to the people of Ireland, urges the Members to review the immigration act enacted in July of 1968, to more equitably deal with visa requests from Irish citizens.

The second, a resolution urging the Congress to enact legislation providing economic incentives for users of alternative sources of energy, is certainly one which bears directly on legislation we have had and will have before us in the near future. The State of Massachusetts has born a tremendous burden in the energy crisis. All of New England has suffered considerably more damage from the combined and intertwined effects of energy shortages and the economic upheaval than most other areas of the country.

I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will read these resolutions with an eye toward legislative action, and I appreciate this time to include them at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ALLOW GREATER IMMIGRATION TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND

Whereas, Unfortunately, there seems to be a part of the new U.S. immigration policy which is neither just nor equitable toward the Irish, and as a practical matter, the average Irish person who desires to come and settle here in the United States will no longer be allowed to do so; and

Whereas, If the present U.S. Immigration Law had been on our statute books one hundred and fifty years ago at least ninety per cent of the Irish in America would not have been allowed to enter the United States; and

Whereas, It is recognized that the old immigration law was unjust and unfair to some other nationalities but that the 1965 Immigration Act substituted a law which, now, is as unfair to Ireland as the old law was to these other nationalities; and

Whereas, Irish nuns and brothers have, for many years, staffed schools, hospitals, orphanages and rest homes for the aged in our nation and these religious groups, who desire to come here to continue this work, must now wait their turns because of this new Immigration Act; and

Whereas, In 1965, the Irish ranked fifth among the nationals immigrating to the United States and since then, she no longer ranks fifth or even tenth. Irish immigration is at an all time low. In 1967, 2,665 were admitted. Since the enactment of the new law in July, 1968, a total of 1,076 persons applied for visas and through November 30, 1968, only 72 were issued; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Con-

gress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to allow greater immigration to the people of Northern Europe; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth; and copies also be sent to the Secretary and Vice President of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR USERS OF ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF ENERGY

Whereas, the residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and other New England states pay the highest rates for electricity and oil in the nation; and

Whereas, the so-called energy crisis has caused a substantial increase in said rates; and

Whereas, the said crisis is causing individuals to consider the feasibility of alternate home-power energy sources; and

Whereas, the use of solar, wind, water or other innovative power sources would ease the energy crisis; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing economic incentives through tax credits or other means deemed appropriate for users of alternative sources of energy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the commonwealth.

DIRTY LINEN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, an article in the June 19 edition of the Bowie News of Bowie, Tex. discusses the recent and forthcoming investigations into the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. The article is written by Mr. Jim Winter, the editor of the Bowie News. His thoughts on the investigations deserve consideration by every Member of Congress and the general public.

The article follows:

Well, it looks like we are going through another orgy similar to the Watergate thing. The CIA has come under the guns of all the left wing congressmen and senators, along with all the radical groups in the country and I suspect before this is all over, anything the Reds didn't know about our intelligence system will be old hat. While your senators and congressmen are worrying about the CIA activities, they continue to stand by and in the space of about two years let the Soviet Union become the most powerful naval force in the world. It is our judgment that it would be extremely hard for the CIA to restrict its activities solely in foreign countries because of the widespread communists activities in this country and more especially in our nation's capitol. It is ridiculous to assume that we give blanket approval to everything they have done, but it is just as silly to wash ALL of our dirty linen in front of the world. This will surely destroy the agency that is entrusted to keep our country on relatively safe ground with our enemies.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent out a congressional newsletter to my constituents. Included in the report was a questionnaire survey to determine my district's views on some of the major issues confronting the Nation. Copies of the questionnaire were mailed to about 160,000 homes and businesses in the district.

Over 5,500 responded to my questionnaire. The letters have been opened and the results tabulated. My office in Washington is still receiving returns, although the results herein were as of June 30.

I am pleased to share the percentage results with my colleagues, and I include them at this point in the RECORD:

1. Should I support economic recovery measures to stimulate employment even though such programs might temporarily increase the budget deficit?

(Amounts in percent)

- Yes, 50; No, 50.
2. Which of the following do you feel would be most effective in stimulating the economy and reducing unemployment?
- Public service jobs, 19.
 - Increased funding of housing and other construction programs, 25.
 - Business tax credits, 19.
 - Individual tax reductions, 33.
 - No answer, 2.
3. To combat inflation, which of the following do you prefer?
- Increase in personal income taxes, 2.
 - Increase in corporate income tax rates, 17.
 - Increase in interest rates, 3.
 - Reduction in Defense Department spending, 18.
 - Reduction in other Government spending, 46.
 - Wage and price controls, 9.
 - None of the above, 5.
 - No answer, 1.
4. Do you think the size of the federal budget should be reduced? Yes, 93. No, 7. If yes, which of these categories do you think should be cut?
- Military construction, 6.
 - Weapons production, 5.
 - Military manpower, 3.
 - Health services, 3.
 - Education, 4.
 - Veterans assistance, 3.
 - Employment assistance, 3.
 - Public transportation assistance, 6.
 - Law enforcement assistance, 3.
 - Foreign economic aid, 21.
 - Foreign military aid, 19.
 - Revenue sharing funds, 6.
 - General government, 17.
 - No answer, 1.
5. Energy Options
- Ever since those bad days last year of long lines at the gas station, the subject of oil and energy has been on everyone's mind. Regardless of whether the term "energy crisis" is appropriate, the Congress cannot ignore the subject on energy conservation. Congress must and will act on several energy proposals now before it. I have listed the major policy choices on which I will soon be voting. Please indicate which, if any, of the following you would support.
- Gas rationing, 4.
 - Import tax on foreign oil, 6.
 - Increased gasoline taxes, 3.

- d. Offer tax incentives for the purchase of smaller cars, 11.
- e. Increase the use of nuclear power, 18.
- f. Increase the use of coal gasification, 11.
- g. Invest more money in solar energy technology, 16.
- h. Require auto manufacturers to produce cars with 50% greater gas efficiency by 1980, 18.
- i. Remove all auto emission standards now in effect, 6.
- j. Make greater investment in public transportation, 9.
6. Are you in favor of limiting the amount of money an individual or group can contribute to a political candidate's campaign? Yes, 82, No, 16. No Answer, 2.
7. Taking into account the high cost of communication with the voter via the media and the mail, would you favor?
- a. Public funding of primary election campaigns, yes, 16; no, 28.
- b. Public funding of general election campaigns, yes, 20; no, 27.
- c. Partial public funding of primary election campaigns, yes, 29; no, 23.
- d. Partial public funding of general election campaigns, yes, 34; no, 22.
- e. No public funding, 3.
8. Do you support the President's plan to bring 50,000 Vietnamese Nationals to the United States and have them assimilated into our American society? Yes, 49, No, 51.
9. Do you feel that we should continue to evacuate Vietnamese Nationals if the opportunity arises under the new government? Yes, 32, No, 64. No answer, 4.

HALT AID TO INDIA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, arrests continue in India. Opposition leaders, students, and thousands of other Indians have been arrested. No one seems to know for sure how many have been arrested. Censorship is being exercised not only on the domestic press but also on foreign correspondents.

Is this a reaction by Indira Gandhi to the threat of imminent invasion? No, it is simply a move by the leader of India to stay in power after being found guilty of election irregularities.

The United States from fiscal year 1953 has given more than \$9.3 billion to India. This does not include aid from multilateral sources of which the United States was the largest contributor.

This aid was usually defended by the rationale that while India might not always agree with us it was the largest democracy in the world and therefore we should give substantial aid. We have been giving substantial amounts of aid to India under this rationale. Now with the arrests and numerous other restrictions in India this rationale seems to be open to question.

With the present situation I call on the President to place an immediate halt on aid to India. Furthermore, I urge the House Committee on International Relations to begin immediate hearings on the question of human rights in India.

THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION AT WOODWARD, OKLA.—A VITAL PARTNER IN AMERICA'S FOOD INDUSTRY

HON. GLENN ENGLISH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, America has long been noted for the skill of its farmers, who through the years have found the skills and techniques to produce more and more food from each acre of American farmland.

When the land-grant colleges started cooperating with the U.S. Department of Agriculture on research to help farmers become even more productive, many stations across the country benefited from this working partnership.

One of these research stations is in Woodward, Okla.—and the Woodward station has made a number of dramatic advances in the years it has been in operation. And, more importantly, these discoveries have been made at a savings to Federal taxpayers, since Oklahoma State University provides numerous research personnel to the station at no cost to the Government.

Recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has announced that it has plans to close down the Woodward station. It seems to me that the USDA is ignoring the best interests of the American people in making this decision, since it is unlikely that the university will be able to support the station's vital efforts alone.

The Enid Morning News, on June 24, printed an excellent analysis of the importance of the Woodward station to America. Since it is important that this research continue without interruption, I include this article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks for the information of my colleagues here in Congress, and for the use of the USDA:

BRAKING THE NATION'S FOOD TRAIN

The world is starving to death. So what is the federal government doing about it?

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has announced its plans to close the agricultural experiment station at Woodward—a field station dedicated to increasing the world's food supply.

And it's not as if the Woodward station has been a failure in its efforts. Just the opposite is true.

During its years of service, the station has come up with scores of test results now being used daily by farmers and ranchers throughout the Great Plains—results which mean more food at less cost to feed the world's hungry.

The station has come up with such programs as:

Feeding out 700-lb. weaning calves compared with 400 to 500 lbs. elsewhere. That's MORE edible meat at no more cost.

A system for feeding cattle that takes far less of the rancher's time, so he can spend it raising other food to feed the world.

Better varieties of tomatoes, grapes and other foods.

The list could go on and on, enumerating the many experiments which have been successful and have proven results. Every one

is being used by hundreds of agribusinessmen to produce MORE food at LESS cost . . . every one has resulted in dollars saved (or earned) for these men who have the responsibility of feeding the world.

(And, incidentally, every extra dollar these men make means more taxes they pay to support the federal government, including the USDA!)

Pat McIlvain, superintendent at the Woodward station, tells us the station's budget is only a quarter-million dollars annually. Instead of eliminating the station, he proposed adding another \$210,000 which would support three more scientists . . . which would result in more practical test results . . . which would result in more food for the world.

If America is to meet its moral obligation of feeding a starving world let's not cut back on the USDA's experiment programs that result in more and better food!

Once a freight train is moving down the tracks at 50 MPH, the engineer can cut back the engines and achieve a heck of a saving in fuel costs—until the train gradually slows to a halt. But if the engineer wants to get to his destination, he's got to pour on the coal, not cut back.

If America is going to attain its goal of feeding a starving world, the USDA must increase experiments at the Woodward field station (and programs at other agricultural stations) and not cut them back. In the long haul, a cutback now will only result in a slowdown of the nation's food train.

KIWANIS CLUB SENIOR CENTER, FORT WAYNE, IND.

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis International Convention was held recently in Atlanta. One of the Kiwanis Clubs in the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana, which district I represent, was the recipient of an award for service to the community during the past Kiwanis year of 1973-74. I would like to take this opportunity to describe the activities of that Kiwanis Club of Fort Wayne, Ind.

The Kiwanis Senior Center won the award. This club is replacing the senior citizen recreation center that was condemned in 1972. They are being assisted by the efforts of the city of Fort Wayne and the park board, so it is a real community project. The city of Fort Wayne agreed to purchase the site of the center and participate in its funding.

To date, the Kiwanis Club of Fort Wayne has raised over \$600,000 of the center's cost and completion of the center is expected in July 1976.

The new center will be located in the city of Fort Wayne's three-block senior citizens' complex that will also include a high-rise living unit and stores for elderly shoppers. The center, which will cost the Kiwanis Club \$750,000, will include an auditorium, kitchen, pool room, card room, workshop and a Kiwanis Memorial Library. The Council on Aging and the Social Security Administration will also be housed in the complex.

I believe that the Kiwanis Club of Fort Wayne is to be congratulated, and I am especially pleased that completion is due for July 1976. I cannot think of a better way to celebrate our Nation's independence and unity.

**HERMAN BADILLO INTRODUCTION
OF BILINGUAL COURTS ACT**

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1975, I introduced for myself and Mr. ROYBAL legislation which provides for more effective bilingual proceedings in Federal district courts of the United States. This bill, H.R. 8314, is identical to legislation recently reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee and represents a modification of similar legislation which I cosponsored earlier in this session with Mr. ROYBAL and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

In recent years we have witnessed a national effort to make the benefits of our legal system available to all Americans, whether rich or poor, old or young, black, white or brown. Although our efforts to achieve the goal of equal justice for all has been marked by some successes, there is still an enormous amount of progress needed in this area. One of the most pressing problems confronting the movement for legal reform is the plight of our non-English-speaking citizens. Language minorities have been denied equal access to courts and are severely handicapped by their limited abilities with the English language in the courtroom.

When non-English-speaking individuals have to participate in legal proceedings, as the victim or the defendant, the legal proceedings are conducted in a language virtually alien to them. These circumstances have contributed to a serious unequal administration of justice. Justice must require that the people involved in legal proceedings understand what is taking place in the courtroom.

The legislation I introduce today will remedy this problem. The act spells out the responsibilities of the Federal courts and standardizes procedures to insure that competent interpreters will be available upon request in all cases involving non-English-speaking people.

First, the act provides that whenever a judge determines either the plaintiff, defendant or a witness does not speak or understand English adequately, the proceedings must be conducted in a court equipped for simultaneous language translation of the proceedings. In civil actions the judge is allowed more discretion as to when the proceedings must be translated simultaneously. In addition, the defendant in any criminal action, or a party in any civil action, who is entitled to translation may waive the translation in whole or in part. The waiver must be expressly made by the defendant or party and must be approved by his attorney and by the judge.

Second, the act provides for certifica-

tion of interpreters, maintenance of an updated master list of all certified interpreters, requires that appropriate equipment and facilities for translation be available to each district court, and requires that a fee schedule for interpreters be devised in each district. The fees for interpreters may be paid either by the court or, in the court's discretion, by the parties involved as a part of the costs incurred in the court's action.

The intent of this legislation is to insure that language minorities are afforded the protections of the fifth and sixth amendments. The fifth amendment provides:

No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Can it be doubted that any legal proceeding, whether civil or criminal, which places a person or his property in jeopardy without insuring their full participation in the trial process is devoid of basic and fundamental fairness as to be contrary to the due process clause? The sixth amendment guarantees that in "all prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to be confronted with the witnesses against them; and to have the assistance for his defense." The fundamental rights of confrontation and counsel in criminal matters becomes an empty gesture to a defendant unable to comprehend the charges of his accusers or consult with counsel relative to his defense.

I urge my colleagues to review this vital legislation and hope that it will be enacted by this Congress.

PRESIDENT FORD WRITES REASSURING LETTER TO DAUGHTER OF AN MIA FATHER

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, a most reassuring letter from President Ford to the daughter of one of our men missing in Southeast Asia has been brought to my attention by Mr. E. C. "Bus" Mills. Mr. Mills, my good friend, is National Director of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia. I know that my colleagues share my grave concern over the fate of our missing men, and feel they will all appreciate learning that the President has restated his firm commitment to securing a full accounting for our MIA's. Certainly, this letter, and its accompanying release, show plainly that our men have not been forgotten:

PRESIDENT FORD WRITES REASSURING LETTER TO DAUGHTER OF AN MIA FATHER

Miss Sherrill Standerwick, daughter of Colonel R. L. Standerwick, U.S. Air Force who was declared Missing in Action February 3, 1971 in Laos, received the following letter from President Gerald R. Ford. The letter is a personal one to Sherrill but she feels the families and the public should know of the President's firm commitment and determination to get an honorable accounting of each Missing American.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 11, 1975.

DEAR SHERRILL: Senator Dole brought to my attention your efforts to learn of your father's status since his plane was downed in combat over Laos in 1971. I want you to know that neither your father nor his valiant service to his country has been forgotten. He and our other men in the armed forces who are still missing in action in Southeast Asia have done their duty—and so much more—for our country, with great skill and courage. It is my duty—and my firm intention—to seek a full accounting for every one of these men who was not returned. I pledge to you that I will not stop these efforts until your father and every other missing American is accounted for.

I want you to understand that I do care about your father and share the concerns and frustrations of you and your mother in trying to obtain information about him. In an effort to learn the truth, I intend to continue efforts to obtain a full accounting on your father and the others still missing.

You are deservedly proud of your father's dedication and sacrifice. I share that pride and I will not break faith with him, with you, or with the many other missing men and their families in our common effort to determine the truth.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in further compliance with my announced purpose of extending into the RECORD proposals of the Federal Election Commission as published in the Federal Register, I herewith include a new issue. My purpose is to give wider distribution to a vital matter and I suggest that some interested Members will find it useful to retain these materials in their office reference files. The material is as follows:

[Title 11, Federal Elections; Chapter II, Federal Election Commission, (Notice 1975-8)]

IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

Extension of time to comment on proposed rulemaking.

The time period within which written comments concerning any part of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Notice 1975-2, 40 FR 23833, June 2, 1975) will be received by the Federal Election Commission is extended to July 15, 1975.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,

Chairman, for the Federal Election Commission.

Date: July 1, 1975.

[Title 11, Federal Elections; Chapter II, Federal Election Commission (Notice 1975-9)]

INTERIM GUIDELINE: COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

1. *Filing.* Any person who believes a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, 2 U.S.C. Section 431, *et seq.*, or of Sections 608, 610, 611, 613, 614, 615, 616, or 617 of Title 18, United States Code, has occurred may file a complaint with the Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463.

2. *Form of Complaint.* There is no prescribed form for a complaint, but all com-

plaints must be typewritten or handwritten legibly in ink. The person making the complaint must sign the complaint, the complaint must be verified by the oath or affirmation of such person taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths, and include his or her address and phone number in the complaint. A complaint shall name the person complained against (respondent), describe in detail the alleged violation or violations and shall be submitted together with copies of evidentiary material available to the complainant.

3. *Notification of Respondent.* The Commission shall send a copy of the complaint to the respondent within a reasonable time after the complaint is received. Such notification of the respondent shall not be released to the public unless and until written permission of the respondent is expressly given.

4. *Reply by Respondent.* The respondent will normally be given ten (10) days after receipt in which to respond in writing to the allegations in the complaint except where, in the judgment of the Commission, a shorter or longer period of time is necessary. The response to the complaint shall be addressed to the Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. The Commission shall send a copy of the response to the complainant within a reasonable time. The response must be typewritten or handwritten legibly in ink. The respondent or the authorized representative thereof shall sign the response and the response shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of such person taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths.

5. *Exchange of Information.* The Commission shall receive all documents and evidence submitted by the complainant and respondent and shall facilitate the exchange of such information by sending copies to the parties within a reasonable time.

6. *Investigations.* The Staff Director and the General Counsel shall proceed to direct the investigation of all duly filed complaints. A duly filed complaint is one which substantially complies with the form described by paragraph 2 above, is within the jurisdiction of the Commission and contains allegations of fact which, if proved, would constitute a violation of law. Investigations shall be conducted expeditiously and shall include an investigation of any reports and statements filed by the complainant, if the complainant is a candidate. Such investigations shall not be made public by the Commission or any other person without the written consent of the person under investigation.

7. *Hearings.* At the time the Commission notifies the respondent that a complaint has been filed, it shall notify the respondent that the respondent may request a hearing. The Commission will determine the manner and procedure for such hearings.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,

Chairman, for the Federal Election Commission.

Date: July 1, 1975.

[Notice 1975-10]

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION: ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC RECORDS AVAILABILITY

The purpose of this announcement is to inform the public of the methods by which the Commission is presently making available for public inspection and for copying the information which the law requires to be made available. Sections 302-308 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, Public Law 92-225, as amended by sections 202, 203, 204, 206, 208 and 209 of The Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974, Public Law 93-443, provide that statements of organization of political committees, reports of receipts and expenditures of political committees and candidates, reports on

presidential convention financing, other expenditure reports, advisory opinions, statements relating to Presidential Nominating Convention Fund provisions, and other information relating to financing of Federal elections shall come under the purview of the Federal Election Commission. Some of the aforementioned information was formerly required to be submitted to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House, or the Comptroller General of the United States under Public Law 92-225. Public Law 93-443 provides that all such information shall either be filed with, provided to, or maintained by the Federal Election Commission.

The following guidelines shall apply to inspection and copying of the Commission's public records:

(a) Inquiries concerning the records available at the Commission's Public Records Division may be made in person, by mail, or by telephone. Inquiries should be directed to: Public Records Division, Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. (Telephone, 202-382-7012). The Public Records Division is open Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Extended hours may be provided for by the Commission to meet public needs.

(b) Requests for inspection of Commission records may be made in person at the time and place stated in paragraph (a). Requests for copies of records may be made in person at the time and place stated in paragraph (a) or by mail directed to the Public Records Division.

(c) Each request for Commission records or copies shall describe the records sought with sufficient specificity with respect to names, dates, and subject matter to permit the records to be located among the records maintained by or for the Commission. A person who has requested Commission records or copies will be promptly advised if the records cannot be located on the basis of the description given and informed that further identifying information must be provided before the request can be satisfied.

(d) A search fee (Appendix to this Announcement) will be charged when more than one-half hour of work is devoted to locating and making records available for inspection or for copying. No search fee will be charged if records adequately described cannot be located within a reasonable time. The Public Records Division shall promptly notify a requesting person if records adequately described cannot be located after a reasonable search. If such person requests and authorizes the search to continue, a search fee shall apply to time thereafter spent searching for the records.

(e) A current schedule of fees for record services, including locating and making records available, copying, and authentication, appears in the Appendix to this Announcement. Copies of the current schedule of fees also may be obtained upon request made in person, by telephone, or by mail from the Public Records Division.

(f) Upon receiving a request for inspection or copying of records, the Public Records Division shall promptly notify the requesting person of the estimated cost, if applicable, of locating and making the records available, of copying, and of any requested authentication. Only after receiving (1) authorization from the person requesting such services and (2) full payment in advance, if applicable, shall the Public Records Division proceed to fulfill a request for inspection or copying of records.

(g) The time actually required for locating and making records available for inspection or for copying in order to fulfill a request may exceed the amount of time estimated and paid for. In such circumstances, no work will be done that will result in fees

beyond the amount estimated and paid for without further authorization from the person requesting the records or copies.

(h) In addition to any other fees or charges which may apply, a fee will be charged for record authentication as provided in the Commission's current schedule of fees. Authentication shall include an attestation that the document copied is a true copy of the original and a certification that the person who attests is in legal custody of the document. The Commission seal shall be affixed to such document.

(i) Copies of public records filed with or retained by the Commission, or portions thereof, will be provided subject to fees set forth in the Commission's current schedule of fees.

(j) Requested records shall be furnished without charge or at reduced charge whenever it shall be determined by the Commission that a waiver or reduction of the fee is in the public interest. Requests for a waiver or reduction of fees may be submitted with the original request for records and may state such facts as may be considered appropriate and necessary.

Any interested person or organization is invited to submit written comments to the Federal Election Commission concerning the manner and form by which public documents should be made available to the general public. Comments could include those relating to easy access filing systems, the use of photocopying devices, microfilm, microfiche, or any other retrieval systems. Comments should be mailed to: Federal Election Commission, Rulemaking Section, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463.

THOMAS B. CURTIS,

Chairman, for the Federal Election Commission.

Date: July 1, 1975.

APPENDIX, SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR RECORD SERVICES

Locating and making available records requested for inspection or copying (including overhead costs): First one-half hour: No fee. Each additional one-half hour or fraction thereof: \$2.50.

Authentication with Commission Seal (in addition to other fees, if any). Price per authentication: \$2.00.

Facsimile Copies of Documents. Price per page: \$10.

Full payment for the above services shall be made in advance of records of copies being made available. Payments must be by check or money order made payable to: "Treasurer of the United States." Mailed payments must be addressed to: Director, Public Records Division, Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF CONGRESSMAN CONYERS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, due to an unforeseen delay today I was unable to make the vote on S. 555, the Senate referred bill pertaining to farm and rural development.

As this bill would amend the emergency loan provisions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to enable farmers in natural disaster areas to borrow money at reduced interest rates, I would have joined my 403 colleagues who voted "aye" on this legislation.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT
AMENDMENTS OF 1975

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, in April, the House of Representatives took a major step in responding to the pressing needs of the elderly in our society. The passage of the amendments to the Older Americans Act, H.R. 3922, which I cosponsored, will continue and expand vital community services that the Older Americans Act has provided since its inception in 1965.

This legislation will in fact make the Older Americans Act more responsive than ever to the special and varying needs of our senior citizens. Title VIII of the bill, the special service programs, represents the response of the Congress to the plight of the elderly as they face the current economic problems with limited resources. We have, with this bill, made a special effort to authorize programs designed to provide the means to help our older citizens lead more meaningful and independent lives.

Of special concern to me, and I know to many of my colleagues, is the section on homemaker and other services, part B of title VIII. The thrust of this section is to provide programs designed to enable the elderly to lead an independent life in a home environment without the need for institutionalization. Those who can remain at home as a result of these services will lead longer, more enjoyable and productive lives, and the cost to the Government will be far less than the cost of providing institutional care.

Recently my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) citing both congressional studies and GAO reports, released figures showing that in New York City home health programs—averaging from \$180 to \$600 per month depending on the level of care—cost substantially less than the \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year or \$1,500 per month or \$50 per day that it takes to keep a patient in a nursing home.

These significant savings to the taxpayer, added to the substantial benefit to the patient, make a compelling argument for home health care, homemaker services, and the other home services which are authorized by this section of the bill.

It is my sincere hope that these programs of home health care and homemaker services will prove to be the successful model that will result in Congress enacting legislation to provide the option of home health care and correlative services under medicare and medicaid for our elderly and disabled citizens as an alternative to institutionalization. In this regard, I want to reiterate my strong support for the home health care legislation introduced by my colleague, Mr. KOCH, which I have also cosponsored. I fully believe that this is the direction in which we should be moving.

The other programs authorized by H.R. 3922 will provide similar beneficial services to the elderly. Counseling assist-

ance will furnish legal, tax, and other counseling to elderly persons in need of assistance. Housing repairs, transportation programs, and mortgage interest reduction and insurance payments will all serve as useful resources for our senior citizens.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that now that both Houses of Congress have passed versions of this bill, we can move quickly to pass a conference report that the President will sign into law. This legislation is of vital concern to senior citizens, and the sooner that the Congress acts on this legislation, the sooner we will be responding to the needs of our older Americans.

A THOUGHT-PROVOKING MESSAGE
FROM MISS LAUREL BAKER

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of addressing the graduating class of the Viewpoint School of Calabasas, Calif., in my congressional district.

During the course of the ceremony, the award-winning entry of the American Heritage essay contest was read, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

As was pointed out to me by Sally Jordan of the Viewpoint School, the award is made annually by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Handley to a ninth grader who writes in class a 500-700 word essay on a previously disclosed subject. The student is allowed to receive background information on the subject a month prior to the class exercise, and to review a brief outline on a 3x5 card with Mrs. Jordan, but that is all. As Mrs. Jordan explained, many times people unfamiliar with the school find it difficult to believe that 14 and 15 years olds can write so well, but they obviously can!

The following is the winning essay, a thought-provoking message written by Miss Laurel Baker, a ninth-grade graduate:

THE CHALLENGE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR
AMERICAN BICENTENNIAL

The sombre silence of the still room is interrupted by the sound of a hand turning a door knob. It is Thomas Jefferson. Under his arm he clutches the final draft of the document which would soon be on its way to King George's court—the document that would declare the colonies free from England's tyrannical hand. It needs only the signature of his fellow patriots.

Soon they begin to assemble. John Hancock chuckles merrily over his friend Ben Franklin's last joke. John Adams sits pensive and quiet in the corner. The southern delegates talk among themselves of their colonies' likenesses and differences.

Suddenly, the hubbub is ceased by the sound of a gavel banging on a walnut desk. Mr. Jefferson slowly stands, and in his firm, clear, resonant voice, eloquently reads the product of their patriotism. A low murmur of voices follows, and all is agreed upon. The wording of their declaration of independence is the result of many weeks of arguing and disagreement. Now, they need only sign their names. One by one they grasp the elegant

quill, and one by one they pledge their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honour."¹

All are possessed by a spirit born out of their hunger for liberty, and appeased by their intense patriotism. It dominates them, guiding them through the intense turmoil of the troubled times. It will remain in them—and in their children and grandchildren. It becomes them.

We today are a product of our forefathers' strife—and still, deep within us, lives that spirit, but it lies sadly dormant at present. Can two hundred years of great achievements, of troubled times, and prosperous years awaken that vital ingredient within us to ward off the dark and heavy hand of tyranny that seems to be engulfing all around us?

The great love of the founding fathers for this country and for us, their unborn babes, has placed in us the ability to exist on our beginning principles for another 200 years. And in the children of that generation will be that same ability—but only if the responsibility to them is shouldered now. If not, then the enemy will lie not only in the fields, but in our hearts as well.

America's two hundredth birthday is a monumental event in the eyes of the world. She is a great lady, who grows older and wiser with the passing of years—all of it due to men like Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Franklin. Through their struggle, they have attained the highest permanent standard of living anywhere in the world. It was all due to the spirit within them.

That small, inexplicable flame is the secret of the American people, and nothing can extinguish its everlasting light. Benjamin Franklin, who knew the souls and minds of the men intimately, guessed at its meaning. He was certain that the spirit was America herself:

"Like a Field of Young Indian Corn, which long Fair weather and Sunshine had enfeebled and discoloured, and which, in that weak State, by a Violent Thunder Gust of Wind, Hail, and Rain, seem'd threatened with absolute Destruction; yet the storm being past, it recovers fresh Verdure, shoots up with double Vigour, and delights the Eye, not of its Owner only, but of every observing Traveller."²

(The winning essay by Laurel Baker, Grade 9, Viewpoint School, 23620 Mulholland Drive, Calabasas, Calif. 91302.)

REPRESENTATIVE HAGEDORN
WASHINGTON REVIEW

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the text of my recent Washington Review which was mailed to constituents of the Second Congressional District of Minnesota:

WASHINGTON REVIEW

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., May, 1975.

DEAR FRIENDS: Greetings from Washington. This is the first of the regular newsletters I intend to send to my friends and neighbors in the Second District to give them a clearer picture of exactly what's going on in Washington.

¹ The Declaration of Independence.

² From a letter by Benjamin Franklin to George Washington—March 5, 1780—*The Spirit of 1776*, 1971, p. 9.

While preparation and mailing of this newsletter had been one of my first priorities, I found that the job of settling in Washington, organizing a Congressional office, and maintaining close contact with my constituents took more time than I had anticipated.

You may be interested to know that Kathy and I have purchased a home in McLean, Virginia. McClean is a suburban community about ten miles due west of Washington, in the hills of northern Virginia. Although Kathy and the children are still living on the farm, they will be joining me here as soon as school is out this spring.

Since the new Congress was sworn in in January, I have made every possible effort to keep in close contact with the District. My weekly schedule usually includes arrival in Washington on Monday morning and departure for the District again on Thursday night or Friday morning. In addition to keeping a heavy schedule on the weekends, we have mailed a questionnaire to every household in the District and supplied every newspaper with a weekly column. (If your local newspaper isn't using the column, maybe you should ask them to do so.) From now on, this newsletter will also be a regular feature.

I am very pleased with the operation of our Washington office under the direction of my Administrative Assistant, Mr. George Berg. George is a veteran of 23 years on Capitol Hill and brings to our staff the expertise a freshman Congressman so vitally needs. I would urge all of you to consider this office and staff to be your office and staff, and to feel free to contact us at any time for assistance.

With warmest personal regards I am
Sincerely yours,

TOM.

FEDERAL DEFICIT OUT OF CONTROL—AND THE CONGRESS SPENDS ON

Nothing that is presently happening in Washington presents us with more long-range dangers than the rapidly increasing Federal deficit. President Ford has already raised his estimated Fiscal Year 1975 deficit from \$52 billion to \$60 billion, but this is only the beginning! Realistically, we cannot expect the liberal majorities in the Congress to hold the line on additional spending as President Ford has asked, and every penny they appropriate beyond his recommendations will be added to that \$60 billion.

According to the recent estimates, the combined budget deficit for Fiscal Years 1975 and 1976 could reach as high as \$156.6 billion. When the government is forced to finance a deficit of this size, it is bound to have serious economic repercussions. If the government finances the deficit by competing for available funds in the capital market, the private sector will be denied necessary capital and unemployment will result. If the government chooses, on the other hand, to finance the deficit by simply printing money and expanding the money supply, inflation will result. More than likely, the net result will be a combination of inflation and unemployment such as we are presently experiencing. I intend to keep fighting excessive government spending with every tool at my disposal, but I must admit that the outlook is not optimistic.

A FREE MARKET ALTERNATIVE TO RED-INK ECONOMICS

While many in Congress appear to have thrown economic sanity to the winds, I have joined with a group of Congressmen dedicated to the free enterprise system in proposing a comprehensive program for dealing with our economic dilemma. To summarize our program, we propose:

A tax indexing measure to assure that inflation does not push taxpayers into higher tax brackets while their purchasing power remains the same,

A balanced Federal budget, except in times of national emergency.

A reasonable cut in individual and corporate income taxes,

A percentage limitation on the level of revenue collected by the Federal government,

The enactment of capital formation inducing laws, and

The removal of anti-competitive Federal regulatory laws.

LANDMARK LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO REFORM WELFARE SYSTEM

The next time someone asks you why they don't do something about the "welfare mess" you can tell them that someone is at least trying. Last month I joined a by-partisan group of Congressmen in introducing the National Welfare Reform Act of 1975. This bill is aimed at plugging the loopholes in our nation's Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) program.

AFDC is our nation's most costly welfare program. Since 1954 its cost has increased from about \$500 million to over \$4 billion, and the number of children covered by the program has increased so rapidly that one child in eight is now under AFDC. The bill we have introduced is detailed and very complex, but in essence would reform the present system by establishing procedures to detect welfare "cheaters," and by tightening regulations so that only the truly needy are eligible for AFDC. If these reforms are enacted we can reasonably expect savings to the taxpayers, and greater benefits to the truly needy.

ACTIONS TAKEN TO AID FARMERS

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I have supported a number of measures designed to aid farmers and help revitalize the rural economy. Following are a few examples of areas I am working in to accomplish this:

Increased target prices and loan rates for agricultural commodities has been one of my chief aims. I intend to keep fighting in this area so that farmers can feel free to produce at maximum levels without fear of price-depressing over-production.

Elimination of the Department of Agriculture's practice of monitoring foreign grain sales would help open additional foreign markets to American agricultural commodities. Although this monitoring is theoretically voluntary, in practice it has been used as an effective means of export control.

Reform of Federal estate tax laws by increasing the exemption, increasing the marital deduction, and assuring that farmland will be assessed as farmland and not as commercial property will help our farms remain family held as they should be.

DR. JOE ROBERTS: A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Dr. Joe Roberts was buried at Arlington Cemetery with full military honors. Dr. Joe Roberts was born and raised in San Marcos, Tex., and graduated from Southwest Texas State University in 1929. He was a friend and classmate of President Lyndon B. Johnson while at the San Marcos campus.

Through the years, Joe Roberts traveled far from San Marcos. He compiled a most distinguished record—as a physician, professor, author, military officer.

Although he lived outside of Texas, his heart was still very close to San Marcos and central Texas. This was very evident to those of us who attended a gathering of SWT alumni here in Washington, March 20, 1975. At the meeting it was revealed that Dr. Roberts had become the first member of the Diamond Century Club by donating \$1,000 to his alma mater. Dr. Joe captivated the audience with his humorous tales of his student days at "Friendly Campus or the Hill" in San Marcos.

Dr. Roberts received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from SWT in 1974. Graduates of the class of 1958 heard Dr. Roberts deliver their commencement address.

Dr. Joe made his mark and all who came into contact with him were better for the experience. I offer my deepest condolences to his widow, Mary, and his family.

I insert this story from the Washington Post about Dr. Roberts:

RESERVE COL. JOSEPH ROBERTS, PHYSICIAN,
AUTHOR, LECTURER

Retired Army Reserve Col. Joseph T. Roberts, 65, a physician, author and lecturer, died Wednesday at his home, 4700 Levada Ter., Rockville, after apparently suffering a heart attack.

He had been associated with the Veterans Administration for nearly 30 years and at the time of his death was senior medical consultant to the rating schedule staff of the Compensation and Pension Service, Department of Veterans Benefits, at the VA central office here.

Col. Roberts earlier had been the medical member of its predecessor, the Disability Policy Board of the VA Department of Veterans Benefits.

He also had been assigned to the Physical Disability Agency, U.S. Army Central Physical Evaluation Board at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

He had served as chief of medical services, chief of professional services and deputy director of the Andrew Rader Army Clinic at Walter Reed and had been chief of professional and medical services for the Military District of Washington.

Col. Roberts had served in the Medical Corps of the Army Reserves from 1950 until retiring in 1970. He was a specialist in cardiovascular research.

Born in San Marcos, Tex., he was a graduate of Southwest Texas State Teachers College and later received a master of science degree, his degree in medicine and a doctorate from Tulane University.

In 1968-67, Col. Roberts was chief medical officer at the old Gallinger Municipal Hospital, now D.C. General Hospital. During that period, he also was adjunct clinical professor of medicine at Georgetown and George Washington Universities.

He joined the Veterans Administration in 1947 in Little Rock, Ark., where he was chairman of the dean's committee and a consultant in internal medicine at the VA Hospital in North Little Rock.

At the same time, Col. Roberts was a professor of medicine, dean of the school of medicine, head of the department of medicine and medical director of the hospital and clinic at the University of Arkansas.

He also was chief of medicine at the Arkansas State Hospital for Nervous Diseases and a consultant on medicine at the Army and Navy General Hospital in Hot Springs, Ark.

Col. Roberts moved from there to Batavia, N.Y., where he was chief of medical services at the VA hospital in 1949-50. He then became chief of the cardiology section of the

VA hospital in Buffalo, N.Y., a position he held for six years.

From 1949 to 1959, he was a lecturer on medicine at the University of Buffalo's School of Medicine, then served as assistant professor of medicine there until 1967.

In 1966-67, Col. Roberts was chief of medical services at the VA hospital at Ft. Howard, Md.

Col. Roberts was a Diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine and Cardiovascular Diseases and a Fellow of the American College of Physicians and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The many other organizations of which Col. Roberts was a member and in some instances an officer included the International Academy of Pathology, the American Registry of Cardiovascular Pathology, the D.C. and American Medical Associations, the American Heart Association, the American Federation of Clinical Researchers and the American Association of Anatomists.

He was the co-author of a number of books, including the "Encyclopedia of Heart Disease," "Pathological Physiology and Mechanisms of Disease" and "Progress in Arthritis." He contributed articles to numerous journals.

Col. Roberts received a number of honors including the Army's Meritorious Service Medal in 1970, when he also received a Certificate of Appreciation from the President.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Gertrude Goldston Roberts, of the home; four sons, Joseph T., of York, Pa.; Alton O., of Burlington, Vt.; James T., of Bolinas, Calif.; and Charles E., of Rockville; his mother, Georgia Talmadge Roberts, of San Marcos; a brother, George T., of Citrus Heights, Calif.; a sister, Alice Roberts Oliver, of San Marcos, and five grandchildren.

The family suggests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the American Heart Association or the Walter Reed Medical Center.

PROJECT PREP—A SUCCESSFUL PILOT PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, much attention has been given to a variety of federally funded projects of dubious value. I would like to direct the attention of the Members to one federally funded project which, in its initial stages, has made exciting breakthroughs in early childhood education; and, in its later stages, has become a model copied throughout the Nation. This program, which I recently had the opportunity to inspect at close range, is called PREP. That is an acronym for Parent Readiness Education Project. It is funded under title III, section 306, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. PREP is centered in the Redford Union School District of Redford Township, a suburb adjacent to the city of Detroit, and is administered by a remarkably innovative and capable director, Diane K. Bert.

PREP began out of the concern of many educators that large numbers of children were entering kindergarten lacking in visual motor development and in the listening and language skills needed for subsequent academic success. It

was felt that part of the problem was that many parents did not know how to assist a child with learning difficulties in developing the requisite skills for a successful school career. A series of meetings with young parents confirmed this hypothesis. Many of the parents pointed out that nothing in their past lives had prepared them adequately for the parental role in assisting a child who had learning difficulties.

With this as a starting point, it was felt that if a program could be developed that could identify pre-school children with potential learning difficulties, provide such learning experiences as would ameliorate skill deficiencies in the children, train parents to work with and relate to their children more effectively, and, simultaneously, prepare young adults for future roles as parents, it would indeed be a valuable and worthwhile venture. Under the leadership of Diane Bert and with the cooperation of the Redford Union School District, such a program was developed. Federal assistance in funding the program was sought and obtained. I would like to report to you on what this program does and how well it has worked.

Children are selected for the program after a series of tests and other pre-screening devices have identified the child as one who might have a problem in learning. A total of 48 children are enrolled for each class. They are divided equally into four groups. Each child, and one of his or her parents, attends class one morning each week, Monday through Thursday. The children are provided extensive language, visual, auditory, and coordination exercises, as well as experiences aimed at improving the child's knowledge and appreciation of himself or herself. Parents observe the activities of the children through a one-way glass while a teacher explains what is happening and why. Later in the morning, the teacher meets with the parents and gives instructions for at-home activities the parents and their children can engage in. Such activities are designed to complement the exercises the children took part in at school. The materials required for the at-home activities are those materials commonly found in every home. These at-home activities require only a few minutes each day, but are an essential part of the program. PREP also makes additional, in-home counselling available for those families which need such individualized assistance.

During the second half of the year's work, senior high school students from a nearby school are brought into the program. These students, who are taking an elective course for credit, are each assigned a particular child to work with. Under the supervision of a qualified teacher, the high school students lead their assigned child through planned activities. Assignments given the children are geared to the unique needs of that child. One child, for example, may have coordination difficulties. Another may lack visual differentiation skills, while another is excessively shy and withdrawn. The older students keep logs of their observations of the children and the various interactions that take place. On

Friday of each week, the high school students meet with teacher-supervisors and discuss general child development, teaching techniques, as well as the progress of each individual child.

Regularly, parents of the pre-school children meet as a group with the teachers and discuss those same subjects, exchange experiences and ideas, and evaluate the progress of their children.

At the conclusion of the first year, all of the children involved in the pilot group, along with a substantial control group of children who were not involved in the program, were administered the Caldwell cooperative pre-school inventory. This is a sensitive test for analyzing skill development in small children. Objective analysis of the results of these tests established that the experimental group was more advanced in skills than the control group, even though children in the experimental group had been initially identified as being deficient in such skills.

Beyond this objective evaluation, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to talk at length with the administrator, the teachers, the high school students, and several of the parents. I sensed the enthusiasm, the commitment, and the feelings of satisfaction and accomplishment. I specifically asked several of the parents if they felt such a program justified the use of Federal funds. Unanimously they felt that it did. Moreover, the parents stated emphatically that as a result of the year's work, they now knew more about their children and more about themselves. Their relationship with other children in the family, they told me, had also improved. The high school students reported considerable growth in their knowledge of small children as a result of their experience, and felt it would be extremely beneficial if and when they had children of their own.

In addition to these documented gains, there is evidence of other benefits as well. For example, hundreds of Redford Township citizens have now experienced closer identification with community schools. Kindergarten and first grade teachers have increased their ability to plan for and deal with individual differences among small children, and siblings of the PREP children have benefited through what their parents have learned about helping children.

I might add that the PREP program of Redford Township has attracted considerable attention from communities in other parts of the country. Many other school districts are hoping to duplicate the PREP process, as well as its success. Diane Bert is much in demand to work with other communities in setting up similar projects.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of administering PREP, including the salaries of the Administrator, the teachers—all of whom are extremely well qualified by virtue of their education, their experience, their temperaments and personalities, and their love of children—all teaching materials, and administrative expenses, has been no more than \$349 per child per year. When we consider that each child has been diverted from a path of an unproductive school career, it is

clear that this is money well invested. Prevention is always less expensive than later efforts to remedy the results of learning problems.

I feel very strongly that Redford Township and the Administrator and teachers of PREP in the Redford Union School District are to be congratulated for their initiative, imagination, foresight, and ability in making a valuable contribution to the Nation as a whole. And I think the Members of Congress can share some pride that a federally funded program has lived up to its potential and proven worth. PREP is an excellent example of the Federal Government working in partnership with a local community to produce results that neither, independently, would have been capable of achieving.

METROPOLITAN LIFE COMES TO JOHNSTOWN

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the death of Johnstown, Pa., appeared imminent. Bethlehem Steel—the area's largest employer—announced it would be forced to reduce the work force at its Johnstown plant and place 5,000 people out of work.

The community pulled together and with help from the State and Federal Government was able to save the 5,000 jobs. The community spirit did not dissolve when Bethlehem announced it would continue. The crisis had created the Johnstown Area Regional Industries (JARI)—an organization designed to improve the area's economic picture.

After several efforts and some smaller successes, JARI announced on July 1 that Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. has chosen Johnstown as the location of its midwestern office.

For the area this represents a significant diversification away from manufacturing and basic industrial type of plants that presently characterize our region to include a new, management-professional work force. Besides new jobs, the Metropolitan decision will stimulate more consumer spending in the area, provide a more diversified population that will change spending habits, and create the psychological boost needed to start a whole new era in the Johnstown area and in central Pennsylvania.

With the benefits come new burdens on our area schools, housing markets, public services, and sales outlets. The arrival of Metropolitan represents an opportunity and a challenge for everyone in the Johnstown area, and nearly every aspect of the community will face change.

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to thank publicly some people who deserve praise for their work with this development.

First, let me mention the individuals within the community who are working hard to revitalize Johnstown. The major

accomplishment with Metropolitan results largely from the hard work and as:

Charles W. Kunkle, Jr., chairman, JARI.

Frank J. Pasquerilla, chairman, Johnstown Area Economic Development Corp.

Howard M. Picking, JARI board member.

Also, in his remarks making the announcement, Mr. Kunkle mentioned the work and dedication of these individuals:

John Burkhard, Johnstown Chamber of Commerce.

Michael P. Flynn, executive director, JARI.

Jack Scheppler, Economic Development Corp.

Eugene Swetz, Greater Johnstown Committee.

Second, the project could not have been arranged without the help and cooperation of public officials. Besides their work in attracting Metropolitan, they now face a major task in providing the necessary Government assistance and services. Certainly deserving mention are:

Joseph P. Robert, chairman, Cambria County Commissioners.

Joseph Gorman, county commissioner.

Raymond Johnson, county commissioner.

And third, we certainly commend the efforts of officials at Metropolitan Life. They have shown great confidence in the people of our region, and took time to recognize the advantages of a smaller urban area. Their foresight is to be congratulated. I know they will not be disappointed in their site selection. Deserving recognition from the company are:

George P. Jenkins, Board Chairman.

Russell A. Baumann, General Manager of the Johnstown facility.

Edwin L. Barker, District Sales Manager.

Joseph J. Guiffre, vice-president.

Andrew R. Innocenzi, regional sales manager.

Charles E. Lanigan, vice president.

Robert F. Muller, assistant vice president.

Donald A. Odell, senior vice president and secretary.

Paul J. Pittinger, vice president.

Vincent Reusing, government relations associate.

Charles E. Snoddy, vice president.

It has taken a great effort to reach this point, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that through the efforts of these individuals and others, a new era has begun for the Johnstown area and central Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that 67 Members of the House join with me today in introduction of a resolution calling for a permanent "National Family Week" observance in November.

This resolution is similar to one ap-

proved by the 92d Congress and signed by the President in 1972 with the exception that this proposal calls for the establishment of an annual observance in honor of the family institution.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to which this resolution will be referred has stated that only proposals with "national appeal and significance" will be considered for commemorative days or periods. I cannot think of a more significant institution with wider national appeal than the family and I am hopeful this Congress will act promptly to approve this resolution.

More than 40 Governors have endorsed State proclamations of Family Week in the past and dozens of organizations have expressed an interest in promoting a national observance once the resolution is approved.

The legislation calls for the 4th week in November, the week including Thanksgiving, to be designated as "National Family Week." It also encourages States and local communities to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

No institution in our society has had more influence over the development of America during the last 200 years than the family. Our Nation's freedom was born in the families that formed the 13 colonies.

Our goal is to restore the family to its rightful place in society by enlisting the support of millions of Americans in this drive to understand and appreciate the significance of the family in the history of this Nation.

My hope is that Congress this year will renew its endorsement of national family week in order to assure the success of this annual observance. Many governors, mayors and organizations are awaiting an official proclamation before proceeding with their plans.

A national family week organization has been organized to promote this observance throughout the land. The following organizations have indicated their interest in helping:

American Home Economics Association, American Legion, American National Red Cross, Big Sisters of the District of Columbia, Black Silent Majority Committee, Center For The Family, Community Family Life Services, Inc., Community Group Health Foundation, Cub Scouting Division, Family Service Association of America, Future Homemakers of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Life Line, Lions Clubs of Northern Washington, Metropolitan Police Boys' Clubs, Mission of Community Concern, National Catholic Community Service, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Council of Jewish Women, National Exchange Club, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Salvation Army and Teen Corps, Inc.

Members of the House who join with me in sponsoring this measure are:

Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Archer, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Beard of Rhode Island, Mr. Beard of Tennessee, Mr. Beville, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brodhead, Mr. Broyhill, Mr. Burgener, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. Clawson, Mr. Collins of Texas, Mr. Conlan, Mr. Conte, Mr. Dan Daniel of Virginia, Mr. Davis, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Duncan of Tennessee, Mr. Ellberg, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Fithian, Mr. Flowers, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Gradison.

Mr. Grassley, Mr. Guyer, Mr. Helstoski, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Horton, Mr. Howe, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Kemp, Mr. LaFalce, Mr. Lott, Mr. McHugh, Mr. McKay, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Michel, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Mitchell of New York, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Moorhead of California, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Roe, Mr. Schulze, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. J. William Stanton of Ohio, Mr. Talcott, Mr. Thone, Mr. Treen, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Winn, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Yatron, Mr. Young of Florida.

OIL'S "BATTLE OF THE BILLIONS"

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the seemingly endless battle between the public interest and that of the administration aligned with oil company lobbies will continue in another arena over the next few weeks as H.R. 7014—the Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act of 1975—comes to the floor of the House. This bill, reported out by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, is a relatively comprehensive and equitable measure which features, most importantly, a price ceiling on uncontrolled domestic oil. The Commerce Committee has made it clear by the approval of this bill that it will not sit idly by as the administration permits the OPEC cartel to establish the price for our own resources and wreak havoc on our economy. Ralph Nader describes the motivations of the interested parties quite well in his column which appeared in the Washington Star on July 5, 1975:

OIL'S "BATTLE OF THE BILLIONS"

(By Ralph Nader)

The stage is set for a dramatic struggle between Gerald Ford and consumer forces in Congress over the price of energy in this country. As if to punctuate the onset of this "battle of the billions," the giant oil companies' recent price increases signaled the second lap in their drive for \$1-per-gallon gasoline.

President Ford's energy policy would replace price controls by our government with OPEC-Exxon pricing of our domestic energy, including oil, gas and coal. That would be the direct result of his oil price decontrol plan.

No economist would deny that once controls go off, the price of domestic oil will rise to the level of the OPEC price for foreign oil.

Similarly, if President Ford achieves his deregulation-of-natural-gas objective through Congress, the price of domestic natural gas will more than triple, rising to the equivalent price of OPEC oil. Steam coal prices have doubled in less than two years, mysteriously reflecting similar upward pulls of the price of oil.

Under the Ford energy plan, stripped of its presidential television rhetoric, every time OPEC raises its price \$1 per barrel, Americans will pay almost \$6 billion more per year for domestic oil, gas and coal.

This country's domestic energy supplies provide our country with 80 percent of its energy consumption. So President Ford's decontrol scheme would let the price of the 20 percent of the energy we import determine the price of the 80 percent of the energy we produce in the United States.

The giant multinational oil companies, of course, like the President's program. In fact, they helped write it. Exxon, Gulf, Mobil, Arco, Shell and other oil giants are making more profits than ever before as the OPEC price goes up.

Moreover, as long as the OPEC price stays high or goes higher, the value of their oil, gas and coal reserves in this country and elsewhere increase by hundreds of billions of dollars.

If OPEC did not exist, the big oil companies would want to create it. Fortune magazine, in its May issue, described how the OPEC cartel depends on the multinational oil corporations to ensure that production cutbacks, needed to sustain cartel prices, are distributed equitably among the cartel members.

In a word, these oil companies are shoring up the cartel because they have a stake of billions in its continuance.

When representatives of the oil-producing countries visit this country, they must wonder how the oil industry's White House service station can publicly condemn OPEC while it and the large U.S. oil companies are doing everything to keep it going.

What will the Ford plan cost the American family? At least \$600 a year from higher fuel, electricity and gasoline prices. In addition the ripple effect of higher food, clothing and other prices will add even more to the already strained family budget.

This means massive inflation, more unemployment and recession. And that is why members of Congress have been balking at the veto-threatening President Ford.

As a countermove to Ford, the House Commerce Committee has reported to the House of Representatives HR 7014, the energy conservation and oil pricing act of 1975.

Bitterly fought over between pro-consumer committee members and other Democrats like Rep. John Dingell, who want to weaken the bill in the oil industry's favor to avoid a presidential veto, HR 7014 represents probably the best provisions likely to get through to law in this era of the imperial presidency.

Led by Congressmen Bob Eckhardt, John Moss and Andrew Maguire, HR 7014 holds oil prices far below the Ford plan but still at a level amply sufficient to encourage exploration and production.

It provides for mandatory automobile fuel economy standards, industrial fuel efficiency goals and several other ways to reduce inflationary energy waste.

It also sets up a petroleum reserve and provides the General Accounting Office with subpoena powers to get the facts about reserves, costs and other situations from the hidden recesses of the oil industry.

The congressional votes on HR 7014 will be coming up later this month and early August. If you're interested in more information, write to your representative and ask for a copy of the House Commerce Committee report on HR 7014.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESSES TO WILSON HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1975, READING, PA.

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following commencement address by the valedictorian, Mr. Glenn Troxel, of Wilson High School class of 1975, Reading, Pa., and the commencement address by the salutatorian,

Ms. Catherine Dadamio, of Wilson High School class of 1975, Reading, Pa.:

YOUR TOMORROW IS BEING SHAPED TODAY

When we as students consider and evaluate ourselves we find that we are the sum total of our experiences. All that we have done has become part of us and we constantly draw from this reservoir of knowledge when we are faced with new problems and situations.

One of the many molding parts of this reservoir has been our parents. They have provided guidance when we needed it and whether or not we are willing to admit it, they have also given us the basis for our own morals. There has been much talk of a generation gap; but when you get right down to it, the basic rights and wrongs for both of us are still the same.

Another important molding part has been school and so far this has been provided in basically three phases:

In grade school we got to learn what school was all about; and we also made new friends, friends whom we have known and kept all of our lives. Our friends are the people by whom others judge us and they are usually the ones who influence us the most.

The next phase of schooling was junior high where we were basically separated into sections. Here we got to know mainly only those in our particular sections well.

Next came senior high school and here we found friends in fields that we enjoyed, extracurricular activities such as sports or clubs. By senior high school we have also pretty well determined what course of study we are going to embark upon and this decision is reflected by the quality of work and how we apply ourselves in school. High school has also been an experimenting time. It has been a time when we've gotten a chance to try out new things, things we could never do before or things that we read about in books. Along with this goes social affairs and here we learn self-control and to judge for ourselves what is right and wrong.

Wilson, as a high school, has also provided us with many opportunities and open doors. First and most importantly of all it has provided a means of education and this had come through competent members of the Wilson faculty staff. However, it has been up to us as students if we wanted to seize this opportunity.

For others, high school has provided a chance to get started in a career or business through the vocational technical and cooperative programs.

Wilson has also provided a chance to meet new people and friends and also a chance for athletic competition. Here those of us involved have learned how to take defeat and how to control our pride in victory. Sports in a way have helped to prepare us for life with all its downfalls and high spots.

As we look toward the future some of us will be going to college, some may be into business. Others may try to get a part time job for a while, and others will be starting families. I think that at the age of seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen we are by no means children anymore, yet we are now faced with a difficult decision; that is what field we will enter. This decision will be shaping the rest of our lives and eighteen is rather young in this perspective. This is why we must try to make decisions that will not limit us in the future, but rather open new doors to us. As we go on now we will probably meet whole new groups of people and we'll have to adapt to them, just as we have adapted before, except this time it should be an easier task since we have that reservoir to draw from.

With high school we have not just acquired knowledge. We have learned self-control and how to react to different situations.

In the future we will be facing many new challenges such as a job, marriage, and family. We'll also face new problems and these we will have to work out for ourselves be-

cause there will be no guidance counselors to help us. Again, these we'll be able to try to solve because we are the sum total of our experiences.

In conclusion I would like to leave each one of you with this message. You must go out in life and prove to yourself that you can have and do what you want because you can. Each one of you has some basic skill or talent; some know what it is already, others may have to search themselves for it. You must then go out and apply yourself with what you have and if you go with tolerance, with self-understanding, and with confidence, I think you will enjoy a happy, productive life.

YOUR ATTITUDE CAN DETERMINE YOUR FUTURE

In order to achieve anything it is important that we are able to face both disappointments and encouragements. To surmount what is merely possible, we must say to ourselves that we can do it.

Experience is the substance that makes up our lives; and achievement often requires tedious, long, harsh experiences such as competition, criticism, and even failure. But if we want to know achievement, we must have such experiences; and if we want to know experience, we must attempt achievement.

It is encouraging to know that even the greatest of men and women had approached seemingly unsurmountable obstacles, but with fortitude and perseverance they cleared their own path of difficulties. Tom Dempsey, the kicker of the Philadelphia Eagles, was born with half of a foot and three fingers on one of his hands. In spite of his physical handicap, he now holds the record for the longest field goal. In 1973 a Conrad Weiser High School senior and football player became paralyzed after a tragic trampoline accident. At that time he was confined to a high-back wheel chair and had to wear a four-poster brace. With the help of excessive therapy and faith, he now has the use of his arms and is able to operate an electric wheelchair. He is now planning to attend college, and he sees college as his chance to begin helping others.

Houston McTear, an eighteen year old sprinter from the backwoods of Florida, is one of the record holders in the 100 yard dash running it in 9.0 seconds. When he was fourteen years old he won the 100 yard dash in a junior high school track meet, running in sneakers, a T-shirt, and a worn pair of cut-off blue jeans. His father, mother, and seven brothers live in a squalid shack at the end of a dirt road. His father makes \$400 a month. The school he attends lacks many facilities, including a track; but he is letting nothing stop him. He has potential, and most important of all, he has drive.

A few weeks ago I attended a luncheon and was privileged to hear the speech of Judge Lisa Richette of the Court of Common Pleas Court of Philadelphia. Judge Richette is the author of "Throwaway Children". She talked of how she and many women had to struggle for their positions in life not because they lacked intelligence or ability, but because society failed to recognize the liberated woman. Judge Richette, among others, never gave up despite the fact that everywhere they turned people claimed that they did not look like a doctor, a lawyer, a judge . . . or whatever the case may be. Society implied that therefore they could not become one.

Of course, not everyone can become nationally known or a "superstar"; but if we set goals within our own little world, we can strive to reach them. Our goals must be high enough so that we may look ahead but low enough so that we may someday reach them. We can expect failures, but failure will stir us to endure much more and keep aiming for our goals.

Here in the Wilson area we find that both the roles of men and women are changing in the fields of sports, leadership, and job opportunity. Many of us feel that we are hindered

because these fields are lacking. We cannot, however, become discouraged because of the fact that it seems as though we have to fight so much for what we really want and need. As we learn to make our own decisions and strive for our own goals, we will become able to work together for the making of a better society. It is true that whatever I do for myself can only help myself; but if we, as a whole, retain the optimistic views each one of us has towards ourself, we can join with others and reach for America's goals. Optimistic individuals make an optimistic American society.

Here is a quotation by Walter D. Wintle that we should remember when we face these future challenges:

Life's battles don't always go
To the stronger or faster man,
But soon or late the man who wins
Is the one who thinks he can.

WE BEGIN TOMORROW

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Fourth of July, we witnessed the national spirit of patriotism as we commemorated our country's independence, and marked the beginning of our Bicentennial year. This feeling of respect for our country and for the individual liberties that are ours as citizens of this great land, provide the solid foundation for our national strength.

In my judgment, this coming year is a time for Americans to reaffirm our national heritage and promote America and unity among all Americans. It is a time to encourage a massive expression of appreciation for the blessings and freedom of our country on her 200th birthday.

Therefore, I was especially pleased to see the editorial in the July 3 edition of the Suburban Life, an outstanding publication serving West Cook County, Ill., calling for all Americans to renew their patriotism as we honor our country's 200th anniversary. The article follows:

WE BEGIN TOMORROW

Tomorrow we enter into our 200th year as the United States of America, and we begin the one year Bicentennial countdown to the date which will launch us into our third century.

The Bicentennial is springing up across our entire nation as a spirit of participation and achievement. Western Springs and Darien have already had Bicentennial events. Many of our communities are flying the Bicentennial flag. We hope all will be doing so soon.

The La Grange Bicentennial Commission is putting forth a special effort for every resident to fly the American flag tomorrow. Again we hope this communitywide effort spreads throughout the area and nation.

We believe this country needs a return to good old fashioned patriotism. Getting involved in Bicentennial activities is the best way we know to achieve this goal.

In contrast to this nation's Centennial in 1876 which was celebrated in a single city, Philadelphia, the activities commemorating our Bicentennial will take place in communities throughout the U.S. Most area villages have committees hard at work on local celebrations. Any community not already involved is missing the boat.

Fireworks, parades and picnics are the traditional Fourth of July observances. With participation in these events tomorrow, we hope residents will renew the patriotism and spirit which has made this nation the greatest land on earth.

It is our hope that during this final year of our second century, all Americans will come together to remember how we came to be, celebrate what we are and to reflect on where we are going.

We hope that Americans will use this coming year to prepare a celebration befitting our great nation. Each community, in its own way, should be planning now to celebrate the Bicentennial in a manner best suited to its location, means and desires.

It should also be a day to break ground for a Bicentennial project that will help shape a better tomorrow so future generations can look back and know that the community of today cared about itself, about its nation and the principles which we honor.

We begin tomorrow, not with just a day off from work, with a reaffirmation of our faith and trust in the American way. Fly the flag and be proud you're an American.

THE WORLD IGNORES THE CAMBODIAN DEATH MARCH

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for many months before the fall of Cambodia to the Communists many in the Congress and in the press urged a withdrawal of U.S. aid to the anti-Communist Government of Lon Nol. They argued, as in the case of the majority leader of the Senate, that stopping the aid was "in the best interests" of the Cambodian people. New York Times Columnist Tom Wicker said that there was "not much moral choice" between the Khmer Rouge and the Lon Nol government.

Now, we can review the results of the Communist takeover of Cambodia and decide whether or not it has really been in the best interests of the people of that country.

The fact is that the Khmer Rouge, shortly after their takeover, embarked upon a policy of genocide in Cambodia. Upon entering Phnom Penh, Khmer Rouge troops immediately ordered the entire population—some 2 million people—to move out of the city en masse. Women, children, old men—were all driven out like cattle, many of them totally unequipped or supplied to go for more than a few hours—toward an unknown destination said to be 65 miles away.

An intelligence memo prepared for the White House states that—

. . . it is clear that the forced march out of Phnom Penh resulted in death for many of the young, old and weak among the city's 2 million inhabitants. . . . First-hand accounts from individuals caught up in the forced exodus—and who subsequently exited the country—paint a grim picture. One reported scores of bodies floating in a river near the capital. . . . The removal of the urban population to the countryside is clearly a deliberate and calculated policy of the new leadership. . . .

Denis D. Gray, an Associated Press reporter in Thailand, interviewed Cambodians who managed to escape. One former soldier said that he saw about 40 trailers with about 10 corpses piled into each being towed down a road. Two days later, after the Khmer Rouge had left, the soldier said he discovered arms and legs and other parts of bodies sticking out of shallow graves near the village of Phan Rong. Gray writes that—

Another refugee said he had been a policeman. . . . He said he and 16 other police and military intelligence men were rounded up, stripped of their underwear and taken toward a pit surrounded by Khmer Rouge soldiers. They were beaten with shovels and bamboo clubs during their death march to the mass grave, the man said.

The brutality being inflicted by Communists in Cambodia has been largely ignored by world opinion. Columnist Jack Anderson writes that—

The United Nations, collectively and separately, continues to ignore the forced evacuation of an estimated 3 million Cambodians from the cities to the countryside. Yet this must go down in history as the greatest atrocity since the Nazis herded Jews into the gas chambers. The mass exodus was a death march. . . . An estimated 1 million people are expected to die from hunger and exposure. . . .

Those who believe in the pleasant illusion of détente, that somehow the Communists have changed, should review events in Cambodia.

I wish to share with colleagues the article, "Cambodian Refugees Tell of Executions" by Denis D. Gray, which appeared in the Washington Star of June 24, 1975, and the column, "U.N. Ignores Cambodia Death March," by Jack Anderson, which appeared in the Washington Post of June 23, 1975, and insert them into the RECORD at this time:

[From the Washington Star, June 24, 1975]

CAMBODIAN REFUGEES TELL OF EXECUTIONS

(By Denis D. Gray)

SURIN, THAILAND.—Cambodians who escaped recently to Thailand report that mass executions have taken place in Cambodia since the Khmer Rouge victory more than two months ago.

The refugees say most of the victims were men of the former Cambodian army. They apparently were killed to eliminate elements thought to be potentially hostile to the new rulers of Cambodia, the sources said.

Two former soldiers said they saw Khmer Rouge soldiers beat about 40 officers and enlisted men to death with shovels and clubs in the northwestern province of Siem Reap at the end of April.

The victims, their hands tied behind their backs, screamed and begged to be shot as the Khmer Rouge pounded them to death.

The corpses were buried near the village of Phnom Prong, nine miles west of the provincial capital, the two men said. They said they watched the killings from separate hiding places in the jungle.

Another former soldier from the area said he saw about 40 trailers with about 10 corpses piled into each being towed down a road. Two days later, after the Khmer Rouge had left, the soldier said he discovered arms and legs and other parts of bodies sticking out of shallow graves near the village of Phan Rong.

Another refugee said he had been a policeman in the northwestern province of Oddor Mean Chey. He said he and 16 other police and military intelligence men were rounded up at the provincial headquarters during the

second week of May, stripped to their underwear and taken toward a pit surrounded by Khmer Rouge soldiers.

They were beaten with shovels and bamboo clubs during their "death march to the mass grave," the man said. But he reported that he asked his captors for water and when they gave it to him managed to escape into the jungle as the Khmer Rouge fired after him. He showed scars on his wrists which he said came from the steel wire with which he was bound.

A former diplomat who escaped with his family reported that on May 31 a Khmer Rouge official stopped him about 30 miles from the Thai border and told him: "You are lucky. Three days ago we received instructions not to kill any more people of the old government."

The diplomat said the official told him 29 truckloads of soldiers and members of their families were executed in the area of Talork, a former military camp.

The former diplomat also said he was told that almost 3,000 army men were executed southeast of Phnom Penh about five miles off Highway 1 during the last week of April. He said he was told of this by persons who said they were wives or sons of the victims.

A former lieutenant colonel, driven from Phnom Penh in the forced exodus following the capture of the city, said he saw corpses strung together around coconut palms along a highway south of the capital.

"There were about 20 such groups, each with some 10 men lashed together," he said. "We dared not look too closely. But the men were naked from the waist up and had bullet holes in their backs."

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1975]

U.N. IGNORES CAMBODIA DEATH MARCH

(By Jack Anderson and Les Whitten)

The United Nations, collectively and separately, continues to ignore the forced evacuation of an estimated 3 million Cambodians from the cities to the countryside.

Yet this must go down in history as the greatest atrocity since the Nazis herded Jews into the gas chambers. The mass exodus was a death march, with reports of bodies abandoned along the way. An estimated 1 million people are expected to die from hunger and exposure in the hinterland, where the food stocks simply aren't adequate to feed the city population.

The details, however, have been bottled up. As we reported in an earlier column, the Communists have sealed off Cambodia so that almost no information leaks out.

An intelligence memo, prepared for the White House, reports this much:

"Although the accounts are confused, and in many cases conflicting, it is clear that the forced march out of Phnom Penh resulted in death for many of the young, old and weak among the city's 2 million inhabitants."

Another million people from other towns were driven out of their homes and were forced to join the death march.

Continues the intelligence document: "First-hand accounts from individuals caught up in the forced exodus—and who subsequently exited the country—paint a grim picture.

"One reported scores of bodies floating in a river near the capital. According to doctors among the marchers, scores of people died from cholera, dehydration or hunger since the Communists provided no food, water or medicine throughout the long march.

"Having forcefully relocated the urban population, there is evidence that the leadership is having difficulty adequately caring for its new wards and the toll of human lives is likely to continue as the result of disease and famine."

Why did the Communists empty the cities? Declares the memo: "The removal of the urban population to the countryside is clear-

ly a deliberate and calculated policy of the new leadership and appears to be aimed at furthering the Communists' plan to remake completely Cambodian society in the shortest possible time, relieving the strain on urban food supplies and facilitating consolidation of control over the cities and towns."

But the full "magnitude of human suffering caused by this policy," suggests the memo, "will probably never be fully known."

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR EGIDIO ORTONA—END OF AN EXEMPLARY CAREER IN SERVICE TO ITALY AND AMERICA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker. It is my distinct honor and privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished Ambassador from Italy the Honorable Egidio Ortona who has announced his intention to retire after a distinguished 8-year career as Ambassador.

Actually his retirement marks the end of a career in the diplomatic service which stretched some 43 years. Ambassador Ortona before entering diplomatic service had compiled an outstanding scholastic record in some of the finest institutions of learning in the world. This included a law degree from the University of Turin and a degree from the prestigious London School of Economics.

Ambassador Ortona began his diplomatic service in 1932 and spent time in Cairo, Johannesburg and London. In 1940 he returned to Rome and served as the Chief of the Office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In 1945 Ambassador Ortona was first assigned to the Italian Embassy in Washington. In 1949 he was appointed as the head of the Italian technical delegation which gave him close dealings with the program of American economic assistance to Italy which served to reinvigorate their nation after the ravages of World War II.

In the 1950's Ambassador Ortona's diplomatic talents began to be better recognized and he was chosen as the minister-counselor for the Washington Embassy.

In 1958 he was given one of its highest honors when he was chosen to be the Italian Representative to the United Nations. He had the distinct and unforgettable privilege of presiding over the Security Council on two different occasions.

In 1961 Mr. Ortona was summoned back to Italy to serve as the Director General for Economic Affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His economic expertise was called upon often in this period serving as chairman of a number of major international conferences. He was also chosen to be a member of the Italian delegation in the International Monetary Fund as well as a member of the Council of Ministers of the European Economic Community.

After this time he again returned to the diplomatic field and was appointed Secretary General of the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In May of 1967 he culminated his brilliant career in public service by being appointed as the Ambassador of the Republic of Italy to the United States. In his tenure as Ambassador he gained the friendship and respect of the American and international diplomatic community. He has many friends in all walks of life both in America and in the world community. I have had the personal pleasure of knowing the Ambassador for a number of years and have found him to be a man of great intelligence and compassion dedicated to serving the people of Italy. The people of Italy have been fortunate to have a man of the caliber of Egidio Ortona as their Ambassador. We in this country have been fortunate to have had the services of Ambassador Ortona as he has proven himself to be an exemplary leader in the diplomatic world.

A successful diplomat is one who has a natural rapport with people. Ambassador Ortona throughout his long years in the diplomatic service has enjoyed his duties and his contacts with people. He has provided myself and the other Italian-American Members of Congress with inspiration and guidance in our work and has afforded us extensive courtesies at the famous embassy on 16th Street. He is a man who has lived life to the hilt and at an age when most men would be seeking a quiet life, Ambassador Ortona remains active in his work and his favorite extracurricular activities of swimming and horseback riding.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Italy, the Italian-American community, and the diplomatic world as a whole will sorely miss Ambassador Ortona. I know I speak for all these groups when I extend to the Ambassador my best wishes for a successful and healthy retirement and many more years with his lovely wife, Giulia, and their three children, one of whom I might add is seeking to follow his father in diplomatic service. Ambassador Ortona is a man who deserves nothing but the best from life, for that is exactly what he gave to it.

POLITICIANS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

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

POLITICIANS

Given the deep mistrust of politicians, anyone—and especially a politician—who takes pen in hand, or opens his mouth, to defend politicians as a group should probably be prepared to duck fast. But I believe the defense needs to be made, so I'll ignore my own advice and give it a try.

You don't need to tell those of us who are politicians that we have a bad name and that people have become extremely cynical about us. Attacking politicians is, of course, a national sport, played enthusiastically year-round, in good weather and bad, in or out of doors.

What, then, can be said in defense of politicians? Believe it or not, a pretty good de-

fense can be made, and it goes something like this: The role of the politician is to make the country work. John Gardner reminds us that in a country as big and diverse as America, worthy groups want mutually contradictory things. Without the aid of politicians in creating consensus and accommodation, the country would come apart at the seams. The politician promotes stability, accommodates different points of view, develops a consensus, tries to meet the needs of the people, and strives to achieve justice. On any scale of values, these are not unworthy tasks.

Most politicians are knowledgeable about the competing pressures in the country, and they learn to mediate among them. They know the flashpoints of contention on most subjects, and they try to work their way through conflicting arguments and pressures to workable solutions. Politicians are necessarily students of what will work and of what will keep all sides in a conflict, if not satisfied, at least not too unhappy. They will often blur the stark line between victory and defeat by making gracious overtures and even concessions when they win, and by putting the best possible face on defeat when they lose.

People often have exaggerated expectations of what politicians can accomplish. They want instant satisfaction, and when they don't get it, they experience instant disappointment. They often overestimate the ability of their favorite politician to solve a problem and they underestimate the difficulty of the problem itself. They become too quickly frustrated and disenchanted with the political process when politicians do not make the progress they think should be made. In fact, politicians often accomplish more than people realize. Too often, people become transfixed by the daily charges and countercharges, as the news media focus on personalities, differences, and generalities, that they miss, or forget, the progress made and the problems avoided.

Basically, politicians struggle for power; that is what their business is all about. In this country this struggle is out in the open, in a system in which politicians try to make the competing interests, the frustrations and desires of 215 million Americans and mold them into some kind of national policy. Politicians play an indispensable role in this vital process, although, admittedly, it is sometimes done rather crudely.

In a big, tough, sometimes cruel world, the politician also serves as an important buffer between individuals and their government. Any Congressman can tell you that he and his staff spend much time in obtaining social security benefits or unemployment compensation for constituents, and in many other ways politicians are able to make a harsh environment a little kinder for individuals who encounter the sometimes appalling indifference of massive government bureaucracy.

The politicians' efforts to build a majority or a consensus are also essential in forging national unity. The forces of sectionalism are very strong in this country. We rightly pride ourselves on the diversity of class, race, creed, and region, but these things do have a divisive thrust, and on many questions the country needs all the unifying forces it can muster. Fence straddling, back-slapping, frustratingly ambiguous politicians may deserve more credit than you think for softening the rough edges of America's fabulous diversity. In the long view, the unity of the country is more important than winning or losing a particular fight over policy.

This defense of the politician may be a little one-sided, but the other side is heard so often that I hope it is in order. To paraphrase a prominent political scientist: There is no America without democracy; there is no democracy without politics; and there can be no politics without politicians.

REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE AND PUERTO RICO

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, violent revolutionary acts by organizations supporting the creation of a Cuban-style totalitarian Marxist state in Puerto Rico continue unabated. In at least two cities which have experienced these terrorist attacks, police investigations have reportedly been seriously hindered by a lack of intelligence files on revolutionary extremist groups and their members and supporters.

On June 14, 1975, 12 hours before the start of a Puerto Rico Day parade in Chicago, the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion Nacional (FALN)—(Armed Forces of National Liberation), a Puerto Rican terrorist organization previously active in Newark, N.J., and New York City, claimed responsibility for placing bombs in three downtown Chicago locations.

In the early hours of the morning, a woman phoned the Chicago offices of the Associated Press to announce, "This is the FALN speaking. We have planted three bombs at capitalist institutions in downtown Chicago." After directing reporters to a communique placed in a Union Station telephone booth, the woman concluded, "Free Puerto Rico now! Free all political prisoners!"

One bomb was never found. A second, a black powder, dynamite, and clock device, was discovered in a shoulder bag by two couples who thought they had found some abandoned camera equipment outside the First National Bank. They drove as far as the Mid-Continental Plaza Building before discovering the true contents of the bag. Thrown from the car, the bomb exploded almost immediately, slightly injuring the four persons.

The third bomb exploded outside the United of America Bank 7 minutes later at 12:52 a.m. This was the assembly point for the Puerto Rican Day parade. Press reports indicated that most of the damage was to glass windows.

The FALN communique, labeled "No. 5," provided the customary list of excuses for revolutionary terrorism—"repression" and "exploitation." Stating the bombings were in support of the Puerto Rican Day parade and of the protest contingent of radical groups within it, the FALN Communique No. 5 read:

In solidarity with the protest contingency we have undertaken the following bombings of Yanki imperialist institutions: the United America Bank, First National Bank, and the United States Federal Building which houses various agencies of repression, ex. CIA, FBI, LEAA. Also, the Department of Immigration, which at this time is trying to blame the falling economic system on our chicano brothers and sisters. * * *

These actions also demonstrate to the United States Government that the mobile guerrilla units of the FALN can hit anywhere in the United States.

Once again, we demand the immediate release of the four Nationalist Prisoners being

held in yanki jails, and the unconditional independence of Puerto Rico.

Just in case there may have been any doubts as to the political orientation of the FALN, the communique ended:

We also want to express our solidarity with the four victorious people of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Their victory is our victory.

The revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Puerto Rican Socialist Party—Partido Socialista Puertorriquena—(PSP), whose activities the FALN has previously supported, held a press conference on the Chicago bombings in June 17. The activities of the PSP, whose leader, Juan Mari Bras, has expressed his approval of FALN bombings, have been the subject of previous reports to my colleagues on June 2, 1975, 16573-16575; June 6, 1975, 17747-17749; and June 10, 18248-18250.

The press conference featured David Santiago, secretary of the PSP, and Jesus Lopez, a member of the PSP's elite Political Committee, who stated, "We are enemies of indiscriminate terrorism," and that the PSP could not support acts that were not tied to "a strategic program toward our liberation."

In a written statement, Lopez said:

Terrorism can only be justified in revolutionary practice when it is used in the context of a revolutionary mass struggle to destroy the enemy in the military field at a given moment.

These statements, consistent with Marxist-Leninist theory, do not by any means constitute an absolute condemnation of the FALN, nor has the PSP ordered its members to cooperate with law enforcement in tracking down the bombers whose previous revolutionary exploits include the boobytrap maiming of a young Puerto Rican police officer in New York City.

The PSP's founding program, released in November 1971, called upon its supporters "to respond to the repressive violence of the regime with revolutionary violence to the degree which conditions and circumstances require."

When the FALN first made news in October 1974, with five bombings of New York City financial institutions in support of the PSP's Puerto Rican Solidarity Day rally in Madison Square Garden, PSP Secretary-general Juan Hari Bras declared at the rally:

There is a diversity of forms and means by which the Puerto Rican people struggle for independence and national liberation. This is one of the means.

Latest press reports indicate that law enforcement officials have announced no leads or suspects. Assistant Deputy Police Superintendent Edward Buckney was quoted by the Chicago Sun-Times as saying that the bombings "did not happen in Chicago before, when we had an effective intelligence operation. In the past, we could prevent these things and head them off [here] when they happened in other cities."

WEATHER UNDERGROUND BOMBERS SUPPORT PSP-LED STRIKE

Two days later, on June 16, a medium-sized pipe bomb exploded at about 5 a.m. outside a branch of the Banco de Ponce at 10 Rockefeller Plaza in New York City.

Shortly afterward, a male speaking unaccented English phoned the New York Post while a female telephoned the Associated Press to claim that the Weather Underground Organization—WUO—had committed the bombing "in support of the cement workers strike in Ponce." This refers to a strike which began in January 1975, by the PSP-led Operators and Cement Workers Union—OCWU—against the Puerto Rican Cement Co. owned by the family of Luis Ferre, former governor of Puerto Rico.

Reporters were directed to a phone booth at Greenwich Avenue and West 10th Street—the former location of the old Women's House of Detention, the site of innumerable radical protests—where a 3-page typed communique was discovered.

The Weather Underground denounced the owner of the Puerto Rican Cement Co., Luis A. Ferre, president of Ferre Enterprises and a former governor of Puerto Rico—1968-72—who is a leading member of the pro-statehood New Progressive Party which received 44 percent of the votes in the 1972 Puerto Rican elections. The Banco de Ponce was selected as the bombing target because Sr. Ferre's family has the controlling interest in that institution.

The Weather Underground communique concluded with a rhetorical attack similar in tone and content to material produced by the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee—PRSC—a PSP-controlled united front support organization of several New Left revolutionary groups. The Solidarity Committee includes a number of persons who have expressed political commitment to the Cuban revolution, and who were formerly supporters of the Weatherman faction of SDS.

The Weather Underground indictment of the free enterprise system concluded:

Since 1898, when the U.S. grabbed Puerto Rico as a colony, U.S. corporations have used Puerto Rico as a profit paradise while distorting and wrecking its economic life. U.S. investments return more profit per year than the entire annual budget of the Puerto Rican government. Those profits come from the super-exploitation of Puerto Rican workers, who work long hours under dangerous conditions and receive one-third the wages of U.S. workers, at comparable jobs. The recent wave of strikes by telephone workers, waterworks employees and the cement workers are threatening this system—and in the process shaking the very foundations of U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico.

PUERTO RICAN SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE
DEMONSTRATION

On June 2, 1975, Luis Ferre was the target of a noisy picket line of 30 demonstrators at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology graduation ceremonies at which Mr. Ferre, a trustee of MIT, was speaking. The Maoist weekly Guardian reported that the demonstration, on behalf of the strike by the PSP-led Operators and Cement Workers Union, and "organized by the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, was so loud it forced guards to close windows and doors of the building where the ceremony was being held."

The Guardian further noted:

The strike is an important part of the growing struggle of the Puerto Rican labor movement and will strengthen the United Labor Movement (MOU)—(Movimiento Ob-

rero Unido), a militant federation of independent trade unions.

The Guardian neglected to inform its readership that the MOU is the Puerto Rican Socialist Party's front for the eventual formation of a central labor organization of all workers under its Marxist-Leninist control.

The OCWU/PSP strike against the Puerto Rican Cement Co. has been marked by nearly three dozen bombings of company property. On April 9, Efrain Fernandez, OCWU president, was arrested in Puerto Rico and charged with violating the Federal Firearms and Explosives Act. On June 5, three bombs exploded in cement company trucks causing \$16,000 in damages. At that time Fernandez felt compelled to state, "we did not do this, but we can understand it."

THE CUBAN COMMUNIST PARTY VIEW OF
PUERTO RICAN CEMENT STRIKE

The Puerto Rican Socialist Party and Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee rhetoric, together with the "armed propaganda" provided by the FALN and the Weather Underground, has found a more significant backer.

The weekly review in English published by Granma, self-described as the "official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba," on June 22, 1975, republished an earlier June 11, 1975, article entitled, "The Puerto Rican Cement Workers' Strike: An Example of Labor Unity," under a quotation from Fidel Castro, "Puerto Rico awaits the solidarity of all in its relentless struggle for freedom."

The article contains an announcement of the World Peace Council's international conference of solidarity with the independence of Puerto Rico to be held September 5-7, in Havana, and proceeds to a denunciation of "Yankee imperialism" in Puerto Rico.

Says the "official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba," the Puerto Rican cement workers' strike is an example of the "class contradictions which pit workers against their bosses." "This," state the Cuban Communists, "prepares and strengthens the people, leading them to more organized forms of struggle."

COMPULSORY UNIONISM DOES
NOT WORK IN PRO FOOTBALL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a news report today which let the cat out of the bag as far as compulsory unionism is concerned. The National Football League—NFL—players union is \$200,000 in debt and is doomed without a contract which forces the pros to join the union whether they want to or not.

For those of us who believe unions have a right to organize but workers have a right not to be forced to join a union, this article cut most fiction about compulsory unionism to the bone.

The pro's union head, Ed Garvey said that the membership in the player association has shrunk to about 750 dues-paying members.

Garvey admitted the reason was that there was no check-off for dues. The Washington Post reported him as saying "The player reps have to go around and collect checks from each member * * * and you know how that goes."

Yes, we know how that goes when a little freedom is involved. Is not freedom a terrible thing?

THE BINGHAM DICTATORSHIP

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the evils of monopolies are well known. So it is, that we rightfully have antimonopoly laws—and perhaps need stronger ones. Rightfully, too, public utilities are subject to legitimate regulatory agencies because of their monopolistic character in exclusively serving a given area.

Constitutional provisions for freedom of the press, however, allow monopolistic practices to develop to the point that a reckless disregard for the truth can prevail—by newspapers—particularly in regard to public officials.

In this connection, a daily newspaper in Jeffersonville, Ind., the Evening News, had a most pertinent front page editorial on June 24, 1975, which the people of neighboring Louisville and Jefferson County will probably never be privileged to read. For those who read the RECORD, that editorial is inserted herewith:

THE BINGHAM DICTATORSHIP (Editorial Comment)

It is amusing that the publishers of the Louisville newspapers have become so upset by the increase in the size and in the circulation in Clark County of The Evening News. Your local daily newspaper is printing more pages than at any time, and its circulation has grown to a figure in excess of 16,000. With an average of four to five readers for every copy (the accepted standard in the newspaper business), this means 65,000 to 80,000 readers per day.

All this time that The Evening News has been expanding, the circulation of the Bingham newspapers in Clark County has been slipping.

As The Evening News grew the Bingham newspapers subscribed to, and paid for, more and more copies of The Evening News to be sent to their offices every day. They have now reached the point where those Bingham newspapers receive, and pay for, seven copies of The Evening News daily mailed to various members of their staff at the Bingham offices.

King Barry Bingham sits on his throne at 6th and Broadway in Louisville with Crown Prince Barry Bingham Jr. at his side.

The King and Crown Prince dictate to all of Louisville and most of Kentucky. Most public officials are dominated by the Bingham. Those that are not are constantly subjected to their attacks and smears.

One of the favorite targets of constant smears by the Bingham newspapers is U.S. Congressman Gene Snyder from the Fourth District of Kentucky. He is subjected to regular attacks in the Bingham newspapers, especially around election time.

Of course, Congressman Snyder is a conservative Republican who does not vote the Bingham line or do the Bingham bidding.

The Bingham follow the philosophy of the radical left, and woe be to the persons who do not follow it. Frequently called the "Kentucky pink sheets," no conservative ever gets a fair shake in the Louisville newspapers.

Businessman Al J. Schneider, the owner of The Galt House, The Executive Inn, The Executive Inn West and other properties in Louisville is another frequent subject of the Bingham smears.

It must be jealousy, Schneider has done more to promote Louisville than the Bingham ever have. In fact, it is hard to think of anything the Bingham have ever done to promote Louisville.

They have done a lot to tear down their community, but their main purpose is to dominate and preach the doctrine of the radical left.

Having Louisville, and most of Kentucky, almost under the complete control of their dictatorship, the Bingham now want to expand their domination to cover Southern Indiana.

With its large and growing circulation, The Evening News stands in the Bingham way.

Having failed to stop the slide in their circulation in any other way the Bingham have assigned a flunky to do a "hatchet" job. By doing this the Bingham newspapers hope to attract attention.

We do not believe the residents of Clark County want to be dominated.

We believe our local citizens are intelligent enough to make their own decisions.

We do not believe the people who live in Clark County want to be told what they must do, or how they must think.

The Bingham do that in Louisville for Louisville and Kentucky citizens. They tell them how to vote, what to think, how to act, and what to do. In fact, Louisville residents do not have to think at all for themselves. All they have to do is pick up a Bingham newspaper to learn.

The Bingham have already tried on numerous occasions to dictate to Southern Indiana people what to think and what to do.

On one recent occasion the Bingham newspapers told our courts the occupational tax on Kentucky residents enacted by the Indiana legislature and adopted in Clark County is probably unconstitutional. That is natural, for the Bingham prime interest lies in Kentucky.

In other words, the Bingham are already trying to tell our courts how to rule on a matter to come before them. The Bingham go so far as to cite a U.S. Supreme Court decision where a New Hampshire tax on nonresidents was held unconstitutional. In typical Bingham fashion they only give one side of the picture. The Bingham fail to mention that the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld taxes on nonresidents enacted by Connecticut and Oklahoma. The statutes enacted by Connecticut and Oklahoma are far more analogous to the law passed by the Indiana legislature than is the New Hampshire tax. Of course the Bingham do not bother to mention this. Their interest lies with Kentucky citizens. Their only interest in Indiana is to dominate.

In addition to its smears filled with untruths, half truths, and distorted statements, the Bingham newspapers do not mind engaging in hypocrisy.

The Bingham have their flunky write that The Evening News will not publish letters or news from persons with whom it disagrees.

On numerous occasions as recently as last month The Evening News published its standards on "Letters to the Editor." Those standards do not require the views of the writer to agree with the view of The Evening News. We are glad to publish letters from persons with whom we disagree. No letter is arbitrarily rejected.

On the other hand the standards for letters to the Bingham newspapers, when published, contain the statement the editors reserve the right to reject any letter (for no reason whatsoever). Such hypocrisy!

For the Bingham to be so distraught by the expansion of The Evening News is ridiculous. The whole thing is a joke.

The Bingham will never dominate and dictate to the people of Clark County. Our people are too self-reliant, and can think for themselves.

MEDWAY POLICE OFFICERS RECEIVE THE 1974 MEDAL OF HONOR FROM THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, Patrolmen John A. Mill and Salvatore R. Spataro of the Medway, Mass., Police Department were honored by the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., for their extraordinary valor and bravery on the afternoon of January 4, 1974, when they both risked their lives to save two young children from drowning in a frigid pond.

I feel it is truly fitting to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the description of the events of that afternoon, and to personally convey my thanks and gratitude to Officers Mill and Salvatore for their devotion to their jobs and their community, as police officers and as men.

The text of the events as recorded by the Association of Chiefs of Police follows:

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.

N.E.A.C.P. HEROIC AWARDS PROGRAM

Several years ago, our Association established an awards program to recognize those police officers who rose beyond the normal call of duty and risked their lives to provide aid and assistance to citizens in immediate danger. While such acts may be duly recognized within the officers' community, it was the expressed judgment of our members that these extraordinary deeds should be recognized by the Association through a special program of awards.

I presently serve as Chairman of the Awards Committee which reviews nominations submitted by the various police departments throughout the New England states and selects recipients on an annual basis. On Wednesday, May 14, 1975, our Committee met at Brattleboro, Vermont to review the nominations submitted for 1974.

It is my pleasure to inform you that the 1974 Medal of Honor recipients are Patrolmen John A. Mill and Salvatore R. Spataro of the Medway (Massachusetts) Police Department.

On Friday, January 4, 1974, at approximately 3:15 p.m., an emergency call was received at Medway Police Headquarters regarding a possible drowning in a body of water located in West Medway Park. This call was immediately dispatched to Officers Mill and Spataro where were on routine patrol in separate cruisers. The weather that particular day was extremely cold with sub-zero temperatures.

Officer Mill was the first to arrive at the scene and observed two adult women standing knee deep in the frigid water and frantically pointing to a location approximately 80-100 feet from shore where two small chil-

dren had broken through the thin ice and were floundering in the freezing water. The severity of the situation was compounded by the fact that the points at which the two children fell through the ice were merely 20 feet away from a dam where the water was flowing rapidly into an adjacent pond.

At this point, Officer Spataro arrived on the scene and the two officers grabbed a spare tire from one of the cruisers and charged into the water. Using their bare hands and the spare tire, Officers Mill and Spataro cleared the ice from in front of them as they desperately made their way to the two locations where the two youngsters had fallen through the ice.

Upon reaching the first location, the two officers pulled the unconscious and crying boy from the icy water and placed him upon the floating tire whereupon they immediately began searching for the second boy who had disappeared beneath the surface approximately ten feet away from the first boy. Officer Spataro made his way to the second location and found the back of the boy's jacket floating on the surface. Officer Spataro reached under the surface and pulled the unconscious second boy from the water.

Both boys were taken ashore where the two officers immediately attempted to revive the unconscious boy, using mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and cardiac massage. At this point ambulances from Medway and Bellingham had arrived upon the scene to relieve Officers Mill and Spataro. However, the two officers were then notified that there was a possible third boy who had fallen through the ice. Officers Mill and Spataro rushed back into the icy waters only to find a short time later that the rumor of a third boy falling through the ice was unfounded.

The two young victims, Wayne Elliot (age: 4 years) and Keith Schwerker (age: 5 years) were rushed to the hospital in the ambulance. On the way to the hospital, the unconscious boy was finally revived. Upon arrival at the hospital, both boys were treated for immersion and exposure. The second boy, Keith Schwerker, was transferred to the Children's Medical Center, Boston, where he expired four days later. The two police officers were taken to Milford Hospital where they were treated for immersion and exposure and later released.

Officers Mill and Spataro, in spite of the sub-zero temperatures and in the face of immediate danger to themselves, risked their lives to rescue the two young boys from the ice-covered water. Their joint performance that particular wintry day was clearly above and beyond the call of duty and has brought great credit, not only to themselves, but also to the many thousands of other fellow police officers serving communities throughout New England. Both officers are 37 years old and are veterans of the Medway Police Department. Both officers are married and have families of three and four children respectively.

There were two other officers, Sergeant Orazio M. Celona and Patrolman Robert F. Sheehan of the Boston Police Department who performed an act of heroism on Friday, September 27, 1974, and were so close to receiving the top award, it was voted to present them with the Medal of Valor.

The number of nominations received by the Committee this year was gratifying and due to the outstanding nature of the acts performed by the various police officers, the Committee has also elected to present Distinguished Service Certificates. Presentations will be made to the recipients of the Medal of Honor and Medal of Valor, while the Distinguished Service Certificates will be mailed to the respective Chiefs of Police for presentation.

Sincerely yours,

W. JOSEPH SHEA,
Executive Director, N.E.A.C.P.,
Chairman, Awards Committee.

NATICK, MASS.

REJECT THE ADMINISTRATION'S RAPE OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation began hearings directed toward developing major transportation legislation. As the ranking minority member, it had been my hope that our efforts would include a focus on the positive steps we can take to make America's highways safer and more efficient.

The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that economic development—job creation—is directly tied to the existence of efficient highway systems.

Even more significantly, conclusive proof exists that the appalling accident and fatality rate on American highways—46,000 Americans killed and 1.8 million Americans injured last year alone—can be reduced by the thousands through the modernization of highways and implementation of safety standards. Additionally, in 1974, property damage alone exceeded a staggering \$19 billion, according to the National Safety Council. The related human suffering is incalculable.

Much progress has been accomplished in the past 20 years, but unfortunately, the job is nowhere near completed.

The 1974 National Highway Needs Report, transmitted to this committee by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, indicates that after, and I emphasize this, a scaling down to allow for 20 percent less travel as well as a 10-mile-per-hour reduction in speed, America's Federal-aid highway needs through 1990 amount to \$314.9 billion in 1971 dollars. Inflation has increased that 1971 cost by 40 percent, so the price tag in 1975 approximates \$440.8 billion.

A Senate report entitled, "Transportation in Rural America," dated February 10, 1975, indicates that the cost of alleviating rural road deficiencies in America, excluding local roads, is about \$108 billion; that rural travel is expected to increase by more than 50 percent by 1990; and that the death rate on rural highways is twice that of urban areas. Against these scaled-down needs of over \$440 billion in current dollars, the Highway Trust Fund, if continued in its present form, is projected by the Federal Highway Administration to generate approximately \$118.5 billion through 1990.

The Interstate System is expected to cost an additional \$48 billion Federal share to complete, assuming a 7-percent annual inflation rate, leaving about \$70 billion in Federal funds to support approximately \$400 billion in unmet Federal-aid highway needs. If the \$400 billion in 1975 dollars is adjusted for inflation at a 7-percent rate through 1990, the needs escalate to well over \$600 billion.

The sad but inescapable conclusion is

that the Highway Trust Fund, even if continued in its present form, is woefully inadequate to meet America's Federal-aid highway needs.

In the face of these harsh realities, this administration, which happens to be of the same political party as I, proposed a national transportation policy on July 7 which turns the previous administration's raid on the Highway Trust Fund into a rape.

The U.S. Department of Transportation, by its ignominious announcement of July 7, has raised grave doubts about the seriousness of its commitment to our long-term transportation needs. They propose to take the heart of the trust fund, the 4 cents per gallon gasoline revenue, and syphon 2 cents off into the General Treasury where it could wind up paying for Federal spending programs totally unrelated to transportation; hand over as a gift 1 cent to States if they are willing to collect it, to be spent on whatever programs they choose; and keep the last cent for the interstate system. We are told that, under their plan, highway funds would come out of the General Treasury.

Stated another way, they propose to destroy the fairest form of taxation yet devised by man—the user tax, which in this case provides that those who use the roads pay for them. If the faceless, nameless bureaucrats who devised the administration's proposal simply wiped out the trust fund and returned the gas tax money to the people, at least that would be honorable. However, to take the gas tax money out of the pockets of people who depend on highways without assuring them that the money will be spent on their roads is unfair, if not duplicitous.

It is absolutely incredible that this administration, faced with a myriad of transportation problems including highways, mass transit and railroads, is attempting to demolish the most successful transportation funding mechanism in existence. In my judgment, it is ironic that another Ford is presenting us with another Edsel.

I can only conclude that our President, who strongly supported the Highway Trust Fund in the well of this House just 2 years ago, on April 19, 1973, has been ill-advised by those around him. On that date, Congressman Gerald R. Ford, in opposing an amendment which sought to divert trust fund moneys, quoted Secretary of Transportation Volpe, as follows:

I believe that the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund must be preserved without question. This was the intent of Congress and the Chief Executive in framing the Federal Aid Highway Legislation of 1956 and subsequent acts. In my opinion, to divert highway use tax revenues to purposes other than the provision of highways would abrogate a long-standing moral commitment as well as a statutory provision.

Our President concluded by saying:

We ought not break faith with the taxpayers in order to let this kind of diversion take place.

I agree with these words of Gerald R. Ford, and denounce this scheme as a colossal "rip off" on the American people. As the ranking minority member of the

Surface Transportation Subcommittee, I disassociate myself completely from this ill-conceived proposal and vow to oppose it with all the vigor I can muster.

I shall work with Chairman HOWARD and other members of our committee to develop sound transportation legislation which deals honestly and effectively with the transportation needs of the American people.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—ONE OF AMERICA'S 10 MOST LIVABLE CITIES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America has some very beautiful cities—cities that are fun to live in and be a part of and which are good places to raise a family.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor embarked upon a project to discover which are the 10 most livable cities in the United States. According to the Monitor, several urban experts were consulted and as a result, the newspaper—

Selected cities which in our view combine aesthetic appeal, attractive and comfortable downtown areas, good government, a sense of social and ethnic cooperation, easy commuting, pleasant suburbs, and wide access to cultural and recreational activities.

In the Christian Science Monitor issue of June 11, 1975, the largest city in my district—St. Petersburg—was pinpointed as one of "America's 10 most livable cities." I only wish that the beautiful pictures which accompanied that article could be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all of my colleagues to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share this article with the Members of the House of Representatives and at the same time, invite each one to consider spending some future vacation time in St. Petersburg—"The Sunshine City."

The article by Staff Correspondent Judith Frutig, follows:

AMERICA'S 10 MOST LIVABLE CITIES—ST. PETERSBURG

(By Judith Frutig)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—The last time Ralph and Doris Mullin went camping, they packed one grandmother and two teen-age daughters into the family van and headed south for Fort Desoto, a wilderness park.

Mr. Mullin went fishing from the pier, but he caught nothing. Mrs. Mullin collected shells on the beach. Their campsite was on the beach too, separated from their neighbors by tropical foliage.

In the evenings, they built a bonfire, cooked dinner, roasted marshmallows, sang, and watched the city lights of St. Petersburg shimmer across the bay.

They were 30 minutes from home.

The park—five connected islands and 884 acres of quietude and flamingoes—is one of five in Pinellas County, all within 50 miles of the city.

They help make St. Petersburg a very livable East Coast city that glories in its 38 miles of shoreline and its mile after mile of beaches as soft and as white as sifted flour.

St. Petersburg calls itself the "sunshine city." One local newspaper promises to give away its street editions every day the sun

falls to shine for at least 15 minutes; the last giveaway day was Dec. 15. Since 1910, the paper has given away only 252 editions.

Summer in St. Petersburg is the monsoon season—it rains nearly every day from June through September. During the winter, temperatures get down to the forties; but even during the summer the average temperature is 82 degrees (about 13 degrees cooler than Miami).

St. Petersburg is neither so stylish as Boca Raton on Florida's East Coast, nor so commercial as Miami Beach. It lacks the aristocracy and old money of Palm Beach—or even Tampa. It is as much of an established vacation resort as Fort Lauderdale; in fact, the city's economic wellspring is tourism (2.5 million in 1974).

There was a time when Pinellas County was for tourists, senior citizens, and resident pelicans. This is changing, however.

No longer are green benches set up for elderly people to rest on. Lawrence Welk and Liberace still do landoffice business; local restaurants do offer "early bird specials" for the folks who prefer to retire early; "the world's largest shuffleboard and bridge club," located two blocks from City Hall, boasted 2,861 members this spring; last year social-security checks did bring \$405 million into the county.

But senior citizens are no longer the dominant portion of St. Petersburg's population. They add up to 31 percent; young people 18 and under attending the city's three colleges account for 25 percent.

SUNSET WALKS ON THE BEACH

Inside the city limits are more than 28 miles of public beaches and water sports including fishing, swimming, power and sailboating, and skin diving. Golf courses, tennis courts, lush parks, hiking and bicycle trails abound. Maggiori Lake is the largest city park featuring Boyd Hill nature park, a wildlife sanctuary.

Cost of living is low; housing is inexpensive; electric rates are high; there is no state income tax. City taxes are 4 percent.

At home in suburban St. Petersburg, the Mullins enjoy walking along the public beach at sunset.

"Sometimes, it's enough to look out the window and see the sand and the ocean," says Mr. Mullin. "But to walk in it—to feel the sand between your toes—that's better than just about anything."

This is not a city without drawbacks, however.

It gets hot here—and it stays hot. Spring and summer temperatures hover near 100 degrees. The humidity is oppressive. From April through Christmas, people scurry from air-conditioned offices, restaurants, or the theaters.

Overall population growth has been rapid, up 20 percent between 1960 and 1970 (to 216,000). Pinellas County has become the most densely populated area in Florida. Tampa-St. Petersburg is growing twice as fast as Atlanta, and almost 60 percent as fast as Miami.

As a result, problems have developed with:

Water. A drought emergency has already been declared this year and lawn sprinkling is banned from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. If the combination of rising population and dwindling rainfall continues, the people here and elsewhere in Florida may have to choose between raising their famed citrus fruits, which gulp twice as much water as people do, or stringent water rationing; they may even have to desalinate salt water for drinking at very high costs.

Pollution. In 1961, only Cheyenne, Wyoming, and Honolulu had cleaner air. Last year there were three "ozone alerts"; this year there has already been one. Smog comes from Tampa, but mostly from as far north as Chicago, carried south by high-pressure weather systems.

Transit. The city has no rapid transit system at all.

"We're surrounded by ocean on three sides," said Mayor Charles Schuh. "Some cities can grow to the suburbs. We can't unless we go out into Tampa Bay on stilts. The only way we can go is up, and people don't want to do that."

Concerned, the city is putting together a stringent land-use plan. And St. Petersburg voters in the last two years have approved five bond issues totaling \$40 million for increased parkland, street repair, and storm drainage systems.

HOME BUILDING TURNS UPWARD

Other problems are slowly beginning to right themselves. The home building industry, which sank last year from its 1973 high, is just beginning to turn upward.

The city art commission has recently begun a program to beautify the city. In late May, members voted to censor a neon advertising sign on the waterfront, and commissioned a \$45,000 laser beam sculpture also for the waterfront (pending a \$20,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts). In so doing, the city becomes the first municipality to commission a piece of public art that requires both building permit and performance bond.

The city is largely white; only 12 percent of the population is black. The blacks live in three relatively small and ramshackle sections of the city. A limited program of cross-district busing is in effect.

The single instance of racial violence in St. Petersburg occurred in May, 1968, when the city's 211 garbage men angrily walked off their jobs. The issue began as wages, escalated into race. The initial tactic was strike, but soon generated into hymn-singing and handclapping civil-rights marches on City Hall.

In all the strike lasted 116 days, with thousands of dollars in property damage, dozens of firebombings, and many arrests. But concerned citizens formed a biracial group called the United Alliance Committee, and through the actions of the committee the grievances of the garbage workers were alleviated.

St. Petersburg, despite its restless, hot, and humid nights, has remained quiet since.

Meanwhile, people here continue to enjoy such St. Petersburg specialties as spectator sports: exhibition baseball (St. Petersburg is the winter home of the St. Louis Cardinals and the New York Mets) and local softball teams. There are professional golf and tennis tournaments, boat races, legalized gambling.

The National Football League has designated the Tampa-St. Petersburg area a league city; the team will be called the Buccaneers.

St. Petersburg's waterfront is unmatched by any other city. Twenty blocks have public access. The focus is the bay-front center, also the heart of St. Petersburg's cultural and entertainment district, municipally owned and operated. It seats more than 2,800 in its theater and more than 8,000 in its arena, offering nearly 200 events each year ranging from concerts to Broadway shows to religious conventions and industrial exhibitions.

There is an \$800,000 marina, a \$1 million museum of fine arts, the pier, a sports arena, downtown airport, and the campus of the University of South Florida.

The Florida Gulf Coast Symphony shares a 10-concert subscription series between Tampa and St. Petersburg; this year for its fourth season the St. Petersburg series is sold out.

WEATHER ATTRACTED

William and Mary Hall moved here from Cincinnati in 1973. He retired from Proctor & Gamble, she quit her job as a first-grade school teacher, and they built their own

house. They say they moved here for the weather.

"The biggest disappointment," says Mr. Hall, "has been my golf game."

While Mr. Hall fishes off their dock, practices on the putting green in their backyard, or plays a round of golf on one of the local public courses, Mrs. Hall has taken sewing and tennis lessons and worked as a volunteer in a local public library.

Recently they placed traps off their dock and ate the fresh crab meat—Mr. Hall for the first time. They enjoy watching porpoises swim up the channel. Together they are searching for new restaurants to replace their favorite haunts back home.

They miss their long-time Cincinnati companions. Most of all they miss the change of season. "I miss the fall colors," says Mrs. Hall wistfully.

"We sit out in the backyard in late afternoon," says Mr. Hall, "and the breeze comes in over the water, and you know, it doesn't feel as hot as Cincinnati summers. Besides, we have that beautiful sunset behind the palm trees. You don't get that in Cincinnati either."

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS AND THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—II

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 the Labor-Management Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor approved H.R. 5900. This bill would legalize common situs picketing in the construction industry.

I voted against reporting the bill to the full committee. I do not believe that we should exempt the building trades from the legal prohibitions on secondary boycotts.

My position is receiving support from across the Nation. For the information of my colleagues I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several newspaper editorials in opposition to H.R. 5900. Following are editorials from the June 14, Chicago Tribune, the June 8, Dallas Morning News and the June 9, Indianapolis Star:

THE BUILDING TRADES TRY AGAIN

With the building trade unions constantly pushing wages up to new records, and with unemployment in the construction industry already worse than in any other [thanks largely to those same high wages], the last thing the industry needs is greater clout in the hands of the unions.

Yet the building trades are at work once again, quietly but with determination, to exempt themselves from the laws that prohibit secondary boycotts.

As the law now stands, picketing is restricted at construction sites, where several crafts usually are working at the same time. When a union has a dispute with one or more subcontractors, pickets may not try to induce the employees of other subcontractors to go on strike in order to force the general contractor to stop doing business with the subcontractors involved in the original dispute. More and more unions have been violating the law and getting away with it. Some courts have even supported them—until two weeks ago the Supreme Court allowed a triple-damage suit against

a Dallas union that had engaged in a secondary boycott.

This decision has given new impetus to the effort to change the law. The bill now before the House Education and Labor Committee, H.R. 5900, is sponsored by Rep. Frank Thompson, a Democrat, and 11 other union-oriented and generally union-financed congressmen. The bill describes itself, with misleading innocence, as "a bill to protect the economic rights of labor in the building and construction industry." It would do this—and a good deal more—by exempting these unions from the prohibition against secondary boycotts [also known as common situs picketing] in the Taft-Hartley law as amended by Landrum-Griffin.

It would thus expand the freedom from antitrust laws that unions already enjoy, and would do so at a time when the unions—and especially the construction unions—are wielding the same monopolistic power that the antitrust laws were designed to prevent on the part of business.

The proposed law would give the unions a stronghold over every contractor and every product used at a construction site. Every dispute would quickly lead to a walk-out of all the workers engaged on a product; those who might resist would be left without work to do. Monopolistic unions would become more powerful than ever; small, independent unions would be forced to disband. Nonunion workers would find it harder than ever to get work.

The building trades have been seeking this exemption for themselves ever since 1953, when Secretary of Labor Martin Durkin (himself a plumber and a union official) tried in vain to get the Eisenhower administration to support it. The unions came close in 1959 and 1960, but again failed.

If the cost of building is to be held down and the industry revived, it will not be thru government subsidies as much as thru restoring competition and efficiency in the building trades. This will never be done as long as the unions themselves are permitted to make the rules. Instead of looking for ways to strengthen the labor monopolies, Congress should seek to undo some of the restrictions that the unions have imposed on the construction industry.

COMMON SITUS: A MALADY WE DON'T NEED

In the name of all that is just and reasonable, let us hope the nation never comes down with "common situs." Which ought not be mistaken for a communicable illness—it is a good deal worse than that.

"Situs" is the Latin for "location." "Common situs" is the legal description of a situation in which a construction union can shut down all work on a given construction location by striking against and picketing one—only one!—subcontractor.

Such a situation, so clearly at variance with the dictates of fairness and public responsibility, is at present illegal. The construction unions chafe at their consequent lack of full leverage. They have gotten bills introduced in both houses of Congress, as indeed they have done for several years, to legitimize so overpowering a tactic as "common situs" picketing.

In past years, the bills have died. This year may be different. The present Congress is more strongly pro-labor than any Congress in a decade. As why not? Labor, in the past campaign, was extravagantly generous with its political spending. The members of the House Education and Labor Committee, for example, received a total of \$429,632 in contributions from the unions.

As to the proposed legislation—what would it do? In broadest terms, it would allow the bullying of innocent bystanders in a construction labor dispute. Suppose the

legislation to be enacted; suppose, additionally, there is a new public hospital going up in Anytown, Massachusetts. On the job are approximately two dozen different subcontractors, working for the general contractor. One of the subcontractors is a small electrical firm. The firm is involved in a wage dispute with the electrical workers' union. The union throws out a picket line—and, in so doing, shuts down the whole "situs"; the entire construction job.

What is fair about such a strong-arm tactic? How have the other subcontractors offended, and why should they be punished? Why should the public be punished by a delay in finishing the hospital?

Should the "common situs" bill pass, predictable effects will flow from it. The unions will use their new muscle to force the unionization of all employees on a given job. The contractor will deal no more with "open-shop" labor, lest his whole project be closed down. Accordingly, the right to work at one's trade without joining a union will be infringed. Then, too, union labor is ordinarily more costly than "open-shop" labor. The price of construction, already staggeringly high, will go still higher.

Ironically, in a landmark decision stemming from a Dallas case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled just the other day that unions have no right to force a contractor to deal only with subcontractors whose workers are unionized. "Common situs" legislation would undo the court's decision—just when it looks as though an element of fairness may be restored to labor-management relations in construction. All the more reason to hope the "common situs" virus can be isolated—before the whole country starts sneezing.

SECONDARY BOYCOTT AGAIN

Being revived in Congress is a labor bargaining issue involving the construction industry that has been fought out three times before. Unions call it common situs picketing; employers call it secondary boycott.

Under existing law, namely the Taft-Hartley Act, a union engaged in a lawful strike against an employer can picket that employer, but cannot willfully picket or otherwise pressure other employers operating at the same site, as some would be on a construction job.

Thus a construction union striking against a subcontractor cannot shut down an entire construction project unless the involved contractor's operations hold the key to continuance of other work. The striking union is not allowed to spread pickets all over the site to stop others from working.

Now moves are afoot in both houses of Congress to exempt construction unions from this section of the law. Such an exemption would allow a union striking against even a minor subcontractor on a construction project to throw picket lines around the whole site and shut down the entire project, unless nonstriking workers were willing to cross the picket lines.

The power such an exemption would place in the hands of individual unions is obvious. Organizations of contractors and suppliers predict a rash of job shutdowns if the exemption is enacted. One result almost surely would be further escalation of costs in an industry already badly hurt by high costs.

One effect foreseen by Associated General Contractors of America is that unions would be in a position to dictate to the general contractor on a project which subcontractors he could or could not do business with.

On three previous occasions Congress decided that it would not be a good idea to legalize secondary labor boycotts in the construction business. The idea is not any better now.

THE PLIGHT OF URI PODRIACHIK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, since February of 1975, I have had a continuing interest in the plight of Uri Podriachik, a Soviet Jew whose application to leave the Soviet Union has been repeatedly denied and who is being detained by Soviet authorities in Riga. His mother, the actress Dina Roitkop Podriachik, now lives in Israel and is separated from her son.

It is my opinion that the United States cannot simply carry on "business as usual" with the Soviet Union while it denies its inhabitants basic human rights and in particular the right to escape oppression by leaving the country.

The Assembly of the State of New York recently passed a resolution of solidarity with Dina and Uri Podriachik, representing all oppressed Soviet Jews. The resolution requests Congress to call upon the Soviet Union to release Uri Podriachik, as well as other Soviet Jews, to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the country of their choice. I have made such calls in my own name on numerous occasions. Certainly this resolution merits the immediate attention and action of Congress. I am therefore today introducing a concurrent resolution modeled after the New York Assembly resolution.

Further, we must resist those who call for the weakening of the profree emigration provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 and the granting of valuable considerations to the Soviet Union. We as a nation cannot grant concessions to a country that is in such flagrant violation of the principles of human rights that we hold dear. At this point I insert for the RECORD the text of the New York Assembly resolution, together with biographies of Dina Roitkop Podriachik and her son, Uri Podriachik, and a letter that I have received from Mrs. Podriachik. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to study them, so that they can come to understand better the plight of those held captive in the U.S.S.R.:

STATE OF NEW YORK, RESOLUTION No. 95,
JUNE 16, 1975

Assembly resolution expressing solidarity with Dina Roitkop Podriachik in her plight representing all oppressed Soviet Jews and in particular her son Uri who has been detained in Riga by the Soviet authorities and urging the President and the United States Congress to implore the Soviet Union to permit Dina Roitkop Podriachik's son Uri and other oppressed Soviet Jews to emigrate freely from the Soviet Union

Whereas, In the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries of the world and indeed by the Soviet Constitution; and

Whereas, Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union are being denied the means to exercise their religion and sustain their identity; and

Whereas, The government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by denying them the same rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union and by discrimination against

Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education; and

Whereas, The right freely to emigrate, which is denied Soviet Jews who seek to maintain their identity by moving elsewhere, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas, The government of the Soviet Union by allowing certain members of Soviet Jewish families to emigrate while prohibiting the emigration of other integral members of the family are engaged in a devious and unconscionable strategy to undermine the familial integrity of the Soviet Jewry; and

Whereas, This callous strategy is devoid of any sense of humanity and is calculated to rupture the time honored sanctity of the family unit adhered to by Soviet Jewry and all civilized people; and

Whereas, This subtle and effective separation and seclusion of loved ones from the joys of shared family experiences may only be condemned as acts of a surreptitious government bent upon the shattering of human emotions; and

Whereas, Dina Roitkop Podriachik is a well known and distinguished actress who recently emigrated to Israel from the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, Her son, Uri, is still detained by the Soviet Authorities and prohibited from emigrating; and

Whereas, Dina Roitkop Podriachik is in this country to tell of the oppression of Russian Jews and of her son in particular; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of New York, in the interest of justice and humanity, express its solidarity with Dina Roitkop Podriachik and her own son Uri and all other similarly affected Soviet families in their plight; and be it further

Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of New York urge the President and Congress of the United States to call upon the Soviet government to permit Dina Roitkop Podriachik's son Uri, as well as the other oppressed Soviet Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the countries of their choice as affirmed by the United Nations Declarations of Human Rights; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Dina Roitkop Podriachik as well as to the President of the United States and members of Congress of the United States.

By order of the Assembly,

CATHERINE A. CAREY, Clerk.

BIOGRAPHY OF URI PODRIACHIK

Uri Podriachik was born in Moscow in February 1949 and grew up in Riga. He graduated high school in 1966 and continued his studies at the Riga Technological Institute. Uri was a second year student when he was drafted into the army as private and was assigned work as a plumber. Upon completing his military service in 1969, Uri resumed his studies at the Institute.

He submitted his first application for an exit visa to Israel in 1971. That same year Uri left the Institute, when the authorities demanded an "academic ransom tax," for fear that his inability to pay might delay his emigration. Upon being denied a visa, Uri demanded his right to live with his parents who were allowed to leave for Israel. He appealed to the Ministry of Interior and was promised that his case would be reviewed. However, one week later he was called to the Riga OVIR and informed that his appeal was rejected by Moscow authorities on the grounds that he had been exposed to classified information while in the army. Uri's repeated appeals to the OVIR drew only denials.

During former President Nixon's 1973 visit to the Soviet Union, Uri attempted to ask for his personal intervention. He was subsequently called to KGB headquarters, accused of "anti-social behavior" and threatened with a prison sentence. Now, almost 5 years since his army discharge, he is still denied a visa. In February 1975, the Latvian Undersecretary of the Interior rejected once again Uri's appeal for a review of his case.

BIOGRAPHY OF DINA ROITKOP-PODRIACHIK

Born in 1922, in Rezekne, Latvia, Dina Podriachik received a traditional Jewish education and graduated from a Hebrew high school. As a member of the youth movement "Hashomer Hatzair," she took part in agricultural training and planned to emigrate to Israel. The Russian invasion of Latvia, however, prevented her from carrying out her plans.

In 1940, Dina moved to Riga, where she studied acting at the National Jewish Theatre until the German invasion of that city.

During the war, she continued her studies at a studio under the direction of Solomon Michoels in Tashkent. In 1943, the theatre moved to Moscow where she met and married Eliezer Podriachik, a Jewish writer and scholar. In 1949, their son, Uri, was born. That same year the theatre, of which she was then a member, was closed and the family moved back to Riga. Ten years later she resumed her acting career with a Yiddish theatre and appeared with Nehama Lipshitz among others.

In 1971, Dina and Eliezer were permitted to emigrate to Israel, but were forced to leave their son behind. She is at present with Israel's Habima National Theatre. Uri is still in Riga. He has been repeatedly denied a visa and has been subjected to severe harassment.

[Translated from Russian]

MR. MARIO BIAGGI,
The House of Representatives,
Washington.

DEAR MR. BIAGGI: It is probably not the first time that you have been receiving a letter from a mother whose troubles compelled her to appeal to you. I am one of these unfortunate mothers whose son had been separated from his family because of the ill will of some people. My husband, a writer, and I, an actress, have been separated from our son for about three and a half years now after we left the USSR for Israel. You could justly ask us: "What has made you leave your son and go alone?" Allow me to tell you briefly one of those stories which are so characteristic for the fate of our unfortunate people.

When the Nazis have occupied my native town of Rezhitsa, near Riga in Latvia, I was only seventeen. All alone, I found myself in Russia and found out later that all of the members of my once large family have perished in Auschwitz. Only one of my brothers remained alive and I met with him much later. My husband's fate is not much different from mine—a young man from Romania, he lost all his family in that terrible war and had also found himself in Russia. Fate had united our lives on the crossroads of the war.

After the war I studied in the Moscow Theatre Studio of the Jewish Theatre under the direction of Solomon Mikhoels. My husband worked in the Jewish literary field. We had a son. It seemed that things were settling down well. Yet, our happiness was short-lived—a new terror had befallen the Russian Jewry: the leaders of the Jewish culture have perished, the theatres and the publishing houses were closed. We had to look for shelter and for our daily bread and moved from Moscow to Riga.

After long years of trying to find someone from my husband's family we were successful in our efforts—we found that my husband's only sister was alive and living in Israel. She was waiting to see us, at last, in the land of our forefathers.

Yet, at the time of our receipt of the visas our son had already finished his army service. He was not allowed to leave as, according to the Soviet law, he had to stay in the Soviet Union for three years after his discharge from the army. It was also stated that he allegedly had access to secret information—despite the fact that he served as a private, working as a sanitation technician.

We had to leave by ourselves as during our son's army service my husband was badly injured in a road accident and became an invalid for life. Deprived of any income, without work—I was the only breadwinner in the family and made the ends meet by working in embroidery, we left, hoping that our son will follow us after the "quarantine" period as it was promised to us by the authorities. Alas, we were deceived and cruelly punished for crimes which we never committed—we were separated from our son and no efforts on both our and his part have brought about any success. All the numerous letters sent by me to the leaders of the Soviet Union, to the OVIR offices, to the International Red Cross Organization, to Senator Jackson, to the Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger and to many, many others have remained unanswered.

Now you are my last hope I have heard much about your understanding and about your active assistance to people who have found themselves in the same tragic situation as did our family. Do not judge me, a mother asking for help, harshly for bothering you. I am sure that you will understand how difficult it is for me to be separated from my only son.

My son, Uri Podryadchik, a simple labourer (he did not manage to receive an education) is residing in the USSR, Riga, Gorkogo St., No. 61, apt. 5; tel. 78315.

Please help us to achieve what all the parents have—the happiness of living with one's children in one's old age. Please help both him and us to become reunited in the land where every Jew can achieve national dignity.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. D. ROITKOP-PODRYADCHIK.

DEATH SENTENCE LEVIED; URGENT ACTION NEEDED TO SAVE LEVIEV

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Mrs. Robin Gerber, chairwoman of the Women's Action Committee for Soviet Jewry, Community Affairs Committee, Women's Conference, which described the continuing plight of Mikhail Leviev. The text of those remarks follows:

DEATH SENTENCE LEVIED; URGENT ACTION NEEDED TO SAVE LEVIEV

(This text has been prepared by Mrs. Robin Gerber, chairwoman of the Women's Action Committee for Soviet Jewry, Community Affairs Committee, Women's Conference.)

On December 8, 1974 Mikhail Leviev, 56-year-old Soviet Jew was sentenced to death by firing squad by the Municipal Court of Moscow for alleged "economic crimes." It was

the first such sentence against a Soviet Jew on these charges in many years. As of this date, his last appeal has been denied and he is awaiting execution. The Women's Action Committee for Soviet Jewry is appealing to you to take action to save his life.

Leviev was born in Bukhara in 1918. He left for Moscow where he received a law degree and served as a judge and a counselor to the Soviet Supreme Court. He also served as a judge in Samarkand and Dushanbe. In 1945, he returned to Moscow and was employed as a translator in a law office. In 1947, he was dismissed from his job because he was suspected of having "Zionist sympathies." After allegedly toasting the State of Israel during a circumcision ceremony in 1950, Leviev was sentenced to 10 years in prison. After Stalin's death in 1954 he was released from prison.

In 1971, Leviev applied for exit visas to Israel for himself, his wife and two sons. He resigned from his position as manager of a consumers cooperative store in Moscow when he received his visa application. At the time of his resignation—he had served 10 years as manager—there was a careful inspection of the books and store operations and no irregularities were reported. Six months later he received his exit visa and began necessary departure arrangements.

A few days before his anticipated departure, Leviev was arrested and placed under investigation. He was held for two years in prison awaiting trial, and on December 8, 1974 after an 11-week trial, Leviev, Soviet Jew, was convicted of taking bribes and given the maximum sentence of death.

It is urgent to wire: Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny, Kremlin, Moscow, Soviet Union, and plead for clemency and a commutation of the death penalty in the case of Mikhail Leviev. For more information, contact the Commission on Soviet Jewry, 663-8484.

KOREA AND VIETNAM: THE NON-PARALLELS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Fourth of July congressional recess, the Washington Post published two of the most thoughtful statements about Korea that have come to my attention. Perhaps some of my colleagues missed one or both of these articles. Donald L. Ranard and Edwin O. Reischauer are men who have been intimately involved in the matters they discuss. Their views deserve our close attention.

The editorials follow:

[The Washington Post, June 28, 1975]

KOREA AND VIETNAM: THE NONPARALLELS
(Edwin O. Reischauer)

(The writer was U.S. ambassador to Japan from 1961 to 1966 and is now a professor of Asian studies at Harvard University)

False analogies between Korea and Vietnam originally helped get us into a fundamentally worse situation in Vietnam. Let us not now reverse the process and panic over Korea because of analogies mistakenly drawn with Vietnam.

South Korea simply is not vulnerable at present to the two basic ills that destroyed South Vietnam—the uncertain loyalty of its people, and the resultant possibility for easy penetration and subversion by the North. At present it would require a massive external

flow to overthrow the South, and there seems no sign of this happening.

Kim Il Sung, the northern dictator, is trying to take advantage of the sudden, collapse in Vietnam to intimidate South Korea, but despite repeated cries of warning, the situation along the border in Korea is in actuality less menacing than at most times during the past two decades. Pyongyang does have more than twice the air strength of Seoul, but this advantage is offset by the presence of American air power in the South, while in ground forces the South outnumbers the North by about 600,000 men to 400,000, with reserves and paramilitary units that give an overall balance of 3 million to less than 2 million.

These figures reflect the facts that the South has more than twice the population of the North (in Vietnam it was the North that was the larger), and both regimes are as completely militarized as any in the world. Pyongyang could not risk war without the strong support of China or the Soviet Union, and both of these seem much more eager to avoid a conflict in Korea than they were in the past.

This may sound reassuring, but it concerns only the false crisis derived from mistaken analogies with Vietnam. Back of this, however, is a real danger that is escaping adequate attention, in part because of the red herring of Vietnam.

It is not an immediate crisis, but rather a situation that over a longer time span may produce conditions like those that proved fatal to South Vietnam. In other words, an ultimate, Vietnam-like debacle may be in the cards for us in Korea unless we start to do something about it soon.

The experiences of the Korean War made the South Koreans the most bitterly anti-Communist people in the world and therefore insured their loyalty to Seoul. But this shows signs of eroding.

There has always been much popular dissatisfaction with the government in South Korea. Despite rapid economic growth in recent years, the discrepancies in wealth were severe and seemed to be growing worse. Corruption in government and business—recently highlighted by the admission of a \$4 million bribe to government authorities by the Gulf Oil Corp.—has always drawn much criticism. Except for a brief period in 1960-61 of ineffective Democratic government, Korea's democracy has always been imperfect and incomplete. Individual rights and freedoms were often curtailed.

But at the same time, there was enough individual liberty and democratic participation in government to make people feel that there was sufficient difference from the completely repressive regime of the North to make the South worth fighting to preserve.

This situation, however, has been changing of late. In October, 1972, President Park Chung Hee declared martial law and followed this with a new constitution, which, by giving him the right to appoint one-third of the members of Parliament, reduced that body and all electoral politics to a sham.

He followed this by Draconian measures seriously limiting individual freedoms, including those of political criticism and self-expression, and enforced these with brutal police controls. The opposition forces have been cowed into virtual silence, but hostility and tensions run deep.

Especially among the city dwellers and the better educated, including the bulk of the influential Protestant and Catholic groups, there is a sense of desperation. Student activism may have been successfully repressed; but probably at the cost of creating secret student revolutionaries. Step 1 has been taken toward the making of a Vietnamese situation.

South Korea has recently suffered another blow, this one not of its own making. Korea's dazzling economic record of recent years was

based on industrialization and world trade—an incipient replica of the Japanese economic miracle—and therefore the oil crisis that started in the autumn of 1973 dealt Korea a serious blow.

It is particularly dependent on markets in and investments from Japan and the United States, and both these countries have themselves been in recessions. In addition, the picture of an increasingly repressive South Korean regime makes both Japanese and Americans more critical of conditions in Korea, more dubious about its future and less willing to invest there, thus adding to Korea's economic woes. A serious economic downturn could further erode South Korean loyalties.

The deterioration of the political situation in South Korea has also increased doubts about the American commitments to help defend the country. The post-Vietnam mood in the United States is reason enough for such doubts, but they are greatly increased by a picture of a dictatorial and cruelty repressive regime in Seoul, which is repugnant to Americans.

The American commitment is hedged by the phrasing that "In case of an external armed attack" each nation, "would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." Still, the presence of about 40,000 American soldiers as a sort of trip-wire near the border has always made American involvement in a renewed Korean War seem almost automatic.

But this may well not be true, given the popular mood in the United States, as strengthened by the distasteful political actions of Park's government. In other words, the United States has made a commitment reinforced by a military presence that the American people would very possibly be unwilling to live up to. This is indeed a perilous position for the United States to be in.

Park or his successors have only two paths they can follow.

On the one hand, they can smother all political criticism and ruthlessly eradicate all sources of opposition. North Korea, North Vietnam and China itself show the viability of this sort of regime in an East Asian setting though it may be much more difficult to create one on a rightist rather than a leftist ideological basis, as the experience of the Chinese Nationalists suggest. Of course, this road would ultimately lead to the forfeiture of the American military commitment, and probably much of Japanese and American economic support.

The other road would be a return toward a more open society with a growing role for democratic political institutions. High educational levels make such a course perfectly feasible in Korea, and in my judgment it would be by far the better bet, even in stark military terms.

But what should the United States do? The tendency is to sweep the problem under the rug—to leave things alone and pretend the problem does not exist, counting on the improbability of war, at least in the near future, to see us safely through until some still unknown but, it is hoped, better situation develops later on.

In the very short run, this policy is understandable. The shock of the sudden collapse in Vietnam for Americans, Koreans and the world at large makes it wise to let the dust settle a bit before making any decisive new moves in Korea. But such a do-nothing policy cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, as South Korean loyalties wither and popular American distaste for Korean dictatorship grows.

The defense of South Korea, regardless of the nature of its systems, is not vital to American interests. A defense line in the straits between Japan and Korea has always made more military sense than one in the

middle of the peninsula. Aside from our emotional involvement in the well-being of the brave and talented people of South Korea, our only major concern in the area is the adverse impact its fall to North Korea would have on Japan, a nation of very great importance to the United States.

A sudden collapse resulting in part from an American refusal to live up to its commitments might start a nervous Japan back on the road toward remilitarization, or might frighten it into a stance of much less cooperation with the United States on vital shared problems of economics and world order.

If, however, the United States had disengaged militarily from Korea by slow and well understood steps prior to a collapse, the impact might be quite negligible.

Now is the time, while the Vietnam dust is settling, to start thinking through this problem. We should before long have a clear program to present to Park of measured withdrawals of American troops and reductions of military aid until both are entirely gone within a few years—unless the South Koreans find it possible in the meantime to change course again and start moving back to a freer, more democratic system that would better win the loyalties of their own people and the support of the American public.

To avoid damaging shocks both in Korea and Japan, such a program would have to be spread over several years. Although the crisis is not an immediate one, we must start very soon if we are to complete the maneuver before the situation does reach crisis proportions.

The present is also a good time to start forming a longer-range Korean strategy. Korea has all along been a more dangerous threat to world peace than Vietnam, not just because it is a larger and more effectively militarized country, but because of its more strategic location between three of the largest nations of the world—Japan, China and the Soviet Union—with the fourth, the United States, deeply involved in the peninsula for historical reasons.

The surrounding great powers should move toward an agreement to isolate this danger spot from other issues.

What is needed is a four-power agreement between the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan that they will not allow disturbances in Korea to spill over to involve them in their relations with one another.

The distrust and hostility between China and the Soviet Union stand in the way of such an agreement today, as does also the presence of American forces in the South. Such an agreement will not be easy to achieve but it is an obvious goal that the United States should be working toward now.

When achieved, it will not only neutralize one of the most dangerous trouble spots in the world, but may also take some of the tensions out of the situation in Korea itself. It could lead to agreed military limitations between the two Korean regimes, which would be an economic boon to both, and possibly might open the way for ultimate reunification, which is of course the dream of all Koreans.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1975]

"TONGUE-TIED" ON HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Donald L. Ranard)

Respect for human rights was incorporated in all of the documents and laws which framed our government and which eventually made our country the leader of what we once were prone to call the Free World. I find it unbecoming to our heritage and to our role in world affairs that the United States should be tongue-tied in expressing its re-

vulsion and disdain for the violations of basic human rights that are taking place currently in Korea. To say the least, I find it morally contradictory that the leaders of the past two administrations should have spoken since 1968 of the importance of democratic institutions in our foreign relations—a recent example of which was the President's address to NATO—but in practically every instance where vigorous comment was called for, to have muzzled our public and private reaction both in Seoul and Washington.

When eight Koreans, whose guilt in a so-called conspiracy against the state was never established, were hanged recently, our State Department could only mumble its "regrets." From previous experience in the department I can only sympathize with the frustrations of my former colleagues in their unsuccessful efforts to get through the hierarchy a more forthright statement of the American sense of outrage at this miscarriage of justice. Why should the expression of convictions regarding human rights—principles which are embedded in our Constitution, and in the universal Declaration of Human Rights—be such an agonizing experience for men of conscience in our State Department?

The most frequently heard explanation for U.S. silence is "non-interference in the internal affairs of other governments." This is a sensible and time-honored doctrine but its application to Korea has too frequently been a convenient excuse for avoiding our responsibility to our own principles. Moreover, it is specious to state we are not involved in Korean affairs. We are involved to the extent of 40,000 troops, and some \$150 million annually in military assistance. With Korea, the United States carries responsibilities which arise from a peculiar relationship, and these cannot lightly be brushed aside.

I may also say that I find it disingenuous that our leaders justify their reluctance to speak out in terms of the doctrine of non-interference, especially when we recall the extent to which our officials in Vietnam and Cambodia, with Washington sanction, if not actual instruction, were directly involved in the internal day to day affairs of those countries. In still another Southeast Asian country we financed in part her overseas representation. And in Latin America, we attempted to influence a national election. This is the sort of interference the doctrine sought to avoid. Surely comment about the illegal detention or trial of a Catholic bishop, a nationally prominent poet, a past president, and other honorable and respected men is not in the same category.

We are also told that the security of the Korean peninsula requires a cautious approach, and I concur. Yet for at least four years, the internal situation in Korea has been deteriorating, and relations between government and the people have been eroding. If there is one lesson we should have learned from Korea, it is that her people will not endure forever a government which denies them a right to participate. Unless the present course of events is arrested or reversed, there will be trouble in Korea. And should that occur, how much better for the United States that our role has been honorable and consistent with our ideals. Our conduct to date on human rights issues has not been so.

It may be argued that there are contradictions in criticizing Korea's conduct as reprehensible to democratic rule, while continuing to make possible to this same government military assistance and the protection of the American commitment. So be it. It is in the nature of the realities we face in Asia. But I see less contradiction in the position I have advocated than in the lip-service our foreign policy currently gives to those values which made ours a great nation.

ASHLEY INTRODUCES OZONE PROTECTION ACT OF 1975

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Ozone Protection Act of 1975, a bill to require intensive study of fluorocarbons by Federal agencies and to ban the manufacture of aerosol spray cans within 2 years unless specific evidence is discovered that they have no harmful effect on human health and the environment.

Fluorocarbon gases are compounds used chiefly in refrigeration, air conditioning, and as propellants in aerosol sprays. Current world production is estimated to be over 1.7 billion pounds a year, of which half are made and used in the United States. In 1973 about 3 billion aerosol units were sold in this country, mostly as hair sprays, deodorants, and similar personal cosmetic items.

The problem with fluorocarbons is that they have been found to remain chemically inert in the lower atmosphere and eventually make their way into the stratosphere where it appears they are contributing to the breakdown of the ozone layer. It is this layer which screens out harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun, radiation which has been linked by scientific tests to skin cancer in human beings and animals. Though definitive proof as to the extent of the hazard posed by fluorocarbons is not presently available, last month the Interagency Task Force on Inadvertent Modification of the Stratosphere reported after a 4-month study that there is "legitimate cause for concern" over the release of fluorocarbons into the atmosphere.

When fluorocarbon compounds reach the stratosphere, they are decomposed by ultraviolet radiation and release free chlorine atoms which decrease concentrations of ozone by a chemical chain reaction. The task force report concluded that as much as 2 percent of the ozone shield has been broken down by interaction with fluorocarbons, and that eventually as much as 7 percent of this protective layer could be destroyed if fluorocarbons continue to be used at present levels.

If the ozone shield continues to deteriorate, Mr. Speaker, there are many possible hazards besides an increase in the incidence of skin cancer. Yields of agricultural products may be reduced, plant and animal species may show changes in growth characteristics, there will be disturbances in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, certain agricultural chemicals may lose their effectiveness and stability, and unpredictable changes may occur in worldwide wind patterns, temperature, and precipitation. Additional postulations—with little evidence to support them at this time—of the effect of increased ultraviolet radiation on human beings include early skin aging, increased incidence of eye damage, and excessive synthesis of vitamin D in the skin.

Mr. Speaker, the IMOS report sounds

a warning that we would do well to heed. Manufacturers of fluorocarbons have claimed that solid scientific evidence of the aforementioned hazards has not been irrefutably developed. But the doubts are significant enough that I believe we should take precautionary measures immediately before we are confronted with an irreversible problem of great magnitude. The longer we delay, the more fluorocarbons will be released into the ambient air and begin their slow but inevitable progress toward the stratosphere. If we prolong action for the indefinite period needed to adduce final proof of the impact of fluorocarbons on health and the environment, we will have no way to arrest the effects of the billions of pounds of these gases that will have been used in the interim.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in dealing with a problem with so many unpredictable factors—but with potentially lethal and life-altering impact—it is sound public policy to err on the side of caution. There is no overriding public interest involved in the continued indiscriminate production of fluorocarbons. Rather our first priority must be the protection of human life and supporting ecosystems. If these compounds are eventually found to have little or no destructive effect on the ozone layer, their manufacture and use can go on as at present.

The legislation I am introducing today will require the National Academy of Sciences, NASA, and the Environmental Protection Agency to study the impact of fluorocarbons on the atmosphere and report back to Congress within 1 year. The bill also bans the manufacture and sale of aerosol spray containers using the suspect fluorocarbons within 2 years unless scientific proof is found that their continued use will have no adverse effects on human life.

The reasonable restrictions in this measure should enable us to get a more definitive grasp of the dimensions of this problem before the massive use of non-essential gases causes catastrophic damage to the protective capacity of the ozone layer of the stratosphere. I urge early consideration of this bill on behalf of the health and well-being of future generations who will have to live with the results of our irresponsibility if we fail to act now.

A MAN TO BE MISSED

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1975, Rear Adm. George Stephen Morrison retired from the U.S. Navy. For the past 3½ years Admiral Morrison's official title has been Commander, Naval Forces Marianas, Guam. But to the citizens of Guam, accustomed to military governors from 1898 to 1948, the admiral has been more than a commander of the U.S. Navy; he has been a friend to Guam.

A listing of Admiral Morrison's contributions to the civilian community

would be as lengthy and distinguished as are his military citations and recommendations. In a successful effort to create an atmosphere of open dialog between the civilian and military populations Admiral Morrison created a full-time liaison office between the Navy Department and the Government of Guam; through his continuing efforts a civilian advisory board was formed, a beautification program with military participation instituted and regular meetings with the Governor and Guam Legislature initiated for coordination and effectiveness.

While such original and creative steps are to the administrative credit of Admiral Morrison, citizens of Guam know well that they are founded on his personal awareness of and sensitivity to the needs and pulse of the local community. And it is this sensitivity and human concern that has endeared the Admiral to a people who have seen so many admirals come and go that they are no longer unduly impressed by the gold braid. It is Admiral Morrison's friendship and sincere desire to work with the people of Guam which have made him such a favorite and enabled his last tour of duty to be such an outstanding success.

A crowning glory to his illustrious career came the past 3 months when he assumed overall command of Operation New Life, the care and resettlement of over 70,000 Vietnamese refugees on Guam. It comes as no surprise to us that great humanitarian effort was the admiral's finest hour simply because it called for the human traits and qualities which he so deeply possesses.

The Territory of Guam has said its farewell to Admiral Morrison; we have wished him fair wind and smooth sailing. Perhaps our feelings are best expressed in a recent editorial by Mr. Tom Brislin in the Pacific Dateline, June 24, 1975, and which I insert in the RECORD so that my colleagues may know the Guamanian peoples' respect and admiration for this naval officer.

A MAN TO BE MISSED

(By Tom Brislin)

The tributes will soon begin to pour in. As they do, I'd like to add my four-cents worth (inflation, you know). A week from tomorrow will end the tenure on the island for G. Steve Morrison, who will remove the rather cumbersome label of ComNavMarianas from his title and substitute instead RADM (Ret.).

Admirals come and go on this island, are well thought of and received while here, and then generally forgotten after they leave, unless they're the Nimitz type. Admiral Morrison may well fit into that category.

The problems that Morrison has faced, and the accomplishments made during his extended term here, could well be the subject of a text devoted to recent history.

Morrison certainly had his military problems to deal with—the massive evacuation of Indochinese refugees, their care and processing here; the cluttering of the harbor by the sunken *Caribla*. However, what Morrison will be most remembered, and admired for, are the inroads made into the strengthening of military-community relationships.

Morrison was the overseer of the erosion, slowly but surely, of much of the traditional animosity and distrust between military and civilian leaders. The mark of his performance is Sella Bay, an issue that could have closed the fence gates that separate the communities for many years to come. He rode the

issue out with skillful negotiations and great amounts of patience to reach what looks to be the most equitable settlement.

Morrison has begun what hopefully will be a continuing trend—the opening up of “military” property, notably recreation areas, for “civilian” use.

He also instituted a community orientation program for military personnel stationed here, something that was long-needed, and apparently quite successful.

The crowning glory for Morrison will be Operation New Life, an operation that began with the end of a military conflict, and extended into the reaches of the first American community that the refugees experienced.

Perhaps Morrison succeeded so well in Operation New Life because, although massive, it was defined in human terms. It was an opportunity to reach out, to help, to cooperate, to smooth the flow between military and civilian.

It was what Morrison was best at, and it will be for what we will remember him best.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT: THE TOP CONSUMER PRIORITY FOR THE 94TH CONGRESS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Government Operations Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security is once again embarking upon a well-traveled road in our consideration of H.R. 7575, the Consumer Protection Act of 1975. This piece of legislation has now been before the Congress for some 5 years. During the 93d Congress, nearly 300 Members of this House voted in favor of the establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency. At that time, we were thwarted in enacting this legislation by a small group of Senators who invoked a filibuster to prevent Senate passage of this bill, apparently believing that consumer's interests were adequately represented within the labyrinths of our administrative agencies. Now that the Senate has managed to approve this legislation, we are told that President Ford intends to veto it. I suspect that Mr. Ford hopes that this “warning” will somehow deter us from consideration of H.R. 7575. But Mr. Speaker, as you yourself know, the refusal of one branch of our Government to respond to the clear sentiments of a majority of Americans on this issue, is no reason for this body to emulate the negativism at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. As you yourself have demonstrated in your leadership on this legislation, Mr. Speaker, we, as the elected representatives of the American people, have a responsibility to act in a responsive manner on the needs of the American consumer.

In my brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to set forth a justification for the establishment of this agency. This has been documented by the many witnesses we have heard and in the statements of other members of this committee and this House. Rather, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes to explore

several myths which have been advanced by opponents of this legislation.

One is that this legislation will create another onerous and superfluous regulatory agency. This argument preys upon the well-justified fears of many citizens and Members of this Congress that we presently have too much regulation by the Federal Government in the economic sphere. But even a cursory reading of this bill clearly establishes that the Agency for Consumer Protection is not actually another regulatory body. In fact, it has no regulatory powers at all. Its sole function is to assure representation of consumer interests in judicial and administrative proceedings. Unlike a regulatory body, the Agency for Consumer Protection has no power to hold hearings, to investigate, to issue rules and regulations, or to impose sanctions for the violations of statutes and regulations. By any sense of the term, the ACP is clearly intended to be a nonregulatory agency with representational functions only. Even in representing these consumer interests before judicial and administrative bodies, ACP is required to proceed, as any other party must, under and consistent with the rules and procedures of the particular body before which it seeks to appear.

A second myth which I would like to take a moment to explore is the assertion by some opponents of this bill that this legislation somehow creates a special labor exemption. This argument is intended to confuse those who as a matter of principle oppose special exemptions in legislation.

The truth of the matter, however, is that section 18 of this bill, the “special exemption” section to which critics refer, is actually a codification and reaffirmation of the law as it presently exists. For 40 years, Congress has maintained a policy, affirmed by the courts, of refusing to permit Federal agencies to become involved substantively in private labor-management negotiations. The job of the National Labor Relations Board is to oversee and referee the process of collective bargaining, leaving the results of the contest to the bargaining strengths of the parties. The NLRB does not have authority to influence the outcome of the process. The National Mediation and Conciliation Service, the second labor-related body before which the ACP is forbidden to appear under section 18, is merely a service organization. It was created to offer its services and expertise to parties in labor disputes. It has no regulatory powers and cannot impose its will upon the parties to a dispute.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this legislation, despite the efforts of its critics to confuse the public, is really very simple and yet fundamentally important. It establishes a Government agency to assure the fair and adequate representation of consumers before other governmental bodies. Our hope is that, given the additional information provided by ACP, our judicial and regulatory bodies can more capably resolve issues touching upon the interests of the buying public. For too long our national policy has been “let the buyer beware.” I say it is time to make the companies beware—in cases where they are not being fair.

AN ACCURATE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues considering House Resolutions 568, 569, and 570, mandating a more verbatim account of floor proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am introducing into the RECORD pertinent comments made by well-known authorities on Congress.

In Charles Clapp's classic, “The Congressman, His Work as He Sees It”—1964, there is a discussion of the RECORD which includes the views of some 36 congressional participants in the Brookings Institution round table conference on Congress. Relevant excerpts of Clapp's book follow:

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Congressional Record is an important element in the legislative process. The congressman uses it to build a record, and, hopefully, a favorable image and to strengthen his position with selected individuals or groups. From it he gains ideas for legislation and for political survival. Further, its “Daily Digest” section provides him with a capsule record of current activities in Congress, enabling him to become aware of matters that might otherwise escape his attention. Citizens examine the Record as one means by which to gain understanding of Congress.

The major portion of the *Congressional Record* constitutes a record of debates on the floor of the House and Senate, although it is by no means a true one, a fact of which many of its readers are not aware. Nor is it intended to be. Rather it is “substantially a verbatim” reproduction of proceedings. This causes concern to some congressmen who believe it *should* be a verbatim report except for allowances for minor grammatical revision. Complained one representative: “You have a record it is impossible to interpret on its face.” Speeches never delivered in the Congress appear as though they had, indeed, been made there, and often there is no way to discover the truth of the matter. Other speeches have been substantially rewritten, the rule that only minor changes are to be made is occasionally flagrantly ignored. The inclusion of clever afterthoughts may sharpen the force of a member's argument, disguising his weak floor presentation and causing him to appear victor rather than vanquished in debate. Members have even been known to reverse their positions in revising copy. Deletions and additions may affect the relevance and meaning of the remarks of other members participating in a colloquy. Some congressmen have protested that their statements have been rendered meaningless by the alterations made in the presentations of those with whom they were jousting. Occasionally, according to House members, legislators hopelessly routed in debate will delay returning their revised remarks beyond the deadline for submission, so that they will appear in the appendix, rather than in the body of the *Record* adjacent to those of colleagues who have bested them.

Criticisms made in the heat of debate often are removed in the written record, but implied criticisms of colleagues never uttered on the floor may also appear in the written record within the context of remarks delivered. Protested one irritated member:

In a controversy with the Air Force, I

provoked an official of the Department of Defense to make a bitter attack on me. Later a colleague of mine made a speech on a bill under consideration. His remarks contained no reference to the controversy between me and that official. But when the *Congressional Record* appeared the next day, his speech repeated the personal attack the official had made. My colleague never made the statement on the floor.

Revise and Extend. The source of much of the difficulty is the practice of securing permission to "revise and extend" remarks. Although the occasional excesses are not condoned—they are in fact widely admitted and regretted though no concerted effort has been made to eliminate them—the right to "extend" is regarded as all but indispensable by most congressmen, and any attempt to eliminate it would be firmly resisted. Justification of the practice generally rests on two grounds: (1) it helps to conserve precious House time; and (2) it permits members to correct any grammatical errors and to modify impolitic statements made in the stress of debate. A third factor, which is sometimes advanced, is that it provides one more means by which constituents can gain insight into the thinking of their representatives.

Without the opportunity to "clean up" the *Record*, said one congressman, "it would be really sad reading the next day . . . the best comic book you ever saw." Said another: "It couldn't be used in an English composition class."

Much legislation is noncontroversial, involving no important issue that needs to be resolved. Yet because of the appeal of some such measures in their constituencies members may wish to be "on the record" with respect to them. Especially where roll-call votes are not taken, insertions become a convenient way of expressing an opinion without subjecting colleagues to the unhappy prospect of listening to testimonial after testimonial on subjects about which they are all agreed. If a roll call occurs, members may wish to provide an explanation of their vote or to demonstrate their special interest in the legislation, which, because of limited debate time they cannot accomplish by direct participation in the discussion.

On that crazy ——— bill, one of the toughest of the year, we had twenty minutes of debate on each side. Because of the brief time allotted, no one but the authors had much chance to say anything. One of the authors assured me he would get permission for every member to revise and extend his remarks so I prepared a brief statement and inserted it, so the *Record* would show what I would have said if I had been given time to say it. Congressmen also may wish to influence readers of the *Record*, including members of the "other body," though their own view has not prevailed in the House. If the contribution has no apparent effect on the current controversy, it may help prepare the way for victory in the future.

Those congressmen who have major objections to existing extension of remarks procedures generally do not suggest the practice be discontinued, but they are included to press for a distinction in the *Record* between statements delivered on the floor of the House and those inserted to appear as though they had been given there. On this question, it is interesting to note, the Brookings Democratic round table divided nine-to-five in favor of the present practice: no distinction. Commented one practical legislator who prefaced his remarks by urging rules to prevent "situations where people make speeches on one side of a question and when their remarks are printed are on the other side":

Yet suggestions that we change the system with regard to extension and do like the Senate does—if you don't actually deliver the speech it appears in different type—while correct in theory are not practical. It would be hard to avoid the time-consuming situation which would occur if everybody had to

deliver statements and everybody would want to make sure his name was not applied to a mere extension. The work of the House would become very cumbersome. That is why the system has never been changed in the House—to conserve time.

As a reflection of round table opinion with respect to curtailment of practices currently followed in "revise and extend" remarks consider the following discussion:

Is there a consensus that one flaw in the system has been exposed in that you have in a sense a false record, that without going so far as to be restrictive some way could be found for the record to be more accurate so a person could interpret it better? [The answer was "no."]

This should be said for maintaining the present system. Although it is not the accurate record we wish, it is a deliberate record. It is the way the members want the record to read. In that sense, the sober second thoughts of people—the thoughts they have had a chance to reflect upon—may be more accurate.

This is a record of something, there is no doubt, but of what it is a record there is some question.

It is the record of the way each member wished himself to be recorded. I have found the right to revise and extend in general debate to be an invaluable aid. . . . Each of us owes it to the dignity of the House to make his expressions as good as he possibly can for posterity.

Perhaps the most serious indictment of present procedures rests on the charge that they could result in the marshaling of a false legislative history, a criticism often heard. In attempting to ascertain the true intent of Congress with respect to legislation, the courts examine the floor debates as set forth in the *Congressional Record* as well as committee reports. Said one representative:

I recall writing a paper, when I was in law school, on some legal matter which involved the interpretation of an act of Congress. I researched the *Congressional Record* to see what congressmen had said in order to get an interpretation of how the law should be construed. I considered that an important element of my case. I would have reservations now as to the authority of statements reported in the *Congressional Record* as a sound interpretation of what Congress intended.

A Republican expressed his position much more sharply:

Phony legislative histories are written all the time. Extension in the body of the *Record* appears as if the words had been spoken. Therefore the court or whoever is undertaking to interpret the legislative history might reasonably assume that the words influenced the debate and hence were part of the legislative history. These words might push the meeting of the statute one way or the other, yet they had no influence whatever on debate or vote. Nobody even saw them until the morning afterwards when they appeared in the *Record*. I have observed much skulduggery and the fraudulent making of legislative history by this means. Someone ought to look into this matter closely.

Although the congressman persisted in his contention that the failure to distinguish between delivered and undelivered remarks often sabotaged the possibility of providing a proper legislative history, the majority of his colleagues were not moved. An excerpt from the discussion reflects his inability to convince his colleagues of the logic of his position:

I agree that one ought to tidy up his grammar and improve his rhetoric. And I agree that a member ought to have the right, even though he didn't speak on the floor, to insert into the record a statement disclosing his stand on an issue. What I object to is that matter appears in the record as if it had been spoken. That has the effect of constituting legislative history, but in fact it isn't proper legislative history because it is boot-strap-lifting put in the day after. I suggest that

this be designated as a statement in extension.

Yes, but it isn't as if it is possible to record the legislative history of a bill. The facts that make the House vote as it does or the real meaning of what the House does and wants isn't going to be shown by the debate.

Perhaps the rules of judicial construction of legislative acts are not the best rules that could be devised, but we know what the rules are. The rules are that committee hearings and reports, conference reports, and the floor debate are considered by the court, both in federal and state courts. As long as that is so, we kid the court when we make matter appear as if it were legislative debate when it is not.

If the record is distorted by something put in to appear as though it were said when in fact it wasn't, those who disagree with the distortion have recourse in the days that follow. They can point out the true situation.

Developing the legislative history of a bill is a matter with which relatively few members concern themselves, but it is an important part of the legislative process, and canny representatives alert to the possibilities can do much to influence the practical effect of legislation. In connection with non-controversial bills, it often happens that floor managers will speak only briefly to the House but extend their remarks in the *Record* to reflect more fully the position and thinking of the committee majority and to complete the legislative history. Minority representatives may do the same thing. Major legislation is more likely to involve the development of congressional intent right on the floor. Sometimes legislators will deliberately set out to make legislative history by asking questions of the floor managers to ensure that certain points are clear. There is the danger, of course, that the procedure will not always result in the accurate reflection of committee intent, as one veteran legislator observes:

Making a legislative record by putting questions to a person handling a bill is a rather frequent occurrence. I have often thought that the chairman presumes what power he has in answering the questions addressed to him, in that he is supposed to be speaking for the entire committee. I have disagreed with my chairman when he has said "the committee feels so and so" in connection with an important point. Yet the only course is to rise and say, "I, for one, don't agree with my chairman in this interpretation," and only rarely will anyone get up and do that. That is the way legislative history is made in an interchange between the chairman and his questioner.

The Appendix. The appendix functions as a depository for materials that are not directly relevant to House or Senate proceedings but which members of Congress want placed in the *Record*.¹ These include editorials, reports, speeches, poems, essays, letters, recipes, and testimonials. Some legislators insert their own newsletters, voting records, and the results of questionnaires sent from their offices to constituents. In recent years, legislators have begun to overcome their reluctance to insert their own speeches given outside the Congress; formerly the speeches were nearly always placed in the *Record* by friendly colleagues, perhaps at the request of the member making the speech.

While most of the items in the appendix presumably have been submitted because of their purported general interest or educational value, many of them are, in fact, parochial in nature. Periodic attempts are made to exert more control over the nature of the materials incorporated in the appendix and to establish limits on the amount an individual legislator can insert in any one session. One congressman has estimated

¹ It should be noted that much extraneous matter finds its way into the body as well as the appendix of the *Record*.

that 5 percent of the membership of the House use 80 percent of the space. And in a House speech in 1962, he estimated that the volume of material inserted by some members cost more to print than their annual salary of \$22,500. There is general recognition that much of the matter is "very frivolous and of no real moment," but there is little disposition to be restrictive. One restriction provides that any insertion exceeding two pages in length must be accompanied by a statement from the public printer estimating its cost; as a deterrent this requirement is conceded to be a failure.

Most of the items appearing in the appendix have in the first instance caught the eye of a member of Congress or his staff, but some have been forwarded to the legislator by a constituent or friend with the request or suggestion that they be inserted. These communications sometimes pose problems for the member, especially if the materials are of dubious merit. Constituent initiative usually reflects genuine interest in the outcome of the request; a congressman who declines to cooperate may find he has created an enemy. That some representatives hesitate to return material is evident by this comment:

In the past ten days I have had three letters asking me to put things in the *Record* which are extraneous to the business of the House. I took them home and worried about the problem for two or three days. Finally I wrote each of the persons involved a letter saying I had a rule against putting extraneous matter in the *Record* and didn't want to break it. I may have three enemies or three constituents who think I am a screwball.

Legislators reluctant to insert materials may point out to constituents that printing costs are \$90.00 a page and that they do not want to add to the taxpayer's burden by submitting material not directly relevant to matters before Congress. But it is sometimes easier to ignore one's doubts and insert the material; constituents whose material has been returned may follow closely the insertion policies of their representative, seeking inconsistencies and heckling him with anything they discover. The dilemma is compounded, too, by colleagues who seem to exercise no discretion in what they place in the *Record*.

The political advantages of adroit use of the appendix are apparent to most members, just as they use extension procedures to advantage in connection with the body of the *Record*. Only rarely, as in the instance cited below, will a congressman err in anticipating favorable reaction from those whose material he places in the *Record*.

Most of the appendix materials are inserted by congressmen hoping for political gain. Some folks are sincere and believe the subject matter is worth printing and that their colleagues and public should read it. But much is political, trying to flatter newspaper editors, or something like that. A colleague from my state had an interesting experience in that connection. He inserted an editorial from the largest paper in his district prefacing it with a few remarks and sent it back to the paper. He expected gratitude, but the paper wrote a heck of a good editorial against the practice, saying they wished congressmen wouldn't print any of their stuff, that taxpayers' money shouldn't be spent on it.

Reprints of materials printed in the appendix are a means of subsidizing propaganda. They are obtainable at low cost, encouraging congressmen to use them for campaign or public relations purposes. In addition, legislators may strengthen their position with interest groups by inserting certain materials and making them available to the groups at cost. One private group is said to have obtained ten million pieces in this way. By distributing them to the general public under the frank of friendly congress-

men, the organization saved an additional \$300,000 in postage.

Far more common is the technique used by one practical congressman to consolidate support for him within various organizations in his district:

You can put something in the *Record* that you plan to reprint and send back to specific groups. During the campaign I had written a letter to all the REA people in my district—some 3,000 of them—saying that I would be for REA. It was a hot issue in my area. When the REA bill came before the House I put a statement in the *Record*, reprinted it, and sent it out to the same 3,000 people. This is standard operating procedure from what I have seen. It is a cheap way to campaign.

A substantial part of the material in the appendix is aimed directly at those who read the *Record*—colleagues, opinion leaders, students, and scholars—and is of high quality, attempting to influence them by bringing to their attention interesting and thoughtful materials which support the position of the person submitting them. Congressional colleagues are the main target of these efforts. That congressmen do read the *Record* is evident by the frequency with which they refer in conversation to provocative articles that have appeared there, and by their ability to cite examples of materials they feel should not have been inserted. One legislator who makes frequent use of the *Record* in an effort to reach his associates had this to say:

There are several reasons for insertions in the appendix. (1) You can satisfy constituent requests that way. (2) You may have a special interest group you want to reach to indicate your support of something which is of concern to them. (3) You may be inclined to use it to lobby your colleagues, because a lot of them do read the *Record*. I have discovered that when little things I have put in happened to strike someone's fancy he mentions it to me. It is an easy way to reach members and less direct than sending them a letter. When we feel keenly about things, we write our colleagues directly, but often you don't want to make that much of the matter.

It should not be forgotten either that the *Congressional Record*, including the appendix, forms a rich resource in connection with research for speeches and campaign statements. Many a congressional staff, required to prepare effective speeches on a wide range of subjects with very short notice, have been able to do so only because the *Record* is readily available and indexed.

CHURCH BODY CONDEMNS OPPRESSION IN ROMANIA

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of human rights and religious freedom are close to the hearts of all Americans, especially in this Bicentennial period, for our forebears have taken to arms to realize their human rights and religious freedoms.

Today, many churches in the world are still deprived of their rights and the faithful are suffering various degrees of persecution. One of these countries is Romania, where especially the minority churches, Protestant Reformed, Roman Catholic, and Unitarian, are special targets for oppression.

On June 1-3, 1975, the Bishop's Council and the General Assembly of the Hun-

garian Reformed Church of America passed a resolution in this regard. The present bishop of the church is a man of outstanding intellect and character and a close personal friend of mine, as he had been, until recently, the pastor of Magyar Reformed Church of Perth Amboy, N.J., in my district. Bishop Desmond Abraham's signature under the resolution lends complete credence to the allegations.

The other signer is the bishop emeritus of the church, another oldtime friend of mine, the Right Reverend Zoltan Beky, D.D., who is at the present serving as the national president of the American Hungarian Federation, the national organization of American Hungarian churches, fraternal associations and societies since 1907, and as president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, a fraternal insurance company. Bishop Beky's work on behalf of the American Hungarian community and also in the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the World Council of Churches has provided him with a national and international reputation in church circles, and his signature under the resolution will necessitate serious discussion of the charges by national and international church bodies. Bishop Beky is planning to carry the resolution in person to Geneva to the General Secretary of both international church bodies mentioned above.

I include in the *Record* the text of the resolution of the Hungarian Reformed Church in America:

RESOLUTION

The Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Hungarian Reformed Church of America were shocked to receive information about a new wave of persecution of Hungarians in Transylvania by the Romanian Government, especially the 1.2 million members of the Hungarian Reformed Church.

The General Assembly therefore requests that the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, the President and the Secretary of State and the Congress of the United States should immediately undertake steps aiming at stopping this new wave of oppression and investigate the facts. We have news of medieval-type methods used and also of the confiscation of historical church archives and records by the Romanian Government. The intention is to eradicate the historical traces of the presence of Hungarians and Protestantism in Transylvania, amounting to cultural genocide.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST BINARY NERVE GASES

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has renewed its request for funds to build a facility to produce a new generation of nerve gas weapons called binaries. These weapons would contain two nontoxic chemicals which become a deadly combination when mixed together. Last year Congress wisely voted to delete money for production of binary munitions; it should do so again.

One of the most convincing collection of arguments against development of binary nerve gases has emerged from a meeting of distinguished biological scientists in Atlantic City on April 16 of this year. Based on extensive discussion at the meeting, the scientist's committee on chemical and biological warfare has issued a statement opposing the Defense Department request. Three members of the committee, Robert Rutman of the University of Pennsylvania, J. B. Neilands of the University of California, and Philip Siekevitz of Rockefeller University were primarily responsible for the statement.

It reads as follows:

STATEMENT

As scientists aware of the technical and political aspects of chemical warfare, we believe that present Department of Defense initiatives in binary nerve gases are an ominous threat to efforts to abolish chemical warfare. Our conclusions are based on the following considerations:

(1) The U.S. has been called upon to consider a disarmament treaty which would destroy existing CW stockpiles and ban CW research and development. Approval of the DOD binary nerve gas program can only provide responses from other nations which will make negotiations more difficult if not impossible.

(2) Once DOD development and production of binary nerve gases has begun, a vested military interest in a new form of weaponry will have been created which will act as a brake on disarmament efforts.

(3) Whereas the technology of existing agents (GB, VX) is relatively complicated and expensive, binary weapons are simple and economical and could be produced by any country with a munitions industry. Proliferation of these agents will greatly increase the technical problems connected with disarmament.

(4) To bring binary weapons to a militarily advanced state, open air testing will be essential, and it is logical to expect that this dangerous activity will be projected by DOD.

(5) DOD has already made clear its intention to develop binary nerve gases as part of multipurpose munitions suitable for overseas deployment. Such a move is bound to disturb NATO relations and create great distrust in Warsaw Pact members, slowing progress towards demilitarization of Europe.

(6) Nerve gases, of which the U.S. presently possesses stockpiles sufficient to kill every human on earth, like other war gases, are of limited tactical value but are dreadful threats to unprotected civilian populations. Commitment to these weapons, with their genocidal aspects, removes U.S. policy further from the humane objectives and the spirit of detente.

In view of all these reasons, we regard the program for binary nerve gas weaponry as a distinct backward step which negates the spirit, if not the letter, of Congressional action in adopting the Geneva Protocol on CBW. We urge Congress to delete these DOD items and bar further development of these weapons."

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE
JOINT RESOLUTION ON SSI

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a joint

resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York. This resolution calls for a remedy to the existing deficiencies in the Federal supplemental security income program.

The problems with SSI are well known. But they have to be acted upon to provide adequate funding to the aged, blind, and disabled. One of the more distressing aspects of the program is that it fails to provide adequate provisions for emergency assistance.

Those SSI recipients who also receive social security have been denied cost-of-living increases. With the recent 8 percent increase in social security benefits, SSI recipients saw their checks decrease by the same amount of their social security increase.

The New York State Legislature recognizes its responsibility to New York SSI recipients and has asked us to respond. Accordingly I draw the attention of my colleagues to its resolution. The resolution is attached.

[New York State Legislature]

RESOLUTION

Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to remedy the existing deficiencies in the Federal Supplemental Security Income program.

Whereas, The United States Congress acted to create a single, national supplemental Security Income program to replace more than eleven hundred fifty state and local programs of welfare for the aged, blind and disabled, effective January 1, 1974; and

Whereas, The Congress so acted with the express purpose of creating a minimum income program under which those too old and infirm to support themselves might live in dignity, free of dependency on the welfare system; and

Whereas, The wisdom of the Congress in so acting has been demonstrated in that nearly one hundred fifty thousand aged and disabled New York State citizens who might never have applied for "welfare" status have now been accepted into the SSI program; and

Whereas, The Congress, recognizing that the basic Federal SSI grant would be insufficient to meet the needs of many aged, blind or disabled persons, encouraged the states to provide supplemental payments by permitting states to do so and yet be forever "held harmless" at 1972 state and local costs for aid to the aged, blind and disabled regardless of how the SSI caseload might grow after January 1, 1974; and

Whereas, The Congress also encouraged the "cashing out" of the food stamp program for the SSI population by permitting the states to include the cash value of food stamp supplemental payments subject to the "hold harmless" limitation on state and local costs; and

Whereas, The state of New York, on behalf of its two hundred seventy thousand AABD beneficiaries, actively supported the creation of the SSI program, chose to supplement the basic Federal SSI grants, and elected to cash-out the food stamp program for the SSI population, with the latter decision grounded in the assumption that it was far better social policy to provide ten dollars monthly to all SSI recipients rather than provide the equivalent amount in food stamps to the less than half of the SSI population who would actually use them; and

Whereas, The Congress has failed to act on a number of critical issues which, if not remedied, threaten to undermine the promise of the SSI program for New York's aged, blind and disabled citizens, to wit:

The Congress has failed to modify the hold harmless mechanism so that the state of New York and a number of other states

might pass along increases in the basic Federal SSI grant voted and funded by the Congress—increases which SSI recipients in those states without optional supplementation programs are now benefiting from;

The Congress has failed to provide federal funding for emergency needs of the SSI population—emergencies such as eviction, utility disconnection, loss of household goods due to fire or flood and loss or theft of checks and cash;

The Congress has failed to provide the means by which states providing the cash value in lieu of food stamps could increase the cash-out payment in the event the bonus value of food stamps is raised nationally;

The Congress has failed to create new definitions of disability for adults and children under the SSI program which would recognize the significant differences in needs and abilities of this population in comparison with those served by Social Security insurance programs;

The Congress has failed to make special provision for SSI beneficiaries in need of minimal supportive care and services either in non-medical congregate living facilities or in their own homes; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to remedy these deficiencies so that the full promise of the Federal Supplemental Security Income program will be realized for both the SSI beneficiaries and taxpayers of New York state; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution suitably engrossed be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congress of the United States from the state of New York.

CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report entitled "Crime and Law Enforcement":

CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

In spite of the billions of dollars which have been funneled into it, the war on crime has not worked well, and its central lesson is that we really don't understand crime or how to deal with it.

Last year crime registered the largest jump in serious offenses since the FBI began collecting nationwide crime data in 1930. In 1974 the crime rate increased by 15% in cities with populations over 25,000, by 20% in suburban areas, and by 21% in rural areas. Violent crime rose by 11% last year, and crimes against property rose at an even faster rate, with larceny up 20% and burglary up 17%. The actual increases are probably even greater because many crimes are never reported. An unprecedented 70% of Americans feel that crime has increased in their home area.

There has been a steady rise in crime since 1960 which was interrupted only in 1972 with a temporary 3% downturn. Between 1960 and 1973 the number of serious crimes increased by 158%, and the total cost of crime in the U.S. each year is estimated to be nearly \$90 billion, about \$420 for every man, woman, and child. One study concluded that an urban American boy is more likely to die by murder than an American soldier was to die in combat in World War II.

In recent message on crime to the Congress, President Ford was realistic about the limited role that the federal government can

play in fighting crime, which is largely under state and local jurisdiction. He did propose mandatory minimum jail terms for those convicted of specified crimes and for repeat offenders, compensation for the victims of federal crimes for physical injuries, tighter gun control laws (without registration of firearms or licensing of gun owners) and a ban on "Saturday night special" handguns.

He recommended extending the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, created in 1967 to develop new approaches to the problems of crime, through 1981 with a \$50 million increase in spending over the present \$1.25 billion LEAA budget for crime reduction programs in big city areas. Since its beginning the LEAA has channelled some \$4.3 billion to state and local governments mainly for improving police equipment which, critics point out, has not reduced crime. The crime rate has risen undauntedly since the LEAA was created, and since then combined federal, state, and local spending to combat crime has grown from \$4.5 to \$14.5 billion a year with little positive impact.

The police have made improvements in stopping crime, yet the realization has grown that there is a limit to what they can do to control it on their own. The number of police officers nationwide has increased from 339,000 in 1967 to approximately one-half million, and police forces have adopted new techniques and have improved their training and education levels. They are, nevertheless, frustrated by a criminal justice system which deals ineffectively with the criminals they arrest.

The criminal justice system has become slow, overburdened, and is not doing its job of convicting and punishing those who break the law by providing swift and sure justice. As a result, too many criminals feel that the odds are in their favor and that crime does indeed pay. Only one-fifth of all serious crimes are cleared by arrests, and of the 5% which lead to convictions, a decreasing proportion of the convicted are sent to prison. Ninety percent of the nation's serious crimes are cleared by plea bargaining by which the defendant is allowed to plead guilty to lesser offenses and reduced sentences.

Repeat offenders commit almost two-thirds of all crime in this country. Over a third of all people awaiting trial are arrested for a second offense while out on bail, and many defendants already have a number of charges against them when they are arrested. Career criminals employ legal delaying tactics and, by making use of their anonymity in the criminal justice system, successfully postpone or minimize their prison sentences.

Although no breakthroughs are likely, a number of steps can be taken to bring down spiraling crime rates. The criminal justice system from the criminal code to prisoner release must be improved. The repeat offender must be taken off the street, and all criminals should face the likelihood of swift punishment for the crimes they commit. We must also pay greater attention to the victims of crime and less attention to those committing crimes for which there are no victims. Handguns must be taken out of the hands of criminals, and our prisons should be changed from universities of crime into institutions offering rehabilitation to prisoners who genuinely need and want it and confinement for hardened criminals. Innovative approaches of citizen participation and cooperation with local police have been fruitful and should be expanded. More judges will help, as will uniform and certain sentences and selective and flexible rehabilitation procedures.

Finally, all of us, weary as we may be from failed solutions and overblown rhetoric about law and order, must be unwilling to accept the crime rate and must work to understand the causes and the cures for crime and be prepared to support changes in our own communities, step by painful step, over an

extended period of time toward a criminal justice system that is fast, firm, and fair.

RESTRUCTURING OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we are looking straight into the face of a crisis in the Social Security System.

The genesis of the crisis may be found in two separate and very different trends, which when combined mean that a drastic change in our social security policies is not only needed, but inevitable.

The first trend is political in nature; politicians, faced with the necessity to appeal to a powerful block of voters in the retired and soon-to-be retired categories, have found a continual expansion of benefits from the program to be politically irresistible. Thus, since 1949, the first year in which social security benefits were paid, benefits have increased 640 percent—over 2½ times the increase in the Consumer Price Index for the same period. Thus, through the political process, the concept of social security has changed from the original modest "provision of a floor" idea—to a massive system that is neither insurance, nor a pension plan, nor welfare.

But whatever it is, it is costly. Social security taxes have gone up even more dramatically than benefits; the maximum combined employer-employee yearly social security tax is 2,474 percent of what it was in 1947—seven times the growth in median family and individual annual income. Most Americans today pay more in social security taxes than they do in income taxes.

The only option is a massive reform of the system, one which would change dramatically its foundation and its premises.

I believe that an extremely valuable proposal in that regard has just been offered in a paper entitled "Retirement Security Reform" by Charles D. Hobbs and Stephen L. Powlesland.

The proposal does not deal with the ancillary benefits now administered through the Social Security System, such as medicare and life and disability insurance, but there is no reason to believe that adequate proposals for meeting the objectives of these programs cannot be implemented at the same time.

The bonded retirement security proposal is one of the most exciting new ideas of the year. It has received the backing of a number of distinguished economists, and deserves the careful attention of this body. In order that my colleagues might have a chance to review it, I would ask that excerpts of the Hobbs-Powlesland proposal be printed here in the RECORD.

RETIREMENT SECURITY REFORM

The purpose of this paper is to examine the genesis and implications of the problems of the Social Security System that are rapidly reaching crisis proportions—the excessive growth of Social Security taxes and the unfairness of its benefit structure—and pro-

pose solutions to those problems in the form of Social Security reforms that can be implemented through modifications to existing laws.

The future of this massive system is in jeopardy for the following reasons:

—Unlike private insurance benefits, social security levels are determined politically—by vote of Congress. As a result benefits have been increased over and over again without regard to future ability to fund those benefits.

—Social Security taxes hit the middle and low income workers hardest. Rapidly rising tax rates are meeting increased resistance from young workers, who see no hope of receiving in retirement as much as they have been forced to put into the system.

The Social Security Trust Fund, once intended to grow until the benefit obligations were fully funded, has, in the face of increasing benefits, rapidly dwindled to a cash-flow account and, at the current rate of spending and income, will run out of money in 1980 or soon afterward.

Recent economic analysis shows that the Social Security System has had the effect of reducing total private savings—and hence investment in the American economy—by about 38%. The choices, then, for meeting the coming crisis in Social Security, short of fundamental reform of the system, are:

Increase the payroll tax rate and earning limit to raise the money to meet the obligations.

Abandon the already debilitated notion of social insurance, pour billions of general revenue dollars into Social Security and make it an outright welfare system.

Cut back on expected benefits.

None of these choices, or possible combinations of them, are appealing ones; and, of course, none of them deals with the capital investment drain caused by the system as it stands.

The proposal here advanced operates on the same basic premise as the present Social Security System: that it is in the public interest to compel individuals to provide for their retirement years. Unlike the present Social Security System, however, the proposal abolishes payroll tax financing; ensures that contributors will enjoy a predictable benefit level at retirement, that will always meet and usually exceed cost-of-living increases; creates an option for participants to invest in supervised individual retirement plans; reduces the serious impact of Social Security on private capital investment; and more equitably assigns the financial burden for the present system that has already been incurred.

The first step would be to end Social Security F.I.C.A. payroll tax deductions and employer contributions for all workers. The employer contributions, which are presently counted as a labor cost by employers would be passed on to each employee as an across-the-board annual pay increase of 5.85% of each employee's first \$14,100 (if the proposal were enacted in 1975). The employee would also retain the 5.85% which he has previously withheld as an F.I.C.A. payroll deduction. Thus the initial increase in take-home pay for each employee earning gross wages of \$14,100 or more, (if the proposal were enacted in 1975) would be \$1,649.70, minus the small increase in personal income tax on the 5.85% pay increase resulting from the shift of employers' contributions.

The second step would be to require that each employed person over the age of 25 contribute each year either 10% of his gross earned income or \$2,500, whichever is less, to a recognized individual or group pension program, or, in lieu of participation in such a plan, purchase an equivalent amount in a revised version of U.S. Retirement Bonds. First of all, any worker would purchase annually tax-deductible bonds worth, at time of purchase, up to \$2,500 or 10% of his

earned income, which ever is less. Second, the value of the bonds would grow until maturity at an annual rate of the highest of three indicators—the interest rate on U.S. Treasury Bonds, the growth rate of the Gross National Product, or the growth rate of the National Consumer Price Index. Upon maturity, which would be at age 65 or older at which the participant declares himself or herself retired, the bonds would provide a guaranteed annuity income for life based upon the accumulated value of the bonds and actuarially determined average life expectancies. During retirement the income would be adjusted annually to grow, as the value of bonds did prior to maturity, at the highest of the three previously mentioned indicators, and would be provided for the rest of the participant's life no matter how long he or she lived. Prior to maturity, the value of the bonds could be transmitted through inheritance upon the participant's death.

The third step would be to establish, under the regulatory and insuring authority of the recently-created Federal Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, a new and closely regulated series of privately-managed and federally insured pension programs in which holders of U.S. Retirement Bonds would invest, at any time prior to retirement and at each holder's option, any or all of their U.S. Retirement Bonds. The transferability of the bonds into private pension programs would allow a bond holder to choose between a guaranteed basic retirement income and the possibility of a higher income realized through the private programs.

The fourth step would be to provide each worker currently covered by Social Security with the new version of the U.S. Retirement Bonds in an amount equal in retirement annuity value to what he or she could expect to receive upon retirement under current Social Security law. This step will protect the investment and benefits of current participants in and beneficiaries of Social Security, and at the same time will clarify the annual amount of the national debt accumulated to date by the Social Security System.

The fifth step would be to pay the debt identified in step 4, first by proceeds from the sale of U.S. Retirement Bonds and, second, by increasing personal income and other taxes to meet the remainder of the payment requirements.

The final step, which must overlap all the others, is an educational program to inform the people of the true condition of Social Security, the benefits to be gained from the purchase of U.S. Retirement Bonds, the options, opportunities, and the risks of investment in the private programs, and the responsibilities and benefits associated with self-determination of a retirement program.

In summary, a restructuring along the lines proposed here seems essential if confidence in the Social Security System is to be preserved. The proposal would absolutely guarantee the retirement security expectations of all those now in the Social Security System as contributors and beneficiaries. Retirement benefits would be directly and predictably linked to an individual's lifetime contributions. Politically induced uncertainty and fiscal irresponsibility would be eliminated. Many of the troublesome problems in the present system, such as preferential treatment for retirees with dependents and benefit reductions for retirees who continue to work, would disappear.

The proposal would eliminate the regressive and increasingly burdensome payroll tax on employer and employee. More progressive broad-based taxes would be used to discharge the residual obligations of the present system over a period of seventy years. By creating numerous investment account options, the proposal would open the door to increased investment in productive pri-

vate industry, thus mitigating if not eliminating the serious negative effects on private investment inherent in the present system. By linking the value of U.S. Retirement Bonds to three economic indices, the proposal guarantees that retirement benefits will correspond to the economic conditions when retirement occurs. Finally, the proposal would for the first time make clear the true amounts and incidence of the costs involved in a national retirement security program.

The proposal meets the coming fiscal crisis; does not disrupt or diminish the benefits and investments of present Social Security beneficiaries and participants; and provides for a wider range of individual choice than the present Social Security System. It is presented here as one way to make the vitally needed changes in the present approach to retirement programs and the Social Security System.

MRS. LILLIAN R. GREAUX AND MR. RAYMOND PLASKETT, TWO DEDICATED CIVIL SERVANTS

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend two outstanding civil servants who have distinguished themselves in long and productive careers for the Virgin Islands. Mrs. Lillian R. Greaux, private secretary for three Virgin Islands Governors and Mr. Raymond Plaskett, Governor chauffeur and aide for nearly four decades, have unselfishly dedicated their working careers to the Government of the Virgin Islands.

At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues the following resolutions as passed by the 11th Legislature of the Virgin Islands, honoring these outstanding citizens:

RESOLUTION No. 755

To honor Mrs. Lillian R. Greaux (nee Canton) for her long, able, and dedicated service as private secretary to three Virgin Island Governors

Whereas Mrs. Lillian R. Greaux (nee Canton) was born on the Island of St. Thomas on November 4, 1927, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francisco Canton; and

Whereas Mrs. Greaux is a product of the Virgin Islands public school system, and graduated from Charlotte Amalie High School in June of 1945; and

Whereas shortly after high school graduation Mrs. Greaux joined the staff of the Office of the Government Secretary, where, with the exception of a three year reassignment to the Office of the Commissioner of Finance, she served with distinction and was rewarded by an appointment as private secretary to the Honorable John D. Merwin when he accepted the position of Government Secretary in 1958; and

Whereas Mrs. Greaux commenced a secretarial career at Government House which was to span a period of more than fourteen (14) years when she was appointed private secretary to the Honorable John D. Merwin upon his appointment as Governor of the Virgin Islands in April, 1959; and

Whereas Mrs. Greaux served as private secretary not only to Governor Merwin but also in that capacity for the Honorable Governors Ralph M. Palewonsky and Melvin H. Evans, and terminated her service at Government House in January of 1975; and

Whereas Mrs. Greaux has over the years gained general recognition as one of the most talented, accomplished and dedicated members of her profession in the Virgin Islands, being the first person in the Virgin Islands to earn the coveted rating of Certified Professional Secretary from the Institute for Certifying Secretaries, a Division of the National Secretaries Association; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Legislature that the dedication and accomplishments of Mrs. Greaux in her chosen profession should not go unrecognized: Now, Therefore, be it Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

SECTION 1. That Mrs. Lillian R. Greaux, Certified Professional Secretary, is hereby cited, honored and congratulated for her considerable accomplishments in a distinguished and dedicated public service career as a private secretary to three (3) Virgin Islands Governors, a career spanning more than fifteen (15) years and covering a period in Virgin Islands history during which great strides were taken toward the achievement of greater self government for this Territory.

SEC. 2. That a perma plaque copy of this Resolution shall be prepared and presented to Mrs. Lillian R. Greaux by the President of the Legislature or his designee at an appropriate ceremony held for that purpose.

Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on June 26, 1975.

RESOLUTION No. 756

To honor Raymond Plaskett, a chauffeur of Governors, on the occasion of his retirement after nearly four decades of government service

Whereas Raymond Plaskett was born on August 4, 1917, in Frederiksted, St. Croix, to Mr. and Mrs. Reginald Plaskett; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett received his education at St. Patrick's School in Frederiksted, but moved to the Island of St. Thomas in 1934; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett embarked upon a long, colorful and extraordinary career as a government chauffeur, a career which was to span nearly four (4) decades, when he was appointed chauffeur to the Commissioner of Public Works in 1936; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett first became a Governor's chauffeur in 1950 when he was appointed part time chauffeur to then Governor Morris F. De Castro; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett subsequently served as chauffeur to the Honorable Governors Archibald Alexander, John D. Merwin, Ralph M. Palewonsky, Melvin H. Evans, and Cyril E. King; and

Whereas in 1962 Mr. Plaskett was appointed to the position of aide to Governor Ralph M. Palewonsky, in which capacity he was responsible for receiving dignitaries from Washington, D.C. and elsewhere, a position he also held during the tenure of Governor Melvin H. Evans; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett carried out his duties over the years with a competence, warmth and congeniality which has won him the lasting respect, admiration and friendship of all he has served and otherwise come into contact with over the years; and

Whereas Mr. Plaskett retired from Government service in January, 1975; and

Whereas for those Virgin Islanders who have become accustomed to Mr. Plaskett's pleasant smile and friendly greeting, the sight of the Governor's limousine will somehow never be the same; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Legislature that Mr. Plaskett's lengthy and rewarding public service career should be properly memorialized through the medium of this Resolution; Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

SECTION 1. That Mr. Raymond Plaskett is hereby commended, honored and congratulated on the occasion of his retirement

from a career in Government Service spanning nearly 40 years, a career which has been indelibly marked by the garcious warmth, kindness and easy friendliness of this true Virgin Islander.

Sec. 2. That a perma plaque copy of this Resolution be prepared and presented to Mr. Raymond Plaskett by the President of the Legislature or his designee at an appropriate ceremony held for that purpose.

Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in June 26, 1975.

**YOU WILL NOT HAVE UNCLE SAM
TO KICK AROUND ANYMORE**

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, predictably, the economic recovery policies embraced by the Ford administration and embodied in the recently adopted budget resolution have failed to put a dent in the chronically high unemployment rate. As the Congressional Budget Office recently stated, "the economy is in the throes of the worst economic recession since World War II."

The outlook for the future is equally grim. The Congressional Budget Office forecasts that unemployment, which is currently at a level of "well over 10 percent," will remain in the 9 to 10 percent range through 1975, and drop only by 1 percent by the end of 1976.

Despite this dismal forecast, the administration, and to a degree the Congress as well, has chosen to pursue a policy designed to slow rather than stimulate economic recovery. The President has set a spending ceiling which prohibits a reduction in unemployment or an increase in economic growth. Every economic recovery program passed by Congress which exceeds this arbitrarily drawn spending limit is vetoed.

The President has attempted to justify these votes by claiming that stimulative programs would rekindle inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

According to many leading bankers, economists, and most recently the Congressional Budget Office, recovery programs such as the emergency jobs bill and the Emergency Housing Act would have no inflationary impact whatsoever. In fact, they are all in agreement that, while both a higher deficit level and an increase in the money supply are needed, neither would result in higher inflation. They caution, however, that, if we waited too long to institute such a policy, unemployment would continue to skyrocket to a point where even this approach would be doomed to failure.

It has become abundantly clear that a series of immediate steps must be taken to put the economy back on even keel. Some suggestions were recently offered by Walter Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in an article which appeared in the New York Times on June 30. I strongly recommend his thoughtful remarks to my colleagues.

The text of Mr. Heller's remarks follow:

**YOU WON'T HAVE UNCLE SAM TO KICK
AROUND ANYMORE**

(By Walter W. Heller)

MINNEAPOLIS—The fear of inflation is still so dominant in Washington today that it is evidently destroying policymakers' faith in the recuperative powers of the American economy and blinding their sensitivity to the growing plight of the unemployed.

Transfixed by this fear, the White House and the Federal Reserve authorities are greeting the early signs of modest recovery from this deepest of all postwar recessions as if prosperity were just around the corner. The hellfires of a new inflation were about to engulf us, and let the devil take the hindmost, the jobless.

If that somewhat inflamed statement of the case is not to be inferred from the words and actions of the Administration and the Federal Reserve, how are we to interpret the following actions and statements?

Item: President Ford justified his veto of the emergency jobs bill last month in good part on grounds that economic recovery would be well along by the end of 1975 and much of the bill's impact would not be felt until 1976. Yet, the White House itself expects unemployment to average just under 8 per cent in 1976—higher than the worst unemployment levels in any of the five previous postwar recessions.

Item: In his midyear budget review, the President nonetheless projects a dead stop to the tax cut at the end of this year and clips \$9 billion off of the already-modest expenditure total approved under the new Congressional budget procedures. He would thereby turn budget stimulus into budget restriction.

Item: On Meet The Press on May 25, Arthur Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggested that "the thing to do now is to sit back for a little while. . . ." Subsequently, James Lynn, the budget director, and William Simon, Secretary of the Treasury, added their voices to this litany of little faith.

In other words, ignore the abysmal level of the economy, and look only at its upward direction—lean against the oh-so-gentle zephyrs of recovery as if they were harbingers of hot new blasts of inflation.

Ignore the 8 per cent in real G.N.P. from its late-1973 peak (twice as big a drop as in any previous postwar recession) and the 6 per cent growth of our productive potential in the meanwhile. That is, ignore the forces that have opened up a yawning chasm of \$200 billion a year between what the U.S. economy is producing and what it could be producing.

Ignore the Administration's own projection of an anemic 6 per cent of G.N.P. recovery—versus 8.5 per cent in 1954-55; 9 per cent in 1958-59, and 7.5 per cent in 1960-61—and complacently settle for the weakest of recoveries from our deepest of recessions.

Ignore the nearly ten-million job-seeking and discouraged workers.

Ignore the clear evidence that inflation is abating:

Excess demand has long since been replaced by excess supply—far too few dollars are chasing too many goods.

In short, ignore the facts that inflation is less than expected and is about to abate as productivity jumps and average wage increases slow down in the face of woefully weak labor markets.

External-shock inflation—the food and oil price explosions and dollar devaluations that accounted for some 60 per cent of the monstrous 1973-74 inflation—is subsiding. Except for the game of oil price leapfrog that the President and the Shah of Iran are play-

ing, it should not rise to plague us in the mid-seventies.

In short, ignore the facts that inflation is clearly waning and that the fragile flower of economic rebound in the second half of 1975 has to be cultivated, nurtured, and fertilized lest it wilt or die in 1976.

It would be at least reassuring if one could believe that the White House and Federal Reserve were working toward a conservative but defensible goal like trading off fiscal restraint for an expansionary monetary policy, i.e., pursuing a policy of expansion that would tilt the economy toward the easier money, lower interest rates, and lubricated capital markets needed to help revive housing and ease our longer-term capital and capacity pinches. No such thing. It's a policy of cry havoc on inflation and go slow on expansion of any kind.

What, then, should be done?

First, Mr. Burns and the Fed should firmly pledge to hold interest rates at or below present levels for the next six to nine months. That will still leave plenty of time to put on the monetary brakes before a new inflation threatens us.

Congress should speedily re-enact the \$12 to \$13 billion of the 1975 tax reduction that is not of a one-shot nature and quickly approve an expanded public service jobs program and new antirecession grants to hard-pressed cities and states, programs that would self-destruct as unemployment drops to tolerable levels.

Third, President Ford should declare his firm faith in the U.S. economy's capacity for long and sustained expansion and his determination to put recovery in high gear. He should promptly assure the country that he will not let oil-price increases refuel inflation and retard recovery.

After a year of robust recovery at, say, an 8 per cent clip under these policies, what will the policymakers see?

Unemployment still well over 7 per cent. Excess capacity galore—perhaps one-quarter of our manufacturing capacity lying idle instead of today's one-third.

Inflation still subsiding or at least in check.

Budget deficits falling and interest rates remaining at moderate levels.

Then, in good season, they can take another look and see whether the fear of inflation justifies braking the recovery. But to retard the spark of recovery at its first gleaming, as we are now doing, is an exercise in the economics of fear, an act of little faith and less compassion.

THE SACRED COW

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee began hearings today on what may be the beginning of a historic reawakening of our national priorities with regard to transportation policy. The culmination of these hearings should be legislation which will undoubtedly reflect creative solutions by the Congress that will better balance our transportation system.

Since the inception of the highway trust fund in 1956, the concrete cloverleaf has been our national flower, and public mass transportation has received the care and affection which is reserved for a sentimental weed like the dande-

lion, admired from afar but pruned as a nuisance

This week, President Ford announced the administration's perspective, a view which has been constructively modernized from past offerings and merits careful study. I commend the President for his leadership in this vital area, and I trust that we of the Congress will be fine-tuning proposals advanced by both the administration and other sources during these hearings, and report a bill which will be for the people.

I wish to insert at this point an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Washington Star in response to President Ford's program:

MILK FROM A SACRED COW

President Ford has taken on a formidable task in asking Congress to cut back the lavish care and feeding of that sacred cow, the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

He calls it "a classic example of a federal program that has expanded over the years into areas of state and local responsibility, distorting the priorities of those governments."

That is classic understatement. Nothing—not even the coming of the railroads more than a century ago—has so remade American geography as the interstate highway system, of which the trust fund was supposed to be a financial appendage. Few foresaw at its beginning in the Eisenhower years that the financial appendage financed by a 4 cent per gallon federal gas tax, would take on a life of its own.

Indeed the business can be explained only as a budgetary variation on those tedious genealogies of the Old Testament: The interstate system begat more automobiles, which begat more gas tax revenues, which begat an ever-swelling trust fund, which begat more highways, which begat more automobiles, which begat more gas taxes. And the begetting goes on unchecked. In this way, what was originally thought of as a plan to underwrite the system became an inducement to spend more and more money on highways, simply because the money was there.

The impoverishment and decline of public transportation, especially in the cities, may not be the direct result of the bias of the Highway Trust Fund. But this great concentration of funds and planning authority in Washington contributed to the awful imbalance typically reflected in this city, with its insane glut of rush-hour automobile traffic and its underfinanced and unconscionably delayed Metro system.

Mr. Ford's proposal is to transfer half the present gas tax from the Highway Trust Fund to the General Fund, there to be subject to normal competition for all purposes—including, one would hope, mass transit. One of the two remaining pennies would be available to states that raised their own gas taxes by a penny, the other left to finish the interstate system. States would be "encouraged," but not compelled, to use this extra penny of revenue for transportation of their own choosing.

There have been occasional attempts in Congress in recent years to lay rude hands on the sacred cow; but all that has been forthcoming is an occasional drop or two for mass transit from one of the hinder teats.

In the light of this history, President Ford's attempt to seize the beast more or less whole seems problematical. Already, the highway lobbyists are in full cry; and indeed one does not expect their captive congressmen to yield eagerly. But President Ford's case seems to us unassailable in principle. Like all inattentive centralizations of government funds and functions, the federal highway program has for years pre-exempted

transportation planning for the entire country. We have forgotten that we do, after all, live in a federal system and that authority should be dispersed. There can be no dispersal of authority without substantial dispersal of funds. It is overdue.

ON THE AMENDMENTS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1976 APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, three very important amendments were proposed during the floor debate on the State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1976, two of which were adopted to the bill, and all of which I voted against, namely, the amendment to increase the funding level for the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, the amendment to increase the appropriation for the addition of 1,750 law enforcement officers to apprehend illegal aliens and the amendment to prohibit the use of funds to negotiate the surrender or relinquishment of any U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone. In light of the House's action, and my personal convictions in these matters, I feel it is necessary for me to detail my objections to these amendments so that there can be no question as to why I voted as I did.

First, the amendment offered by Mr. HEINZ to increase the appropriation level proposed by the Subcommittee for the Justice Department's Antitrust Division by \$26.2 million, adopted to the bill: It seemed clear to me during the hearings in the subcommittee, and in further discussion in markup that an increase of this nature, above those funds requested by the Department and OMB, was inappropriate and excessive. The facts are these: The Antitrust Division had funds in the original subcommittee bill for its current staff of 663, plus moneys for 52 slots currently vacant but authorized, plus additional moneys for 33 slots above the authorized number of 715 personnel. The floor amendment that is now a part of the bill provides an additional \$26.2 million for additional personnel and salary increases. I will be interested to see what the Antitrust Division requests in the Department's supplemental.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have misplaced our good intentions, and, perhaps more important, our priorities, by adopting this amendment. There is no question that the Congress must, and to my way of telling, it always has given the Antitrust Division its full support. The State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee has consistently given the Justice Department everything it has asked for for the Division. That is not the problem here. The problem is that, regardless of our interest in providing the Division with all the "muscle" it needs to operate at top efficiency, I am first of all

not convinced that it has proven its efficiency with the money it has been given to date, although I am aware of the considerable increase in litigation cases it has engaged itself in this year, and second, I have not been shown, to my satisfaction, that the Division has the capability to use these extra funds to their best and most productive advantage.

Regardless of our interest and concern as a Congress in insuring the adequate machinery to protect the consumer and the free enterprise system against monopolies, pouring money into the Division, or any area of government or business for that matter, is hardly the answer. The most efficient use of the funds and machinery available is the answer. Increases in annual appropriations must be justified. I do not believe an increase of \$26.2 million for Antitrust was justified. It was not to my satisfaction.

The most important thing we must learn in this Congress is that money is not a panacea. It does not automatically follow that increasing appropriations will mean increasing capabilities or efficiency. Before I give away tax dollars, I believe it is my obligation to my constituents to be convinced that they—as taxpayers—will get a return on their money.

I could not vote for the Heinz amendment because I was not convinced that the Antitrust Division could give them that return. I am still not convinced. I would like to be, and I hope that time proves me wrong. But, I doubt that I will ever be able to support an amendment of this nature because I have learned from experience that unjustifiable government spending is most often wasted spending. Certainly, my colleagues must agree that it is precisely that—wasted spending—by past Congresses that has contributed so greatly to our current economic situation.

The amendment offered by Mr. BIAGGI to increase, by \$45 million, the appropriation level for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, again falls into the category of spending for spending's sake. I cannot quarrel with the theory that additional law enforcement officers in the Service would increase its ability to operate more effectively. The subcommittee did increase the appropriation for new employees by 750. There are currently 285 unfilled positions in the Service. Surely, 1,035 additional personnel is an adequate increase for the next months.

I am pleased that the House voted to uphold the subcommittee's recommendations in this case.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment prohibiting the use of any funds to negotiate the surrender or relinquishment of any U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone, is, in my view, an improper one.

I am vehemently opposed to our relinquishment of control in the Canal Zone. I believe we have a genuine and crucial interest in maintaining our position in Panama—both with respect to our economic investment and our international relations. However, I do not believe that the Congress should so limit the President's power to negotiate as to

rob him of the legitimate courses made possible to his Office by the Constitution. Nor do I believe that it is appropriate or judicial for the Congress to legislate in an appropriation bill on an area of great controversy, when, to my way of thinking, the House has not heard adequate debate or given adequate consideration to this matter.

Before any agreement is reached regarding the Canal Zone, the Senate must ratify, and the House act thereupon, such an agreement. That safeguard is quite clear in the Constitution. There are other means, and certainly more customary means, of voicing the House's position with regard to Panama. I objected to this amendment because I believe it unduly limits the Office of the President and because I see it as an inappropriate amendment with questionable parliamentary roots.

I voted for passage of the fiscal year 1976 appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary and related agencies because I believe the subcommittee bill is a product of the most thorough investigation, and because, despite my objections to these two amendments, I am confident that on the whole its enactment is justified.

THE \$4 BILLION HOUSING DISASTER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, especially timely in connection with housing legislation is the current series of articles appearing in the Chicago Tribune charging that \$4 billion have been wasted by, or defrauded from HUD and FHA since the National Housing Act of 1968. The Tribune investigation, extending over a period of 7 months, claims that HUD and FHA officials in Washington systematically frustrated efforts to stop the waste, and that mortgage companies

have so much influence in the HUD and FHA that it has become impossible to act against even the most unscrupulous companies. The Tribune's chief investigative reporter, George Bliss, and reporter Chuck Neubauer, examined thousands of documents never before made public in their exhaustive review of the low-cost insured mortgage program for low- and moderate-income families.

In its lead editorial today, the Tribune observed:

... it took only four years of the Federally insured mortgage program to reduce a neat, middle-class neighborhood into a shattered, decaying slum. And the same dismal history is being enacted in communities across the nation. No natural disaster on record has caused destruction on the scale of the government's housing programs.

Although the Senate will look into the Tribune's charges, one wonders whether this waste and fraud, if subsequently confirmed, would have continued but for the Tribune's investigation. This is again another example of the inadequacy of Congress' oversight review which is its responsibility over Federal programs. No wonder some Members of Congress have an inbuilt suspicion of vast, finely titled Federal programs.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

THE \$4 BILLION HOUSING DISASTER

The Tribune's current series on government and housing presents a nightmarish picture: a massive federal bureaucracy that uses billions of taxpayers' dollars to enrich swindlers and finance the ruin of urban neighborhoods. Nightmare or not, that is what we have in the Department of Housing and Urban Development and its subsidiary agency, the Federal Housing Administration.

They have been carrying out their work of destruction very effectively, if unintentionally. After seven months of studying the upside-down operations of HUD and FHA, Reporters George Bliss and Chuck Neubauer have summed them up concisely: a \$4 billion disaster. In a "model" block they cited—the 7300 block of South Hoyne Avenue—it took only four years of the federally insured mortgage program to reduce a neat, middle-class neighborhood into a shattered, decaying slum. And the same dismal history is being enacted in communities across the nation. No natural disaster on record has caused destruction on the scale of this government's housing programs.

How did it happen? At the root of this national calamity are three main elements: good intentions, hastily-drawn laws, and near-total failure to remedy or even recognize errors in carrying out the intent.

HUD was created under President Johnson in 1965 to promote "sound development of the nation's communities and metropolitan areas." It consolidated most existing housing agencies, including FHA, with the goal of "achieving maximum coordination" within government, and between government and private lending institutions. Its powers were vastly broadened by the Great Society housing programs that followed: rent supplements, model cities, and—most sweeping of all—the National Housing Act of 1968. This 17-title package provided everything from home loans for the elderly to riot insurance, and included the mortgage insurance program involved in the Chicago scandal; yet it was passed with very little resistance from Republicans who had fought Mr. Johnson's previous housing programs. [One reason was that G.O.P. lawmakers had made a tactical blunder: They had hooted down an administration bill for rat control, and were being bitterly criticized for insensitivity about the needs of the poor.] The bill passed the Senate 67 to 4 and the House 294 to 114.

The housing bill has proved to be riddled with holes, especially in the area of enforcement and disciplinary action. Incredibly, the Washington officials who authorize payments to mortgage companies and real estate firms do not supervise their performance; they simply hand out the money for presumed services, with no knowledge of whether the services have been performed.

For slick operators, this has been a bottomless bonanza. They can, and do, sell federally insured housing to poor-risk families that cannot afford even these modest terms. Then they foreclose at the first default and get their money back from the government immediately, rather than waiting for the full term of the loan. Finally, they collect federal cash for "maintaining" the foreclosed property while letting it fall into ruin. The wasteland on South Hoyne Avenue is one small example of the results.

Instead of the decent homes and dignity envisioned by President Johnson in his housing message of 1968, the law has subsidized the creation of new slums.

Sen. Adlai Stevenson [D., Ill.] has announced that the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, of which he is a member, will hold hearings in Chicago this summer into the multibillion-dollar housing racket. We welcome the investigation, and can promise the senators plenty of material to work on.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 10, 1975

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Very Reverend James G. Bingham, vicar of St. Mary's Episcopal Church, Morgantown, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:

We beseech Your presence among these Your humble servants assembled in the name of persons whom You have created and redeemed.

Give us grace to see that as we celebrate your festival of independence we must be drawn to view a world in which interdependence becomes a reality for all people.

Give us such a sense of Your sustaining presence that we shall have courage to become servants rather than masters.

Grant us such an awareness of our own personal poverty that we will respond to the cry for help of the weakest of our brethren that we hear from anywhere on God's good earth.

In the name of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 8, 1975, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1387. An act for the relief of Raul Alvarez Rodriguez;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Jacinta Roque Armstrong-Perez;