contain provisions that would allow individual States, upon proper showing, to exempt themselves from its provisions.

I happen to believe that most of the abuses are now part of history, and that the more prudent courses would be to substitute new legislation that would affirm the Federal interest in equal access to the polls, and then let the courts determine when such access is being denied. I recognize, however, that such a bill will not be enacted this year. I would hope, however, that by the time the extension we will be adopting expires, there will be a sufficient national assurance that past practices are in fact dead to enable us to adopt permanent legislation that restores the proper relationship between Federal and State officials in matters affecting the qualifications of voters and the supervision of elections.

ORDER FOR NOMINATIONS TO BE HELD IN STATUS QUO DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE, AUGUST 1, 1975–SEPTEMBER 3, 1975

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all nominations currently being considered by the Senate or received by the Senate by August 1, 1975, be considered as remaining in status quo during the adjournment of the Senate from August 1, 1975, until September 3, 1975, unless the majority leader or the minority leader, or both of them, notify the President of the United States within 10 days of August 1, 1975, that a nomination or nominations would not be so considered and would be returned to him and, therefore would have to be resubmitted in order for the Senate to act thereon after it reconvenes on September 3, 1975.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senate will meet tomorrow at 11 a.m. Immediately the 1 hour under the cloture rule will begin running, and at the hour of 12 noon the clerk will call the roll to establish a quorum. Upon the establishment of a quorum the automatic rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture will occur. That rollcall vote, therefore, will occur at about 12:15 p.m.

I would imagine that tomorrow will be a very active day in the Senate with quite a number of rollcall votes. The Senate is already alerted to the fact that we may have a very long session tomorrow.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:40 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1975, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1975:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Martin R. Hoffmann, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army, vice Howard H. Callaway, resigned.

ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Austin N. Heller, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of Energy Research and Development (new position).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

James A. Baker, III, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Commerce, vice John K. Tabor, resigned.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Asaph H. Hall, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, vice John W. Ingram, resigned.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Robert E. Patricelli, of Connecticut, to be Urban Mass Transportation Administrator, vice Frank C. Herringer, resigned.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

John Holliday Holloman, III, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1976, vice Rush Moody, Jr., resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Edwin H. Yeo, III, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, vice Jack Franklin Bennett, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

David S. Cook, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Sheldon B. Lubar, resigned.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

James D. Isbister, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (new position).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Jr., [redacted]FR (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert L. Thompson, Jr., [redacted]FR (colonel, Regular Air Force, Dental), U.S. Air Force.

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under the provisions of chapters 35, 831, and 837, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. John A. Johnston, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Billy M. Jones, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

To be brigadier general

Col. J. E. Gardner, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

Col. Paul E. Hoover, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

Col. Walter C. Leonardo, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

Col. Lawrence A. Quebbeman, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Billy M. Jones, [redacted]FG, Air National Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1975:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Forrest David Mathews, of Alabama, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

John Meier, of Colorado, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominee's commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND OIL POLICY ACT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received today from the State Department regarding the Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act, H.R. 7014. The letter expresses that Agency's concern over several provisions of H.R. 7014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: I am writing to express our concern that several of the provisions of the proposed Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act of 1975 could prevent full implementation of the Agreement for an International Energy Program (the IEP), and would require the United States to express a formal reservation in its adherence to the IEP. Indeed, the numerous restrictions, in the form of advance approvals and potential one-House vetoes, cast serious doubt on the value of the authority conferred. These restrictions appear in the conservation and strategic reserve provisions of the proposed bill. They not only threaten to undermine the IEP, but also extend the role of the legislative branch of government into operations to an extent inappropriate to the emergency situation with which the legislation is intended to deal.

A key element of the IEP is an agreement by the participating countries to prepare, and to have ready for implementation, contingency plans for achieving demand restraint in case of a supply cutoff. The purpose of these demand restraint measures is to insure that, in all embargo situations, in addition to sharing available supplies, each participating country will reduce its consumption by a previously agreed amount (7% or 10% depending on the level of reduction of supplies). The IEP envisions that these measures be made applicable as automatically as

possible, in order to increase the likelihood of effective and prompt implementation in an actual emergency, and thereby to strengthen the deterrent effect of the IEP. Obviously the more credible the measures, the less likely it is that another embargo will be imposed.

The requirement now contained in section 201 of the bill for positive Congressional approval with respect to each and every contingency plan would present two serious problems in terms of implementing the IEP. First, Article 5 of the Agreement requires each participating country to "at all times have ready a program of contingent oil demand restraint measures . . ." The requirement for advance, affirmative Congressional action would create uncertainty as to whether this obligation could be met. Second, and more fundamentally, the United States is obligated to seek legislative authority which would enable us to fully implement our IEP obligations. The deadline for all countries to complete these legislative procedures has been extended to September 1, 1975, but under the current draft of the bill completion of the procedures in the United States would be insufficient since the basic approval of demand restraint measures would only come at some later date, and even then, would be subject to Congressional veto. Under these circumstances, the United States would be required to take a formal reservation in its adherence to the IEP, pending further Congressional action. Should Congress refuse to adopt any contingency plan, the United States would not be able to remove this reservation.

In addition to our objections to the advance approval mechanism, we are equally concerned over the bill's requirement that Presidential actions be subject to disapproval by either House of the Congress. This would place us in an untenable position going into an emergency since we would never know whether the veto power would be exercised. Furthermore, it would cast immediate doubt as to whether the United States will ever in fact be able to discharge its IEP obligations.

If, as a result of the restrictions contained in section 201, the United States were required to take a formal reservation to its adherence to the IEP, this would have very unfortunate political consequences. It would undermine the solid front among industrialized oil consumers which we are endeavoring to create, and would be a particularly unfortunate step since it has been vigorous United States leadership, commencing with the Washington Energy Conference in 1974, which has forged the measure of unity of consumer countries which now exists. The passage of such limited legislative authority and the problems it would create in terms of adherence to the IEP could also leave the United States open to the criticism that it has changed its attitude toward the IEP, and could hamper our ability to achieve other negotiating objectives in the energy area.

The same problems arise in connection with Congressional veto provisions with respect to the establishment and utilization of the proposed Petroleum Reserve. Not only would a plan have to be submitted to Congress before implementation and not be rejected, but also certain extraordinary measures, including condemnation, described in section 255 would be required to pass a similar hurdle, and any draw down from the Reserve would be subject to a one-House veto. The cumulative effect of these restrictions is to cast doubt on whether the United States would ever in fact be able to establish and utilize such a Reserve.

In addition, we believe that section 204 of the bill initially considered by the Subcommittee, relating to the authority to increase production in emergency circumstances, should be restored. This could be an important tool for use in an emergency. We also believe that the information section of the bill (section 214) is inadequate because of the provision requiring certain information to be submitted to the IEA in aggregated form. The potential availability of information was perceived by many other countries as an important incentive to them for entering into the IEP. Specific information requirements, as well as their purpose and uses, are currently the subject of discussion in the IEA. If the United States were unilaterally to foreclose the possibility that certain types of data provided for in the IEP might be made available, while the issue is actively being discussed by the IEA members, it would hinder our efforts to keep these other countries solidly behind the Program. In this regard we should like to reiterate that we are sensitive to the possible security problems in the IEA and to the anti-competitive potential of disaggregated data. We believe that the IEP agreement itself and the authority in the legislation to withhold information which would prejudice competition combines fully adequate means to protect data. Therefore, we oppose this aspect of the information section of the bill.

With reference to the antitrust provisions of section 212, we wish to emphasize the importance of workable antitrust provisions, which are crucial to the effective implementation of the IEP. To this end we strongly suggest that the House accept the comparable immunity subsection in S. 622 which was adopted, with the support of Senators Jackson and Hart, by the Senate. These provisions were worked out by several of the parties concerned, and we believe, should provide a workable immunity subsection coupled with fully adequate procedural safeguards to prevent anticompetitive abuses.

In conclusion, may I say that I understand that there is a strongly held concern with Congressional oversight to which the advance approval and veto procedures are addressed. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the authorities which we request are for emergency use only—and for an emergency which will be less likely to occur if these authorities are granted. We are most concerned that the IEP develop into a viable instrument of the consumer countries, which will serve as a genuine deterrent against future embargoes, and we believe that if the IEP is to be effective, the authorities behind it must be real, and must be perceived as real. Hence, we reiterate our request that the Executive be granted authority to carry out the key elements of the IEP.

Sincerly yours,

ROBERT J. MCCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

"BEAUREGARD H. MILLER DAY"

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on August 2 the city of Gretna, La., will celebrate "Beauregard H. Miller Day" to honor the man who has served as the city's chief of police for 50 years.

A long-time and devoted friend to Hale and me, the chief has dedicated his distinguished career to the safety of the citizens of Gretna since 1925 when he first took office as city marshal. In those days the chief was literally a one-man police force and his "equipment" was a .38 revolver and a Buick; but in the past 50 years Gretna has grown incredibly and "Burry" has kept pace by developing the Gretna Police Department into the model of efficiency it is today, with 38 officers, a detective bureau, a K–9 corps, and 10 squad cars.

It is no exaggeration to describe the chief's career, a national record at half a century, as a living history of the development of contemporary law enforcement technique. However, there is more to effective law enforcement than manpower and technology; the most important ingredient is the man who performs the job. Chief Miller's 50 years on the force have been characterized by fearlessness, dedication, and tireless work—he is still on call 24 hours a day.

His ability was recognized in 1948 when incoming Gov. Earl K. Long offered "Burry" the appointment as State superintendent of police; the chief preferred to remain on the job in Gretna, however, and declined the promotion. Probably the most convincing evidence of Chief Miller's competence is the fact that the voters of Gretna have elected him chief of police of their city for 14 consecutive terms, and on August 2 they will formally honor him by dedicating a day of celebration to his career of public service.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Chief Beauregard H. Miller, and to express my deep gratitude for the excellent job he is doing for the citizens of Gretna, La., and for law enforcement generally.

INCREASING APPROPRIATIONS FOR WETLAND ACQUISITIONS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, H.R. 8773, is scheduled July 23 for House floor action. I will offer an amendment to obtain a $10 million advance for fiscal year 1976 under the Migratory Bird Conservation Account for the acquisition of wetlands. The amendment reads as follows:

Page 10, line 4, strike out "$1,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

In 1961, Congress enacted the Wetlands Loan Act, which authorized a $105-million loan fund to be used in combination with duck stamp receipts to accelerate Federal efforts to prevent and offset serious loss of waterfowl production habitat. It set as a goal acquisition of 2.5 million acres of high quality breeding and other waterfowl habitat.

Despite the fact that there remains $19.1 million in loan authorization now available for appropriation in 1976, no request was made against this authority in the President's budget. The Appropriations Committee has recommended an appropriation of $1 million. Yet, a shortfall of some 600,000 acres exists to

accomplish the initial goal of the program.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has carried on an agonizing struggle to acquire important waterfowl habitat against the pressures of increasing land prices and competition for land, with inadequate funding. The administration has consistently assigned low priority to land acquisition. The least we can do is to honor the loan commitment the Congress made, which also is to be repaid by duck hunters. Furthermore, this body only several weeks ago overwhelmingly extended the wetlands acquisition program, due to expire June 30, 1976.

Unquestionably, the need to identify and preserve wetlands has never been more critical. Wetlands are disappearing at increasing rates and likewise, the cost of remaining wetlands is doubling and tripling. The need for a source of funds in excess of duck stamp receipts to continue acquisition is essential.

The current economic recession has presented unusual opportunity to acquire land from owners and developers who are financially hard pressed. Inadequate funding for this program now will further postpone the initial objectives set by Congress under the Wetlands Loans Act and greatly increase the cost of preserving the habitat necessary to maintain our wildlife heritage.

I urge support of this amendment. The following Members join me in this effort: Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT; Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE; Hon. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE; Hon. PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY; Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI; Hon. BOB CASEY; Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD; Hon. ROBERT I. LAGOMARSINO; Hon. JOHN E. MOSS; and Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RETIRES

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to acknowledge the retirement of Superior Court Judge Frank Blum, an outstanding California jurist. On August 2, 1975, the people of San Mateo County will honor Judge Blum at a retirement dinner and I feel it is fitting to bring to the attention of my colleagues the esteemed career of such a highly respected jurist from my own State.

Judge Blum received his bachelor of laws degree and doctor of jurisprudence degree from San Francisco Law School and was admitted to the California Bar in 1941. During World War II, Frank saw action in North Africa and Italy while serving as a first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps. Included among the medals and citations he received in combat were: Three battle stars, the African Mediterranean Theatre, Victory, and the American Theatre, the Rome-Arno Campaign, the North Appenine Campaign, and the Po Valley Campaign. Upon returning home, he resumed the practice of law and in 1949 became Daly City's second city attorney. Eight years later, after a notable career of service to the people of Daly City, Frank was appointed judge of the superior court. He was presiding judge of the superior court in 1958, 1960, and 1962. Since 1957 San Mateo County residents have been privileged to have the benefit of Judge Blum's prudent administration of justice.

The judge's other achievements include: National President of the International Conference of Conciliation Courts for 1971. In 1972 Frank was the guest lecturer of the California Trial Lawyers Association and in 1973 he served as a faculty member of the National College of Advocacy, Hastings College of the Law. He is also a life member of the National and International Association of Probate Judges.

Judge Blum is looking forward to enjoying his retirement years with his wife Lois, his two sons Frank Jr., and Bill, his daughter Dian, and his two grandchildren Jennifer and Julie. Retirement does not mean rest for the judge who will return to the practice of law joining his son Frank Jr., in the firm of Hupf, Etcheverry, and Blum.

We in San Mateo County are grateful that Judge Blum, a 50 year resident of the county, plans to practice in Daly City where his outstanding grasp of jurisprudence and concern for his fellow citizens will continue to be felt and appreciated.

Finally, and most important to me, he is a good and personal friend, whose warmth, enthusiasm, and understanding have been a constant source of support to me for many years.

HANNAFORD ENDORSES VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS COMPARABILITY PAY ACT OF 1975

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, passage of the Veterans' Administration Physicians and Dentists Comparability Pay Act of 1975, H.R. 8240, is a significant step in solving the recruitment and retention crisis in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. The VA's inability to offer competitive salaries to its physicians and dentists has incited a mass exodus of qualified personnel. From July 1, 1974 through March 31, 1975, 279 full-time physicians have terminated their employment. In addition 153 physicians have converted to part-time employment.

A recent survey conducted by the Veterans' Affairs Committee indicated that of the approximately 5,500 full-time physicians presently employed by the VA, 40 percent are affected by the $36,000 salary limitation and cannot expect any increases in the near future. Comparing VA physician salaries with other categories of physicans further exemplifies this inequity.

Average net income

Non-federal physicians	$49,415
Physicians in group practice	52,000
Full-time academic medicine	37,600
Military medicine	37,355
VA physicians	31,000

H.R. 8240 attempts to achieve pay comparability for VA physicians and dentists in the uniformed services. This bill would authorize up to $5,000 a year in special pay and $8,500 a year in incentive pay to VA physicians and half that to VA dentists. It would also direct the Comptroller General to conduct an investigation related to the problems of attracting and retaining qualified physicians and dentists and report back to the Veterans' Affairs Committee by August 31, 1976, with a permanent legislative solution.

I believe H.R. 8240 in the short run will restore the VA's ability to recruit and retain well-qualified physicians and dentists. It will also give the Veterans' Affairs Committee and other parties involved time to develop a permanent solution.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join with so many of my colleagues in commemorating the 17th anniversary of Captive Nations Week.

The world's hopes for détente doubtless are bolstered as the Apollo and Soyuz space vehicles join overhead and hurtle around the world. As one commentator observed during this historic week, it is not possible to see any boundaries on the surface of the Earth, however hard one might look. The spirit of Apollo-Soyuz is the spirit of worldwide hope, that we can exchange the animosity of the cold war for the openness of lasting peace.

There is no alternative to the goal of effective world peace in the nuclear age. So we must strive for it relentlessly. At the same time, we cannot ignore, nor do we wish to for a moment, those formerly free nations now dominated by the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. knows full well of the consistent concern of the United States in this matter, because we are made up, in large part, of people who made the agonizing decision to leave the lands of their birth and find a haven in the United States rather than endure subservience.

We need to reiterate our strong concern for the captive nations as much to reassure those peoples that we have not forgotten them as to remind the Soviets that these many subjugated nationalities are in our minds and hearts. The remembrance is especially strong during this, our Bicentennial year, the 200th anniversary of American independence.

Détente is a noble objective. To me, it conveys the notion of reasonableness, something for which there has been little

room during the many years of the cold war. I believe that in Apollo-Soyuz we have seen a manifestation of a Soviet inclination toward reasonableness. And I hope that ultimately it can be extended to such issues as the right of individual nationalities to determine their own destinies. The Baltic States, for example, were not allowed to make that decision. They were directed to "vote" under the presence of Soviet military forces in 1940 and have suffered that domination for the ensuing 35 years, managing, however, to remind the world and the Russian of their ceaseless nationalism.

Captive Nations Week is not a very pleasant time. Not for us, not for the Soviets, not for the peoples of those countries. Nor should it be. I look forward to the day when we will no longer need to hold this observance, when the transit from one country to another throughout the world will be as easy as it has been this week for Apollo-Soyuz.

TEACHER'S HELPERS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and of its Subcommittee on Select Education, I am particularly aware of the many problems in the field of early childhood education. Over the course of the last several years, various techniques and innovations have been introduced in an attempt to improve the quality of elementary and preschool education. Some of these programs have not been as successful as we might have hoped, while others have achieved results far beyond original expectations. An article in the Wall Street Journal of June 12, 1975, illustrates one of the newer techniques in operation in my home State of California.

I believe there are several strong points to the early childhood education program. One is that the entire program is keyed to individualized instruction for each child. Through emphasis on individualized education, the program enables teachers and teacher helpers to uncover learning problems far sooner than they are detected in regular classroom settings. Naturally, individualized instruction requires a considerable increase in the number of supervisory personnel. This, in my opinion, leads to the second great strength of the early childhood education program: the massive involvement of parents, grandparents, and even older children in the education of young students. I believe that by involving parents and siblings in educational programs, we might bind families closer to each other in common endeavor.

Another attractive feature of this concept is it provides a flat amount of money on a per pupil basis to the local school to be used in any way that a joint council of parents and teachers determine will best meet children's needs. As the author of an amendment to the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 which establishes a parental-professional advisory board for handicapped children's education, I strongly support a provision which joins parents and teachers together in planning educational programs.

Last, we should look at the record of this experimental program. After 1 year of the program in California, ECE helped increase pupil performance in reading and math by from 10 to 40 percent, depending upon the school. The State department of education noted that ECE alone was responsible for the improvement registered in these tests. Importantly, the gains in test scores were present throughout all socio-economic levels of students.

The enthusiasm with which the early childhood education program has been greeted by teachers, parents and administrators alike requires that we in Congress examine its features and its successes when considering legislation dealing with education. I am pleased to introduce into the RECORD a story which gives in great detail the record of this experimental education program in California.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1975]

TEACHERS' HELPERS: PARENTS PLAY BIG ROLE IN CALIFORNIA PROGRAM TO AID STARTING PUPILS

(By Earl C. Gottschalk Jr.)

LOS ANGELES.—Outside the wire fence surrounding the 107th Street Elementary School in this all-black section of Watts, life is hard. The crime rate is so bad that each classroom's doors must be locked from the outside to protect against muggers and rapists. Most of the parents work in menial jobs or are on welfare. The average family makes a paltry $7,078 a year, and two-thirds of the children come from fatherless homes.

Outside the fence surrounding the Warner Avenue Elementary School in the Holmby Hills section of Los Angeles, it's another world. The average family makes $46,000 a year, and mansions, including Playboy entrepreneur Hugh Hefner's, border the school. Members of the parent-teacher association include executives, attorneys and entertainers like Connie Stevens, James Farantino, Anna Marie Alberghetti and Shelley Berman.

The settings of the two Los Angeles elementary schools couldn't be more different. Yet both are being transformed by the same program—Early Childhood Education, one of the most far-reaching reforms of primary education ever attempted by a state. The two schools are among 1,300 elementary schools in California from all economic levels participating in the second year of the state's new educational strategy. In all, some 280,000 school children, or 22% of the total in kindergarten through third grade, are involved.

The approach differs from previous educational reforms like the federal government's Head Start program that were aimed at helping low-achieving pupils in poor areas. Early Childhood Education is aimed at all students—rich and poor—and is a complete restructuring of education instead of an enrichment program for the disadvantaged.

EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

Early Childhood Education is designed to individualize education for each child. It stresses the need for early detection of learning problems and early intervention to correct problems before they become serious. Under the plan, each teacher has an individual profile of the strengths and weaknesses of every child in all the basic skills, and especially in reading and mathematics. Armed with this profile, the teacher can diagnose the child's learning problems and prescribe remedies.

Since individualized education obviously is impossible in a classroom with one teacher and 30 students, the key to the California plan is a massive infusion of volunteers into the classroom to lower the adult-to-pupil ratio to at least one-to-10. Grandparents, parents, junior and senior high school students, older elementary-school children and other volunteers help the teacher give each child special attention.

Another major facet of the program is getting parents intensely involved in the schools in other ways. The project requires that parents help teachers plan the school's goals. Parents themselves also attend classes to learn how and what their children are being taught.

Parents at both the 107th Street School and the Warner Avenue School seem to like the new emphasis on individualized education and their new voice in their children's education.

"By the time my son gets to fourth grade, he'll know more than my older boy who's in the eighth grade," says Bob Francis, organizer of a fathers' club at the 107th Street School. Louise Epstein, a Warner Avenue parent, says: "We have so many volunteers we've lowered our adult-to-pupil ratio to four-to-one. You can send your child to the most expensive private school and not get that. We're picking up reading and perceptual problems early with all this individual attention."

PLEASED PRINCIPALS

The principals are happy, too. "It's turned our teaching around," says Patricia Marshall, 107th Street principal. "The parents have a new pride in the school." Robert Searle, Warner Avenue principal, says, "Affluent kids have problems, too, and this program is meeting their needs."

Educators and governmental experts across the U.S. are watching the California program to see if it can meet needs elsewhere. "What California is doing is very promising," says Terrel H. Bell, U.S. Commissioner of Education. "I agree with it 100%. I think there's a need for Early Childhood Education at all socioeconomic levels. I believe that parents need to be intensely involved in the schools because the success of the children is closely related to the parents' involvement.

Testing after the first year of the California program showed that Early Childhood Education apparently helped increase average pupil performance in reading and math by 10% to 40%, depending upon the school. Children of all socioeconomic levels have shown good gains. "The first-year results were far beyond anything we anticipated," California State School Superintendent Wilson Riles says "We didn't expect to show any improvement for the first year because we were gearing up for a new program." Mr. Riles expects further gains when analysis of this school year is completed.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT SET

In addition, the Early Childhood Education program has won at least some assurance of continued financial support. It hasn't been affected by the general budgetary cutbacks in California schools because, as a statewide education program, it isn't dependent on average daily attendance figures or local property taxes. It began during the 1973–74 school year with a $25 million appropriation from the legislature and with programs for 12% of the state's kindergarten through third-grade children. For 1974–75 the legislature appropriated $40 million to cover 22% of such children, and the 1975–76 program is also stated in Gov. Edmund Brown's budget at the 22% level, which seems assured. Mr. Riles would like to expand it to 40% of the

children—a proposal that still is in the hands of the legislature.

In the first year, 44% of the money was spent to hire additional instructional aides, 15% on new materials and 22% to hire more teachers and other professionals—and only 2% on administration.

Each local school in the program gets $130 per pupil to spend in any way a local council of parents and teachers (with parents constituting the majority) decide it can best meet local needs. "All we at the state level say is that parents must be involved, a clear plan must be made, it must emphasize diagnosing each child's needs and prescribing an answer, the adult-to-student ratio must be at least one-to-10 and education must be individualized," says Marian Joseph, a legislative coordinator for the state education department.

And different schools do spend their money in different ways. At 107th Street School, some of the money was used to hire parent volunteers because in a poor district many mothers can't donate their time. It was also used to buy more professional help. At Warner Avenue School, classrooms were inundated with some 150 parent volunteers who didn't need the money. Funds were used to hire professional experts to improve curriculum and to get much-needed instructional materials.

Early Childhood Education in California began after Mr. Riles was elected in 1970. One of his campaign pledges had been to put more resources and effort into providing a good learning environment early for children. "Research findings consistently document that 50% of a person's intellectual potential is developed by the time that a person is four or five, and 80% is developed by the time the child is eight," Mr. Riles says. He appointed a task force to make recommendations, and the result was Early Childhood Education.

SOME EARLY CRITICISM

Mr. Riles wanted to start with four-year-olds. But that raised vehement opposition. "People charged that I wanted to take babies away from their parents and brainwash them," he says. The superintendent says he had a recurrent nightmare in which he seized babies from their mothers' breasts and repeated to them, "Read, read, read."

Once he dropped four-year-olds from the plan, Early Childhood Education sailed through the legislature.

But after the first year, the plan ran into some criticism. A few educators and the state's legislative analyst questioned Mr. Riles' enthusiasm for the program, charging that it was impossible to say that Early Childhood Education alone had raised the test scores. They said other extra funds also had been given to schools showing test increases. Mr. Riles replied that his program was a total strategy designed to fill in the gaps where other "categorical" or "special" funding left off. ECE was the catalyst behind the increases, he said.

Indeed, the State Department of Education says it was able to prove that ECE alone made the difference. Analysis of test scores showed that when ECE was added to schools that had either no other special funding or a combination of other funding programs, the ECE schools had superior performance compared with non-ECE schools that were matched in terms of socioeconomic backgrounds and other funding resources.

The biggest problem with ECE is the amount of preparation and paper work that teachers have to do, Mr. Riles says. Since the plan's basic concept is to individualize education, a teacher must keep voluminous records on the progress of each student, for example, in the dozens of subskills that make up a complex skill like reading. "This requires a fantastic amount of organization," says Mrs. Peggy Boyd, coordinator at the 107th Street School in Watts. "The record keeping is driving us wild."

SOME UNHAPPY TEACHERS

As a result, teachers are working harder than ever before. One principal in the San Francisco area, in fact, says he doesn't want the program because "of all the extra work involved." A teacher in a Northern California school complains that "the parents and the state are trying to work us to death with no increase in pay."

But there are benefits to the extra work. "I hate doing all that record keeping," says Cheri Garcia, a teacher at West Novato Elementary School near San Francisco, "but it makes me a better teacher. I know exactly where each child is."

Teachers are also finding that under the plan, parents are invading what had been their exclusive "turf"—the classroom—and some teachers deeply resent that. In one school, some teachers became so angry at what they considered to be impertinent parental suggestions that they cut off all communications with parents. The principal had to spend most of his time mediating.

At Grant Elementary School in Los Altos, a pleasant town near San Jose, there were plenty of teacher-parent conflicts in getting the program started. "The first year was traumatic," says Karen Valentine, a parent leader. But after the smoke cleared there was "a new openness" between parents and the teachers, she adds. The collaboration led to a better program for the children, she says.

The teacher's role in the classroom also has changed under ECE. A visitor to the multi-age (kindergarten, first and second grade) classroom of Marilyn Austin, in the middle-class West Novata School near San Francisco, found 33 children working with four adults—two parent volunteers, one student teacher and Mrs. Austin. It was hard to tell who was the teacher. Four groups of children were working at different learning stations on separate projects in the class study of the earth's surface. In small groups with plenty of supervision, they all seemed interested and eager.

TEACHERS KEEP FINAL SAY

"It's time that the teacher gets over being a power figure and lets other individuals become more important," Mrs. Austin says. But the teacher retains the final say in day-to-day teaching.

All in all, Early Childhood Education requires a lot more structure, a lot more managerial skills than regular education, says West Novato principal Ray Munson, a 25-year veteran. "It takes an expert to know how to manipulate children moving around to all these activities and how to use parent volunteers."

ECE is also the first such educational program to "reward success instead of failure," says Dale Doty, a principal in Cupertino, near San Jose. State inspectors visit ECE schools to see if the parents and teachers are actually doing what they promised to do. If they aren't, they don't get expansion funds. "In most federal programs," Mr. Doty says, "the worse job you do in educating the kids, the more federal aid your school gets because the government figures you need the most help."

There's one thing on which everyone agrees—the California program has tapped a new educational reservoir, the 26,000 parent volunteers. In Grant Elementary School in Los Altos, parent volunteers man a one-on-one tutoring program for children with special reading and math problems. When music was eliminated because of school budget cutbacks, parent volunteers wrote a music program. They also developed a sophisticated physical education program and library materials.

At La Canada Elementary School in La Canada, an affluent suburb north of Los Angeles, principal Don Hingst successfully uses senior citizens are volunteer tutors. One volunteer in the first grade, 77-year-old Emma "Cookie" Koester, says, "I get more out of it than the children. It's been a wonderful experience."

Another unusual volunteer at La Canada Elementary is television director Christian Nyby. Mr. Nyby works with second-graders to write scripts for shows he has directed, like "Six Million Dollar Man" and "Emergency!" He says he has been astounded by the children's imagination.

VOLUNTEERS ARE THE KEY

But what happens if a school can't recruit volunteers? "If you can't recruit them, you're in trouble," says Leonard Blanar, principal of Panama Elementary School in Sunnyvale, "And if you pay all of your volunteers, you don't have enough money left to do the job."

Mr. Blanar contends that the program so far is underfunded and that it's relying too heavily on volunteers. With the present school funding cutbacks and pessimistic economic outlook, Early Childhood Education is unworkable, he believes. He says his school received only half the funds needed to reach its goals.

And Bettye French, principal at Eaton School in Cupertino, says her school tried to get into the Early Childhood program but couldn't because "we just couldn't get enough volunteers. A lot of wives in our district either work or are in school," she says.

"I'm all for Wilson Riles," Mrs. French adds, "but he doesn't have the right to legislate parent responsibility." Through the legislation, Mr. Riles has made it mandatory for parents to participate in their schools, she says. "He doesn't have the right to demand that a parent spend time in school," she asserts.

SOLD ON THE SYSTEM

Whatever the funding situation, parents and teachers in the Early Childhood Education schools say they'll never go back to the old methods if they can help it. Dolly Lesky, a parent volunteer at West Novato School, says, "I'm angry my two older children didn't get the chance to experience this kind of education. When you start out giving the children extra help in the early years, you don't need to try to give it in the upper grades when it's too late. And if a child needs extra help, no one knows it because the program is individualized. Everyone uses different papers and different books. You never have the feeling that one kid is doing badly or is 'stupid.'"

Says Superintendent Riles: "I'm willing to fight for Early Childhood Education. I've been in education and politics long enough to know that you can't choose to die on every hill—but this is one hill I'm willing to die on."

NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my good friend, Virgin Islands' Senator Noble Samuel, I am introducing today legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the possibilities for improving agricultural development in the Virgin Islands. Specifically, the Secretary is authorized to study the opportunities for increasing agricultural production through irrigation, drainage, and other water management techniques.

One of the major reasons for the high cost of living in the Virgin Islands is the

need to import almost all of our food supplies. This legislation could eventually point the way toward making the Virgin Islands more self-sufficient in food production and toward reducing the need for high-cost imports.

The legislature of the Virgin Islands has been working very hard on this problem, and I would especially like to commend the efforts of Senator Samuel on this particular bill.

AMNESTY FOR ALL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives considered and passed a resolution to give posthumous recognition to Gen. Robert E. Lee by restoring his citizenship and his full civil rights. I was one of a handful of Members who opposed this legislation, not out of any disrespect for the memory of General Lee, but because it is morally wrong to restore the rights of one man who has been dead for a century while we continue to deny these same rights to thousands of young Americans now living.

When General Lee left the service of the United States to join the forces of the Confederacy, he did what he felt to be right. Faced with an anguishing choice between supporting the policies of his Government and acting in accordance with his own beliefs, General Lee chose the course of conscience. So, too, did thousands of American men 100 years later when their Government demanded that they fight a war they believed to be unjust and unjustified. Now the House of Representatives makes the symbolic gesture of restoring full rights to General Lee, who can no longer enjoy them, but has yet to give serious thought to the plight of Vietnam war resisters, now scattered throughout this country and abroad, who recognized early on that our Indochina adventure was both wrong and self-destructive.

The process of reconstructing the Union after the Civil War was long and painful. In one important respect—the achievement of full equality of opportunity for black Americans—that process is still incomplete. Let us do everything within our power to heal the wounds of Vietnam more quickly, and begin by heeding Lincoln's admonition that we do so "with malice toward none, with charity for all." The war in Indochina did not force Americans to take up arms against each other, but it surely divided families and split this country apart to an extent which can only be compared with the Civil War. The overwhelming majority of Americans now agree that it was a profound mistake for the United States ever to have become entangled in Southeast Asia. Yet we continue to penalize young men for their insight and their courage to act on their convictions. The time is now past due to grant full and free amnesty to these men who sacrificed their comfort, their good names, and often their freedom, in opposition to a war which almost everyone now agrees should never have been begun.

I am a sponsor of H.R. 7875 which would provide for a program of amnesty which is both more complete and more equitable than the abortive clemency program which President Ford has allowed to expire. I am delighted that my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee are considering this bill, and I urge that it be enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague, ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, and I are reintroducing the Truth in Government Act, with 50 cosponsors.

Our proposed amendment would hold "any person, including any officer or employee of the Federal Government or any elected official thereof" legally accountable for making false statements. The penalty for violation is a fine of not more than $10,000, or 5 years imprisonment, or both.

We are deeply concerned over the people's increasing distrust of our Government and the assumption that lying is not a crime unless it is done under oath. We are concerned that Government officials who lie to the people are seldom penalized.

Section 1001, title 18 of the U.S. Criminal Code makes illegal any false statements about matters within the jurisdiction of a Federal department or agency. The statute, however, is worded so ambiguously that in practice the Government holds private citizens accountable for false statements to the Government, but fails to apply the same standard to itself.

Almost all cases involving section 1001 relate to lies by private citizens to the Government. In those cases which do involve lying by Government officials, the courts disagree on the applicability of the statute.

For example, a 1955 decision by a California District Court in the case of United States against Myers affirmed that the "statute making willfully false statements or entries, in any matter within jurisdiction of any department of the United States, an offense, was designed to insure to the whole world, Government employees and general public alike, that any record, document, instrument, or statement made by a governmental employee, great or small, in his official capacity and in the course of his official duties, can be relied upon by all."

However, in a 1967 ruling in the case of Friedman against United States, the court held that

> This statute should not be given a broad literal interpretation to be applied to all areas of our national life. Such an interpretation was not envisioned by the enactment, reaches patently absurd results, and is fundamentally dangerous. This statute must have some effective limitation.

In subsequent cases, this interpretation has been reaffirmed.

Unless the statute is amended, it is unlikely that the courts will apply it as a vehicle to curb Government lying. What our amendment does is clarify and restate what the law already says.

Members who have cosponsored the Truth In Government Act are listed below:

Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Carney, Mr. Carr, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Clay, Mrs. Collins of Illinois.

Mr. Conyers Mr. Diggs, Mr. Downey, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mrs. Fenwick, Mr. Ford of Tennessee, Mr. Hamliton, Mr. Hannaford.

Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Hechler, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Jacobs, Mrs. Keys, Mr. Krebs, Mr. Leggett, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Maguire.

Mr. Matsunaga, Mrs. Meyner, Mr. Mineta, Mr. Moss, Mr. Neal, Mr. Nix, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Pressler, Mr. Quie, Mr. Rees, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Santini, Mr. Sarbanes, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Seiberling, Mrs. Spellman, Mr. Stark, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Wirth.

A SENSIBLE POLICY FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY EXPORTS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a proposal by my good friend Mr. WEAVER, to make the Commodity Credit Corporation the sole bargaining agent for our raw agricultural commodity exports.

My colleague, Mr. WEAVER, should be commended for his foresight in proposing that the Government, not the large agribusiness conglomerates, negotiate grain deals with Russia and other export transactions. Consumers and farmers can benefit from public, open negotiations, and purchases made at current market prices. Consumers must know they are paying a fair price for their food, while farmers must get a fair return for their work.

We need a vehicle for insuring that no one profits from inside information about impending wheat deals; we need open negotiations, and we need a domestic grain reserve to cushion any price changes caused by adverse weather here or abroad. By moving in this direction, we can insure a food policy that represents farmers, consumers, and all Americans.

STATEMENT ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the following statement grew out of a meeting on June 23, 1975, of distinguished economists and social scientists called by the

Economics Task Force of the Committee for Full Employment. I wish to insert a copy of this statement along with a list of the 44 economists and social scientists who signed the statement in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

ECONOMISTS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS ATTACK CONTRIVED UNEMPLOYMENT-INFLATION TRADEOFF

(The following statement grew out of a meeting on June 23, 1975 of distinguished economists and social scientists called by the Economics Task Force of the National Committee for Full Employment.)

STATEMENT ON FULL EMPLOYMENT

To talk of "coming out of the recession" at a time when the officially defined unemployed number nine million persons and millions more are too discouraged to seek work is simple arrant nonsense.

To describe as "economic recovery" a situation in which twenty to twenty-five million persons will be unemployed at some time over the course of the next year is deceitful.

Continuing high unemployment is both brutal and costly. A policy of full employment is *not* costly. Indeed, the total net cost of reducing the unemployment rate to 3.0% over the next eighteen months is inconsequential compared with the fact that each extra 1% of unemployment costs 900,000 jobs, $50 billion in unproduced goods and services, and $14 billion in uncollected taxes. Sustained full employment is the way to replace horrendous federal deficits with a balanced federal budget.

The achievement of full employment would *not* cause inflation. Inflation is caused by administered prices, the shortage of goods and services, the consequences of a reactionary monetary policy, and the uncertainties of a deliberately contrived roller-coaster economy. The mismanaged economy of the past several years has produced both high inflation *and* high unemployment. A democratically planned economy can achieve both full employment and lowered inflation.

The cost of failure to achieve full employment affects everyone:

The people who are without jobs;

The workers who fear for their jobs, whose collective bargaining rights are threatened, and whose real wages are eroded;

The youth who neither have a job nor can look forward to one;

The consumers who cannot meet their needs because of the goods and services not produced;

The nation's annual loss of $225 billion in production and sales;

The citizenry who cannot get on with the necessary work of achieving social equity and an improved quality life; and

The people as a whole who increasingly lack faith in their government.

It is a myth too long perpetuated that the price of fighting inflation is ever-increasing unemployment. Full employment is the key to raising living standards, achieving social justice, and fighting inflation. A guaranteed job for all who wish work is the proper expression of our country's heritage. The right of all to perform useful and rewarding work at decent wages enhances human dignity and furthers all other rights.

STATEMENT ON FULL EMPLOYMENT—SIGNED BY

1. John Atlee
2. Roy Bennett
3. Emile Benoit
4. Randolph T. Blackwell
5. Robert Browne
6. Herrington Bryce
7. Paul Bullock
8. Domingo Clemente
9. Eli E. Cohen
10. Nathan E. Cohen
11. Wilbur J. Cohen
12. Peter B. Edelman
13. Allen Ferguson
14. Betty Friedan
15. Herbert J. Gans
16. Alan Gartner
17. Corinne Gilb
18. Helen Ginsberg
19. Woodrow Ginsberg
20. Marilyn Gittell
21. Bertram Gross
22. Howard W. Hallman
23. Bennett Harrison
24. Hazel Henderson
25. Frederick S. Jaffee
26. Leon H. Keyserling
27. Mary D. Keyserling
28. Charles Killingsworth
29. Robert Lekachman
30. Leonard Lesser
31. S. M. Miller
32. Stanley Moses
33. Eleanor Holmes Norton
34. Timothy E. Nulty
35. Arthur Pearl
36. Frank Riessman
37. Sumner Rosen
38. Harold Sheppard
39. Arthur B. Shostak
40. Charles Taylor
41. Lester C. Thurow
42. Melville J. Ulmer
43. Nat Weinberg
44. Elizabeth Wickenden

JACK ANDERSON SAYS ADMINISTRATION KOWTOWS TO OIL CARTEL WHILE AMERICAN CONSUMERS SUFFER

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, last night the President returned without approval H.R. 4035, the Petroleum Price Review Act. This veto represents yet another disappointment for the American consumer. Punitive taxation and prohibitive pricing may in fact yield a slight decrease in consumption of fuel, but this limited benefit will be far outweighed by the external diseconomies and social costs of decontrol.

By raising the price of fuel to consumers we will force the poor out of the market—but we will also be pulling billions of dollars out of the economy and putting it into the hands of multinational corporations.

Why has the administration opted for the limited benefit of slightly decreased consumption at the unacceptable cost of a renewed cycle of inflation and recession? Nationally syndicated Columnist Jack Anderson, in his Washington Merry-Go-Round of July 20, offers his analysis. I believe this article should be of interest to my colleagues and am, therefore, including it at this point in the RECORD:

OIL INDUSTRY GETS ITS WAY IN ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

WASHINGTON.—The international oil cartel could not do better if the president of Exxon were President of the United States.

Through the good offices of Gerald Ford, the oil men seem firmly in control of U.S. energy policy. Virtually every move made by the Ford Administration has been suggested in industry energy blueprints and applauded in the corporate boardrooms.

The few crusaders against Big Oil still in the Administration are relegated to dusty corners in the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and Federal Energy Administration. Even there, they are pro-consumer misfits.

Indeed, it is now more difficult to get action against Big Oil than it was during the last Nixon year. As one example, the beginnings of a massive antitrust case—one of the few measures short of prison terms that oil presidents fear—has stagnated.

Yet a few powerful oil companies subtly or directly control all phases of oil production and distribution. They also dominate natural gas, the coal industry, nuclear power and even geothermal energy.

At the FEA, youthful Frank Zarb talks tough to consumer advocates, complaining in frustration about Big Oil's swashbuckling tactics. But he balks at using his popularity with the President to push antitrust action or stronger regulation.

As evidence of his public unwillingness to take on the issue, he recently ducked an appearance with Ralph Nader on a national TV show. Zarb agreed to participate on the program until he learned that Nader also would be a guest. The consumer advocate was eager to debate Zarb on the government failure to curb the oil companies. Zarb backed down.

In the industry itself, talk of government intervention in running the industry brings laughter. One of our old acquaintances described to us a cigar-and-brandy gathering of oil executives at an exclusive oil club.

"The Government would never know how to run it," bragged one executive. "We're the only ones with enough knowledge!"

At the moment, the White House is pushing what may turn out to be the most disastrous concession of all: decontrol of "old" domestic oil—the oil in production before the current crisis.

In 1972 this "old" oil was priced at $4.25 per barrel. But, at the behest of the oil men, the Cost of Living Council arbitrarily raised it to $5.25, where it now stands.

The President's decontrol plan would gradually phase out controls over the next 30 months. Every precedent indicates the oil industry will then peg the price to Arab oil, now $13.50 per barrel and on the way to a possible $17.50.

President Ford and his advisors contend that decontrol will add only seven cents to a gallon of gasoline by 1976. The higher prices will cut consumption and provide funds to find new oil and stimulate production, they believe.

This, President Ford insists, is the best way to reduce dependence on Arab oil while the nation searches for new energy sources in coal, shale oil, nuclear reactors and "exotics" like solar generators.

But study after study has shown that the only thing certain about higher oil prices is higher oil company profits. Price increases since the 1973 Arab embargo have not significantly cut consumption or stimulated production.

They have, however, placed a hardship on every American. Even the "modest" rise of $1 allowed by the Cost of Living Council cost consumers $1.9 billion, according to a Library of Congress study. The new decontrol measure and tariffs will cost every person in the country $225 a year, Nader has estimated.

A congressional analysis of the Ford plan found that it would add a staggering $318 billion to oil company coffers over a decade.

The impact, of course, is not simply on the motorist at the gas pump. There is a "ripple effect" throughout the economy because of the widespread use of oil in generating electricity, transportation, even fertilizers. Moreover, coal and other energy prices tend to rise along with oil.

President Ford's people have been admirably candid on most subjects, but on the economic impact of energy, they have been devious.

Last winter, for example, White House aide William Seidman used "executive privilege" to dodge testifying on the topic. And Congress was refused a copy of a study prepared for the Council on Wage and Price Stability on the economic impact of the White House's energy plan.

The President himself has vetoed a half-dozen measures because they would stimulate inflation. But, contrary to his own executive order issued in February, Mr. Ford neglected to send Congress an inflation impact statement along with his plan to decontrol oil prices. The higher cost of oil, needless to say, would have a critical effect on inflation.

Meanwhile, the oil companies have prospered awesomely. Federal decisions favoring the oil industry since 1970 have helped the U.S.-based oil companies reap more than $60 billion in profits. Exxon's profits rose 31.8 percent from 1973 to 1974. Texaco's earnings were up 98.7 percent from 1973 to 1974; Mobil's up 66 percent, and Standard of Indiana's rose 80.8 percent.

The prospect of decontrolled domestic oil also means more than higher prices and profits. Many experts see grave international implications.

Decontrol could make the U.S.-based multinational oil companies more beholden to the Arabs than they are to the United States. There is already evidence that the oil men are willing to cave in to their Arab business associates.

In 1973, for example, the Arabian American Oil Company (Aramco), a consortium of U.S. companies operating in Saudi Arabia, undertook an extensive propaganda campaign designed to undermine Israeli war support in the United States at the request of the late King Faisal.

Decontrol of "old" domestic oil would give the U.S. multinationals even more of an incentive to help the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries cartel. After all, U.S.-produced oil, if decontrolled, would be pegged to Arab prices. And the higher the prices, the more profits for the oil men.

JORDAN ARMS SALE OUGHT TO BE BANNED

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 1975, the President notified the Congress of his intent to sell $350 million worth of air defense equipment to Jordan. Today I am cosponsoring a concurrent resolution to disapprove this sale.

America has had a long and mutually beneficial friendship with Jordan. I hope that this friendship continues. However, I believe that this proposed sale of military equipment is ill-timed, of a magnitude that is not justified, and will endanger the relative peace which is prevailing in the Middle East.

Jordan has four neighbors who could conceivably pose a threat to its security. Their neighbor to the South and East, Saudi Arabia, is footing the bill for this military sale. To the Northeast, Iraqi-Jordanian relations have recently improved as part of Iraq's less militant policy vis-a-vis its neighbors. To the North, Jordan has recently established a joint military command with Syria.

Deputy Secretary of State Atherton told the International Relations Committee Subcommittee on Political and Military Affairs that if the United States does not supply this air defense system, the Jordanians will probably attempt to get Soviet equipment through the Syrians. Disregarding the tremendous problems Soviet military technicians would cause King Hussein, this would be an incredible reversal of Jordanian foreign policy and would belie the constructive force for moderation the King has played in the Middle East.

I believe that there is one and only one nation that this air defense system can be directed against; namely, Israel. Any argument that the Jordanians do not have the Israeli's in mind as the motivating factor for this system simply does not hold water when one looks at the entire picture.

King Hussein has said that the lack of an air defense system is one reason why he stayed out of the Yom Kippur War. While this may not have been the compelling factor, the existence of a sophisticated air defense system will take away an inhibiting factor if the efforts for peace fail. The 1973 war is a pretty good indication that Jordan has nothing to fear if it does not enter the fighting. Israel respected Jordan's sovereignty, it did not attack nor go through Jordan during the fighting. Hence, the Jordanians only need a defense against Israel if they make a decision to enter the fighting.

It should be emphasized that the Improved Hawk system is mobile. Fifty trucks and trailers can transport a battery. While not as mobile as the Russian made SAM–6, the Improved Hawk can be used as an offensive weapon much as the Egyptians and Syrians used the SAM's during the 1973 war. The Redeye is handheld and can cause high casualties against helicopters and other slow moving aircraft. While it is probably true that the Jordanians would have to expose some vital targets by moving these missiles, past experience has shown that Arab armies have done just that to start or protect a military offensive.

I am not against military sales to Jordan per se. In fact, I welcome small volume sales as a sign of our friendship and support for King Hussein. Additionally, I would welcome large-scale U.S. backed investment in Jordan to bolster their economy. I would prefer to do something more constructive with the $350 million they wish to spend on an air defense system.

I would hope that such investment would be considered after the missile sale matter is resolved. It should be a part of a larger Middle East package including the much awaited request for large-scale continued military and economic assistance for Israel.

However, this sale is far too large and the systems are too important. Delicate negotiations are still taking place between Israel and Egypt. This proposed sale, despite some semantics by its advocates, violates the spirit, and the groundrules, of the administration's reassessment. I cannot support the President's proposed action and urge my colleagues to join the effort to stop this sale. We have only until July 30 to act. I am hopeful that the International Relations Committee will report this resolution to the House floor for quick action.

AMNESTY

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, just before the July 4 patriotic weekend recess, the Judiciary Committee on which I serve, by a vote of 34 to 1, reported a general amnesty bill to the House. The reported bill is identical to one already passed by the Senate by voice vote with no apparent dissent. Today it passed the House by a vote of 407 to 10. Is it surprising that the matter has received almost no attention in the press? Allow me to explain.

The bill not only grants general and unconditional amnesty, it covers the case of an American citizen, a West Point graduate and officer of the Army sworn to uphold the Constitution, who not only refused to fight for the Nation but actually joined the opposing army to serve as a high ranking officer.

The bill covers only one person. His name is Gen. Robert E. Lee, commander in chief of the Confederate Army in the Civil War, who was indicted for treason at the end of that conflict.

I apologize for the literary teaser, but obviously I am trying to make a point. The point is that the issue of amnesty is with us again; as it has been at the conclusion of every war. It is an issue with which we must deal, to the extent possible, in a calm and sensible way.

After the Civil War, President Andrew Johnson granted amnesty to "all persons engaged in rebellion." Excepted from the general proclamation were 14 categories of persons which consisted of a very small group—in general, those of high military or political rank. However, the President added that "clemency will be liberally extended" to those excluded who made individual application.

Further proclamations designed to reunite these individuals with their country were issued on September 7, 1867, July 4, 1868, and December 25, 1868, and by Congress on June 8, 1898. With all these opportunities for reconciliation, why was Lee never absolved?

The Confederate general actually

applied for amnesty. But due to unexplained circumstances, the required amnesty oath be filed was misplaced, not to turn up until 1970 in a duty box in the National Archives. As a result Lee was never granted amnesty and only now, after 100 years, is his case being reviewed.

Great divisions in American society resulted from the Civil War and from the punitive laws of the "Reconstruction Era" which followed. The bitterness between North and South lasted for more than a century and some of the scars are still visible. Can anyone today argue for the wisdom of those policies?

Another civil war, this time in Southeast Asia, likewise caused deep divisions in our society. Like the aftermath of the War Between the States, many of the wounds of the Vietnam conflict are still festering and unhealed. Will we learn the lesson from our past history?

In recent years, many young men made a decision not to participate in a war which they considered to be wrong. One can argue the merits of their judgments as one can argue Lee's decision to join the enemy. But their decision is no longer an issue; anymore than the correctness of Lee's decision is an issue. "Amnesty" means to forget, as in amnesia. It does not imply that those receiving it were right—or wrong. It is a neutral word. It is what occurs when a child commits a transgression and the parent says, "Let's just forget the incident," so that the normal family relationship can be reconciled and resumed.

The Nation "forgot" the transgressions of the Confederate soldiers who were volunteers and who fought no doubt in good faith, against their own country. The case for unconditional amnesty could be said to be a good deal weaker for the rebels, who in the legal sense were guilty of treason, than for those in the Vietnam era who neither were volunteers nor fought against their country, but merely refused to participate in the Indochina war. This is especially true in light of how easily many others avoided the draft through a variety of means without suffering the condemnation of their countrymen. Many avoided service by attending college, joining the National Guard, becoming a teacher or other essential worker, by being physically unfit—a category which many professional athletes seemed to fit into—or female, or by proving conscientious objection to all war.

Of course, there is no doubt that some of those who refused to participate in the Vietnam conflict did so for less than noble reasons. When fishing for mackerel with a net, you are bound to catch a few catfish, some seaweed and an old tire or two. That can only be avoided by fishing with a rod and line, which is not always the best method if you want to feed a lot of people.

This is the amnesty question before us now: What is the best way to accomplish our objective? Did the case-by-case method of President Ford's now-ended clemency program accomplish the announced objective of reconciliation? To this date, about 250 cases have been processed through the clemency board program.

My own feeling is that Ford's very courageous and wise goal has not been accomplished and that it is time to say to our sons and brothers: "The war is over. It was a bad experience for all of us. Let's forget it; come on home and let's regain that relationship we once had. Join the family again. We have a lot to do to fulfill the promises of this great Nation."

THE INCREASING COST OF FOOD

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has to buy food realizes that prices have been going up. But as time goes by, as an increase is replaced by a savings to be followed by yet another increase, we tend to lose our perspective on just what is happening.

To help remedy this, I began surveying prices a year ago in 25 groceries located throughout my district in Chicago's northern suburbs. The yearlong results provide a clear, black-and-white picture of what has happened to food prices since last summer.

On June 29, 1974, a shopper could walk into a grocery store in my district and pay an average price per pound of $9.10 for eight meat items. By June 21, 1975, the average price for the same eight meat items was $12.03, an increase of more than 30 percent.

During the same period, the price for a typical market basket of 27 items—including meat and poultry, dairy products, produce, frozen foods, canned goods, and household items—went up more than 10 percent. The average price on June 29, 1974, was $17.86. By June 21, 1975, it was $19.20.

The only solace my constituents have is that prices are even higher elsewhere. A few weeks ago I went into a grocery in the Washington suburbs and discovered that comparable meat items cost 11.2 percent more there than in my district and the market basket was 7.7 percent higher.

Mr. Speaker, I am entering the detailed results of the year-long survey, in the RECORD and I hope that they will help spur us into taking some prompt action to get our country off of its roller-coaster ride to higher food prices. I believe the first fundamental step should be to help stabilize grain prices by instituting vigorous antitrust action against the handful of companies that currently control the vast majority of the grain trading in our country and by establishing a national grain reserve that would buy commodities in the good years and hold them in reserve for the lean years. We should also suspend those Government regulations that contribute to the higher cost of transporting food.

The survey showed that:

A pound of bacon registered the greatest increase over the yearlong survey. It went from 98 cents on June 29, 1974, to $1.74 on June 21, 1975—an increase of 77.6 percent.

The greatest price decrease was registered by a head of lettuce, a very volatile product, which went from 57 cents on June 29, 1974, to 47 cents on June 21, 1975—a drop of 17.5 percent. For nonperishable products, the biggest decrease was for a turkey TV dinner, which dropped 10.1 percent, from $1.48 to $1.33.

Eleven of the nonmeat case items surveyed actually had lower prices on June 21, 1975, than they did on June 29, 1974.

Over the yearlong survey, no particular food chain emerged as having consistently lower prices.

AVERAGE PRICES FOR 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

	Individual items surveyed—				Percent yearly increase
	June 29, 1974	Sept. 20, 1974	Feb. 8, 1975	June 21, 1975	
Sirloin steak	$1.53	$1.63	$1.36	$1.99	30.1
Rump roast	1.44	1.50	1.37	1.77	22.9
Pork chops	1.42	1.66	1.49	1.87	31.7
Hot dogs	.99	1.19	1.14	1.23	24.2
Chicken	.47	.61	.62	.67	42.6
Round steak	1.38	1.37	1.26	1.71	23.9
Ground beef	.90	1.06	1.00	1.05	16.7
Bacon	.98	1.46	1.50	1.74	77.6
Bananas	.19	.19	.20	.26	36.8
String beans	.54	.38	.71	.64	18.5
Lettuce	.57	.44	.57	[1] .47	−17.5
Eggs	.62	.83	.81	[1] .61	−1.6
Milk	.74	.73	.77	[1] .70	−5.4
Cheese	1.02	.98	1.10	[1] .99	−2.9
Cottage cheese	.59	.58	.67	.68	15.3
Bread	.54	.56	.58	[1] .50	−7.4

	Individual items surveyed—				Percent yearly increase
	June 29, 1974	Sept. 20, 1974	Feb. 8, 1975	June 21, 1975	
Crackers	$0.60	$0.68	$0.70	[1] $0.59	−1.7
Cereal	.76	.76	.77	[1] .69	−9.2
Frozen vegetable	.42	.45	.49	.47	11.9
T.V. dinner	1.48	1.48	1.45	[1] 1.33	−10.1
Orange juice (frozen)	.62	.64	.66	[1] .61	−1.6
Canned peaches	.50	.61	.61	.59	18.0
Vegetable shortening	.70	.84	.87	.71	1.4
Catsup	.49	.55	.57	.56	14.3
Peanut butter	.61	.64	.68	.63	3.3
Gelatin	.16	.19	.26	.24	50.0
Soup	.22	.22	.22	[1] .21	−4.5
Dog food	.33	.33	.35	[1] .32	−3.0
Paper towels	.59	.65	.69	.63	6.8
Detergent	1.09	1.13	1.32	1.26	15.6
Aluminum foil	.77	.79	.85	.82	6.5

[1] These June 21, 1975 prices are lower than when the survey started on June 29, 1974.

NATIONAL CIVILIAN STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE—H.R. 7014, SECTIONS 251–260

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my strong support for the creation of a national civilian strategic petroleum reserve.

A reserve of this kind is an integral part of current strategy to protect us against an interruption in foreign oil supplies. Emergency reserves are required by the International Energy Agreement entered into by the following 18 nations: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. Countries under this agreement must maintain sufficient reserves to sustain current consumption without imports for 60 days—later to be increased to 90 days. While definitions in the agreement were kept loose enough for us to qualify, in actual fact we have only 15 to 20 days of usable commercial reserves. If half our imports were embargoed, our commercial storage would be exhausted in 6 weeks.

A strategic oil reserve is only one part of an overall program to reduce our vulnerability to a foreign supply disruption, but it is perhaps the most important part. The final draft version of a National Petroleum Council study, "Petroleum Storage for National Security," released on June 27, 1975, concludes that while all options for emergency preparedness—conservation, conversion to alternate fuels, and increased production—should be pursued, "a standby petroleum reserve would be the major factor in compensating for a future embargo or supply interruption."

Cutting consumption to reduce imports by 1 billion barrels a day would not give us the security of a storage program and would, moreover, plunge us deeper into recession. Switching to alternate fuels could save at best only 100 to 150,000 barrels a day of imports, a saving that would afford little or no security in the event of an embargo. Nor is increased domestic production a viable alternative, for this decade at least.

Developing reserves in place—or shut-in capacity, as some have suggested, would be no substitute for stockpiles. The cost of developing and maintaining new standby production is prohibitively high, both in capital and resource requirements. More importantly, shut-in reserves could not supply the flow of oil we would need in the event of a foreign supply disruption. The maximum rate at which the petroleum reserve at Elk Hills could produce, for example, is 400,000 barrels a day. By contrast, stockpiles of the kind planned in this legislation, could be drawn down at the rate of 3 million barrels a day, enough to offset an embargo of half our total imports, the maximum that is even likely to occur.

The National Petroleum Council has estimated the cost of salt-dome storage—leaching plus pipeline construction—at from 60 to 80 cents a barrel. Others have estimated the total cost of such storage at a maximum of $1.60 a barrel. Even if this cost were borne wholly by consumer, it would amount to only a few cents a gallon.

I include at this point in the RECORD a chart of preliminary storage costs prepared by the Federal Energy Administration:

PRELIMINARY STORAGE COSTS

[In dollars per barrel]

Type	Construction	Annual maintenance cost
Steel tanks	3.00– 5.00	0.06 –0.10
Salt domes:		
Onshore	.50– 1.00	.002– .005
Offshore	.75– 1.50	.005– .01
Abandoned mines	.20– 1.50	(1)
Mined caverns	3.00–10.00	(1)

[1] 0.5 percent of investment.

Storage of a billion barrels of oil would require roughly $2 billion in investment for facilities plus the cost of the oil itself—which would be recovered when the oil was used.

The Project Independence Report, which strongly recommended strategic petroleum storage, points out the favorable cost/benefit ratio for oil stockpiles. The 1973 embargo cost us 500,000 jobs and from $10 to $20 billion lost in GNP. If another embargo should occur, the economy would save $3 to $5 for each $1 cost of storage.

Moreover, costs must be considered relative to costs of other proposals with similar objectives. Military costs of defending our oil import flow would run very high. It has been estimated that 2 carrier task forces and 75 escort ships might be needed to protect the tanker route from the Persian Gulf. The 10-year cost of such an escort would be over $15 billion, and its chances of success would be slim.

It is 2 years since Congress first held hearings on a strategic petroleum storage program. In September 1974, the National Petroleum Council completed a study of emergency preparedness against a disruption of foreign oil supply. The Council reported at that time that a strategic petroleum storage program should be established and that "efforts to implement such a program should begin immediately because of the long construction leadtimes involved." The Council has followed up with an in-depth analysis and specific recommendations on the implementation of a stockpile system. In the final draft version of this study, released only a few weeks ago, the Council recommends 500 million barrels of security crude oil storage as a first target of a national security storage program.

The Federal Energy Administration has in the works a comprehensive long-range plan, as well as an early storage program. This early storage program could give us 150 million barrels of storage by 1978. A recent FEA working paper on strategic storage emphasizes that because of long construction leadtimes, implementation of an early storage program should begin as soon as possible.

If we start now, in 5 to 6 years we will have enough oil in storage to enable us, with modest emergency precautions, to withstand an embargo without economic hardship for 6 to 8 months. The mere existence of national oil stockpiles would serve as a deterrent to future embargoes and would increase the flexibility of U.S. policymakers. I urge support of the strategic petroleum storage program created in this bill. A strategic reserve, together with modest emergency standby provisions, is our most effective near-term strategy against both a wartime and peacetime supply disruption. Our substantial dependence on foreign oil makes it imperative that we move ahead at once with this important program.

SENATOR TED STEVENS ON GUN CONTROL

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard more and more talk about the need to curb and control guns in America. While it is true that many crimes committed in this country involve the use of guns, it is also true that it is people who commit those crimes and people who are held accountable for them.

Lately, however, it seems that many of our well-intentioned citizens have lost track of this fact. They no longer seek to fault the person for the crime, rather, they seek to blame the weapon for the crime. "Take the weapons off the streets and crime will go away," they say.

In a speech to the Safari Club International earlier this year, my colleague Senator TED STEVENS addressed himself to this very real and important problem. I would like to bring his remarks to the attention of the rest of my colleagues in Congress.

The article follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR TED STEVENS

There's a fellow named Sam out in the boondocks who bought a new typewriter. He waited weeks for it to come, all his family and neighbors came over to watch it get unpacked and set up on the table. Late that afternoon, a neighbor who had been away when the typewriter arrived came by and was astonished to see the new machine sitting atop his neighbor's garbage can. "Sam," his neighbor cried, "what's your new machine doing in the garbage can?" "Well," said Sam, "it operates real purty, but it can't spell worth a durn."

Which makes my point that a piece of hardware can't do anything the user doesn't make it do. A typewriter—or a gun—is not intrinsically good or bad—though some seem to want us to believe guns are the primary evil—not the criminal.

No, a gun is only as good or as evil as the person who wields it. As the bumper sticker slogan says, "Guns don't kill people; people kill people."

And that, I feel, is how most people view gun control—not as an end in itself, but as

a means to an end. That end is crime control. Crime—not guns—is the central issue. But often this distinction is blurred in the emotional debate over the pros and cons of gun control!!

Despite the loud and dedicated passions on each side, both proponents and opponents of gun control *agree* on one thing: that the criminal in America must be stopped and that crime is the ultimate evil to be reckoned with. Let's bring this central issue—crime and the criminal—back into the spotlight where it belongs; let's look beyond the means to the end.

This Congress I have cosponsored, and intend to work very hard to see enacted into law, S. 216, a bill which would make commission of a federal crime with a firearm a separate offense. This measure, if enacted into law, would create a mandatory sentence of not less than one year for the first conviction, and a jail sentence of not less than five years for the second or subsequent offense. What this measure means is that the judge has no discretion; once a person is convicted of the offense of using a firearm to commit any felony for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, he MUST GO TO JAIL.

I am firmly convinced that this type of legislation is a responsible means of cutting down on the illegal use of firearms. Those who would misuse this piece of machinery must be dealt with swiftly and severely, but those law abiding citizens should not be deprived of their right to own guns for hunting, recreation, and protection. We must also invest the time and resources necessary to improve our local police forces so they can more adequately handle the rising crime rate, eliminate the bottlenecks in our courts to insure that justice is swift, and improve our prison system so that those sentenced to a period of internment come out better—not worse—for their stay.

The areas I have described, if worked on conscientiously, would reduce the illegal use of firearms and would generally reduce the level of crime. My proposal asks a great deal of all Americans, but I feel is much more responsible than a knee jerk suggestion from ALBEIT SINCERE CITIZENS that the way to reduce violent crimes is to disarm law-abiding Americans as well as the criminal.

The anti-gun forces were active in the 93rd Congress and I am sure will be active again this year.

Last year, the Senate debated S. 1401, a bill to establish a national criteria for the imposition of the death penalty. While the Senate was considering this matter, an amendment was offered by the anti-gun forces calling for the establishment of a federal registration and permit system for all handguns.

I strongly oppose such a measure not only on its face, but also because I believe it is nothing more than another step towards complete Federal control, AND POSSIBLE CONFISCATION, of all firearms.

In fact, one of the proponents of the registration and permit amendment made the following statement on the floor of the Senate. I quote:

"In my own book, I think the need is to prohibit ownership of handguns by private citizens in this country except only for law enforcement personnel and to permit a citizen to own a handgun if he is a member of a licensed and recognized gun club and if he keeps it on the premises of the gun club."

The amendment was defeated when the Senate voted to table it by a margin of 68–21. I voted to table this amendment as well as another amendment regarding "Saturday Night Specials." I voted against the amendment regarding the ban on the sale of the "Saturday Night Special" because it did not contain a workable definition of a handgun designed for sporting purposes. This amendment also failed.

In my State of Alaska, guns, including handguns, are an absolute necessity for many people. To put on my people the burden of registration and licensing would mean that many of them would have the duty to travel literally hundreds of miles to go to a Federal official to register their guns. And for what?

As a practical matter, in the areas where the licensing laws and registration laws exist today, the rate of crime is higher. Where there are no such laws and where there is a preponderance of guns today, the studies that have been conducted indicate that crime rates are lower. Where more guns are in private hands, crime rates are lower.

I cite, for example, a pamphlet prepared by New York Law School, under the New York Law Forum, entitled "A Controlled Look at Gun Controls." It shows that five States—Iowa, North Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and New Hampshire—have an average homicide rate of 1.8 percent.

That is much lower that those States that have strong gun control laws. Some people would say, "Well, that's because these are low population density States." One can look at the State of Rhode Island, for instance. It had a very low homicide rate of 2.2 percent, despite its very high density, and it had no gun control laws in effect at the time the study was conducted.

However, the battle is not yet over. As I am sure most of you are aware, there is currently brewing a scheme to effectively outlaw the use of handguns by most Americans. Last year a citizens group calling themselves the Committee for Handgun Control petitioned the Consumer Product Safety Commission and asked that it institute steps to ban the interstate sale of handgun ammunition. The Commission, I feel quite correctly, held that Congress had not given them the jurisdiction to deal with this issue, and denied jurisdiction.

However, this did not end the matter. The citizens group next went to the Federal District Court in Washington, D.C., and asked that the Commission's decision be overruled. It was. The judge held that the Consumer Product Safety Commission had jurisdiction, not under the Consumer Product Safety Act, but on the face of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, and ordered the Commission to consider the citizen's group petition.

Some private groups and citizens have recently filed a motion to intervene and a motion asking the judge to vacate the complaint. In effect, these groups are asking the judge to reconsider his initial decision. They argue that Congress never delegated this type of authority to an administrative agency. They also point out that the judge did not consider the legislative history relevant to the Federal Hazardous Substances Act and he is now being asked to consider this information.

I believe that if the intent of Congress is considered by fair minded individuals on either side of the gun control issue, it is abundantly clear that Congress would not delegate the authority to an administrative agency to effectively outlaw the use of handguns. This is a gut issue in Congress and invokes strong feelings on the part of people on both sides of the issue. It is far too important and the ramifications of a decision on this point too far reaching to be delegated—the issue is for Congress alone to decide.

Let there be no mistake, if a decision of the Consumer Project Safety Commission banning the interstate sale of hand-gun ammunition survived judicial and congressional scrutiny, it would have the same effect as Congressional action outlawing the private ownership of handguns. In Alaska and I'm sure many other States, no ammunition is manufactured commercially. A handgun is both a necessary and respected item for many of the citizens of Alaska. A further objection which I have to the petiti' ' now being considered by the Consumer Product Safety Commission and most gun registration proposals is the lack of distinction between the States it affects. The use of handguns in Alaska differs significantly from the use of handguns in other States; those primarily composed of urban areas. I am convinced that gun control legislation requiring registration should not be enacted at the Federal level, but is more appropriately a matter for State legislation. The problems facing citizens of the large inner cities, such as Detroit and New York are vastly different from the problems facing the citizens of rural States such as Alaska.

I am not prepared to stand idly by when this matter is considered by the courts and the Commission. I strongly support a bill introduced by my friend, Senator McClure, which would make it clear that the Consumer Products Safety Commission may make no ruling or order that restricts the manufacture or sale of firearms, firearm ammunition, or components of firearm ammunition.

The battle I have just described is not the only one that will be facing us this year. I am convinced that there will be activity in Congress to pass more restrictive anti-gun laws. Just last Tuesday, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives which would outlaw the private ownership of handguns.

The facts show that crime and guns are not synonymous and, in fact, controlling guns may have the opposite effect. Many people in their anger against the criminal have turned on guns as the scapegoat. We must redirect this strong anger back toward the real culprit, the person who would use a gun to harm another human being. The fight should be to strengthen our police, streamline our courts, and remodel our prisons so crime control is a reality and gun control is a moot reality.

VANIK ANSWERS OIL INDUSTRY ARGUMENTS ON DECONTROL

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have witnessed a new lobbying offensive by the oil industry. Having abandoned the fight to retain the depletion allowance, the industry is now focusing its efforts to win public and congressional approval of a complete decontrol of oil prices. As part of this offensive, Charles E. Spahr, chairman of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, recently published an article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer setting forth his arguments for price decontrol.

The stakes in this controversy—billions of dollars in additional fuel costs to American consumers and business—are simply too great to take the step of removing price controls without a full and complete ventilation of the facts. For the interest of every Member, I wish to present the views of our distinguished colleague, CHARLES VANIK, as they appeared in the Plain Dealer on July 19, 1975, in response to Mr. Spahr's presentation.

Mr. VANIK's article follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Saturday, July 19, 1975]

OIL AND GAS: INDUSTRY HOLDS ALL OF THE CARDS

(By CHARLES A. VANIK)

In the July 5 Plain Dealer Forum I read an interesting article entitled "Oil supply OK

today but watch out in fall." In this article Charles E. Spahr, chairman of Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), suggested that the problem of oil shortages resulted from policies of government and suggested the need for immediate oil decontrol.

Congress has no real access to the truth of oil and gas production or the extent of known or potential reserves. This information is the most highly guarded secret in America. We don't really know how much oil and gas is in the ground waiting to come out—when the price is right. The great big government of America—which many would like to miniaturize—begs the oil and gas information from an industry-managed reporting facility. There are no penalties for false information, the suppression of truth or the under-reporting which would serve the best interests of the industry, which can multiply profits by keeping oil and gas in the ground for higher prices in the years ahead.

In this vacuum of information, the oil industry holds all of the cards. A legislator has no means to develop information for public decisions or to test the industry-supplied reports. Nor can he determine which oil and gas wells are really dry—or which are simply sealed off for more favorable market conditions. One fact we do know—the longer the already discovered oil and gas is kept off the market, the higher its price and the greater the profit that can be made from it.

However, the oil industry has convinced President Ford that the decontrol of natural gas and "old" oil will produce greater supplies of both. The recent crushing escalation in the price of oil we purchase from abroad did not increase world oil supplies. It simply resulted in a shocking flow of capital from this nation. Imported oil cost Americans $7 billion in 1973, $25 billion in 1974 and an estimated $30 billion this year. It promises to cost $50 billion by 1980.

The domestic oil and gas producer says that of course he can do nothing about the multiplication in the world price. But he certainly enjoys it! Everytime the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries stirs for a boost in its oil bounty there is jubilation in Houston, since more and more domestic oil produced from new wells can be sold at the exciting new world prices.

President Ford and the oil industry want an instant decontrol of oil and gas prices so they can ascend to the world price levels where the sky is the limit! At present about 40% of the "old" or already discovered oil is sold at a "controlled" price of about $5.25 per barrel. Our present oil and gasoline prices represent a "mix" between old oil at controlled prices and imported oil or "new" oil at the world price.

Congress—in its wisdom or folly (depending on whether you are a consumer or a producer)—froze the price of old oil during the embargo crisis to protect the American consumer from the manipulation of oil prices developed by the OPEC cartel which would otherwise have affected all oil used in America at an added annual consumer cost estimated between $55 billion and $85 billion.

Another reason for restricting the price of "old oil" was that it was found and developed with heavy tax incentives and subsidies provided by the American taxpayers. This oil discovery and development occurred in considerable part from capital which would otherwise have been taxed by the federal tax collector.

The issue of decontrol is before Congress and now is being fully debated. However, should Congress act without officially confirming through government sources the extent of the oil and gas, or should it gradually "phase-in" decontrol to cushion the inflationary impact as the nation recovers hopefully from a recession which was substantially the result of price escalation in oil?

In his support for immediate decontrol, I fear that President Ford is the victim of bad advice from advisers whose oil orientation is deeper than their public responsibility. It is incredible to suppose that there can be or should be a free market in a scarce commodity controlled by so few. A free market in oil is an invitation to the oil men of the world and the oil men of America to rip off consumers without review, without audit, without reason. A complete relaxation from review and control would invite economic disaster.

The fact is that the price of oil was controlled for a long time. For 14 years, between 1959 and 1973, the American oil industry limited the importation of foreign oil—which was available in unlimited supplies for as little as 16 cents per barrel—in order to sell American domestic oil at $1.65 per barrel. The oil industry prevailed on President Eisenhower to limit imports to protect the markets of the domestic oil industry from the crushing impact of 16-cent oil from abroad. American consumers were "ripped off" to the tune of $77 billion for the difference in price. I don't remember prominent oil men in those days urging America to use all of the cheap 16-cent-per-barrel oil it could get from abroad and leave American domestic supplies in the ground for future needs. Who in the oil industry was thinking about us in those days, in which it was national policy to use up American domestic supplies as fast as possible?

In 1959 I called President Eisenhower's oil import quota regulation Price Control Order No. 1. For 13 years the price of oil was "rigged" for the benefit of the American oil producer—and his profits. If it was "right" to limit imports and rig oil prices for the American oil producers for 13 years, is it "wrong" to extend price control for the benefit of the American consumer for at least a few more years?

We in America, who are now moving into our bicentennial year, rejoice in our freedom and our capacity to preserve it. Most of us are descendants of either serfdom or slavery. However, the power of oil in our world threatens the freedom of every American. If a few people can drain us of our earnings and our savings to buy the oil and gasoline we think we must use we will be moving into a new kind of serfdom and slavery.

These circumstances demand that responsible people in government use care and caution in removing government from the arena of oil policy. The survival and economic well-being of our people is at stake. At this time I am unwilling, unprepared and unconvinced that the well-being of our people will be secure in a marketplace of scarcity, cartel and sheer greed.

I am, therefore, unwilling to immediately decontrol oil and gas and submit to the judgment and discretion of the oil industry. While there are occasions in which the public has suffered because of indiscretions on the part of government and those who serve it, there is practically no basis in history to support public confidence in the oil industry. For some it may be a difficult choice. But from my vantage point I would prefer that the federal government maintain a close surveillance and continue controls over an industry that has the capacity to bring the nation and all of its people to their knees and keep them in a state of permanent genuflection.

NO ARMS TO TURKEY

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, a coordinated, energetic drive is being mounted in Congress to repeal the ban on sales of American arms to Turkey. In the past several weeks, this move has gained enormous momentum and endorsements from a variety of quarters. Many reasons, some of them seemingly plausible, have been offered for such an act by Congress. I oppose any move to resume such arms sales to Turkey at this time, and I believe for equally if not more important reasons.

There are certain issues which transcend the convenience and temporary gain offered by advocates of lifting the ban. Turkey, for example, has utilized our weapons, not merely to hold up her end of NATO's responsibilities, but to make war upon another member of NATO; Greece. One year ago, Turkey invaded Cyprus, taking over a large part of the island and displacing several hundred thousand of its Greek inhabitants. Nothing has happened since then to alter the situation, one brought into being by Turkey's unilateral action. Therefore, I see no reason at this time to reward such reckless military adventurism with more U.S. arms. The area is too volatile; to drop the ban on arms sales would only insure that more powder kegs are placed in the already loaded arsenal, one ready for war.

I am not convinced by recent arguments that a lifting of the ban by our country will bring about a negotiated peace settlement. All signs indicate to the contrary. Can the placement of additional military weapons into a country where political infighting suggests no move to enter into peace talks, either at present or in the near future, ever result in a peaceful settlement? Any reasoning to suggest this seems, to me, not only fallacious, but absurd as well.

Another reason which prompts me to oppose such a resumption of arms sales and shipments is the decision on the part of the Turkish Government to allow cultivation of the opium poppy. Despite Congress' acceptance of the bona fides of the Turkish Government to monitor the situation more closely and demonstrate its good faith on the opium question, the opium derived from Turkish crops has continued to end up on the streets of our cities, destroying the lives of our people. There is no doubt in anyone's mind as to the direct connection of this crop and drug-related crime in our cities. We have tried to halt this cultivation in Turkey and the resultant traffic from that country in opium. I sincerely believe that until we witness the complete halt in opium traffic, it would be counterproductive for us to reward such policies with further arms shipments.

There is also the question of simple justice. Turkey has shown no willingness to be flexible in any of the area's described herein. No effort has been made to resolve the worsened situation created by her military actions on Cyprus. Instead, the United States has been warned that we either ship them weapons or stand the chance of losing our military bases. Although I would deplore the loss of such facilities, I know that we should not give in to such open coercion.

As one of the cosponsors of House Resolution 553, expressing the sense of the

House that the ban on military aid to Turkey would not be lifted until Turkish forces are withdrawn from Cyprus and a negotiated settlement arrived at among Greek and Turkish Cypriots, I shall continue to oppose this attempt to resume military assistance.

EQUITY FOR RESERVISTS

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to correct an obvious oversight in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

The pension reform bill created a little noticed inequity which should be remedied. A self-employed businessman who belongs to a Reserve component is, by law, prohibited from having an individual retirement account.

It does not matter that his Reserve pension at age 65 may only be $40 a month, or that his counterpart, who does not belong to the Reserves, may save thousands of dollars a year toward retirement, tax-free.

In the first place, the law is unfair, and unjustly penalizes any self-employed individual who belongs to a Reserve unit.

In the second place, such a law will make the Reserve forces less attractive, and may in fact force reservists to choose between the Reserve unit and an adequate retirement.

Self-employed individuals make a vital contribution to both our culture and our economy—and to penalize those who are in the Reserve forces for their loyalty, when self-employed Americans are already among the most harassed and regulated members of society, is certainly not equitable.

This legislation would remedy the situation by allowing self-employed reservists to set up individual retirement accounts for any year in which less than 30 days were spent on active duty. These reservists would have to meet all other criteria for eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 was complicated and massive. Not all the implications and ramifications could have been anticipated. But as adverse reactions become apparent, they should be dealt with fairly—and expediently. And that is what I am proposing today—that self-employed reservists get fair treatment from pension reform.

The bill follows:

H.R. 8789

A Bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces will not be disqualified from taking the deduction for retirement savings because of their participation in the Armed Forces retirement system

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (c) of section 219 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions and special rules for retirement savings) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2), no individual shall be treated as being an active participant in any plan described in clause (iv) of subsection (b)(2)(A) for any taxable year solely by reason of being a member of a reserve component (as defined in section 101(27) of title 38, United States Code) of the Armed Forces unless such individual was called to active duty during such taxable year for a period in excess of 30 days."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1975.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, July 20, marked the anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. It has been an entire year since thousands of armed Turkish troops landed on the independent Republic of Cyprus to wrest political control of the northern part of the island from the Cypriots. Turkish destroyers shelled coastal targets, and Turkish jets fired on Cypriot towns and on the Cypriot countryside.

Innocent people were driven from their homes in terror during the bombardment. All of the horrors of destruction and suffering which accompany warfare were in evidence. Forty percent of the island fell to Turkish control during the attack; and to this day, Turkish forces continue to illegally command that portion of the Republic.

There has always been some controversy between Turkey and Greece over Cyprus. Most of its citizens are of Greek origin but it is only 40 miles off the Turkish coast. The Turks apparently did not trust the democratic machinery of the Cypriot Constitution to treat them fairly, so they have militarily intervened there in the name of national defense. This deed created a conflict, not only between the Turks and the Cypriots but between Greece and Turkey. We share a bond with both these countries due to their professed adherence to free world principles like that of national self-determination. In these circumstances, how can we continue to regard both these nations on the same terms? The Turkish breach of our mutual ideologies should not be ignored.

Such activity clearly violates very basic principles of international cooperation which are necessary in order that civilized nations may interact peaceably to the benefit of all peoples. Neither are these principles merely implied concepts which because of their universal application are assumed to be shared by all. The invasion of Cyprus was a transgression of clearly enunciated agreements embodied in the United Nations Charter and that of NATO. Turkey is a member of both organizations. Are the tenets of our international accords so inconsequential that we can allow one party to ignore them if it chooses?

The territorial integrity of an independent republic was violated last year. The Turks claim that they were provoked by Greece into military intervention. Both countries are NATO members and as such have access to numerous diplomatic channels through which to settle disputes. In fact, one of the primary functions of the organization is to peaceably eliminate such friction as may arise between fellow members. Before invading Cyprus, had Turkey exhausted all diplomatic means to settle the controversy?

Eighteenth century conflict-settling tactics cannot be allowed to prevail in this, the 20th century. In a technologically advanced world, alternate means must be employed in coming to terms with differences among national entities. Until militaristic actions such as those employed by the Turks cease to be exhibited, there can be no hope for lasting world peace.

The affront of invasion in violation of the doctrine of national sovereignty has been compounded by the fact that today the Turks are still in Cyprus, and their control is firmly entrenched. The Cypriots have seen their land criminally seized and held. Since the unwelcome landing on the island a year ago, Turkish forces have been responsible for slaughtering hundreds of Cypriots and making refugees of thousands more. As if to emphasize the undisguised nature of the Turkish takeover, they have been settling citizens from Turkey into areas in Cyprus from which Greek Cypriots have been displaced. Naturally, the majority of Cypriots themselves have been opposed to the foreign meddling. Their country was invaded, and almost half of it was taken away from them to virtually become part of a neighboring country.

That such a blatant act of imperialistic aggression could occur in this day and age among what profess to be civilized nations is appalling. That we actually seem to condone the activity by letting the situation exist for so long while we exhibit friendly relations toward the aggressor nation is far sadder. Turkey receives a large amount of U.S. military aid and we know that this aid was used directly in the invasion and is still being used to dominate Cyprus. Unquestionably, a violation of our Foreign Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Acts occurred. These laws explicitly prescribe that American implements of war can only be used for self-defense of the recipient nation. We must acknowledge this infraction and act accordingly.

Political problems cannot be permanently resolved by might and the force of arms. With Turkey's illegal control of Cyprus as an example, how can the world hope to gain confidence in peaceful coexistence? There can never be equitable dealings among the various nations of the world while the threat exists that the more militarily advanced a country is the more heavily its interests will be weighed.

A whole year has passed and Turkey has refused to negotiate a Cypriot solution which would entail her leaving the island. As it now stands, the Turks stilll do not appear to have any intention of

relinquishing their control in the area. The United States cannot allow such situations to continue in existence. Let us persist in our efforts to urge mediation and an equitable resolution of differences. Cyprus must be helped to regain her rightful independence.

VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress will soon be voting on a measure to provide for voter registration by mail. This is a concept which I have long advocated based on my experience as an elections official. However, I do not favor the two bills which have the most visibility, H.R. 1686 and S. 1177. Both bills provide for mass mailing of postcards to all postal patrons in the country, a measure which I contend is expensive and potentially confusing to voters and administrative officials.

I have introduced my own bill on voter registration, H.R. 6079. While it provides for postcard registration, it does not impose the mass mailing of cards. Rather it stipulates that cards, developed by the States, be made widely available for pick up by those who are not alredy registered. In addition, it includes incentives for States and local governments to develop other methods for improved voter registration.

On July 25, 1975, the National Association of Counties—NAC—and the National Association of County Recorders and Clerks—NACRC—adopted a resolution on voter registration by mail. They affirm their support of postcard registration but emphasize their disagreement with H.R. 1686 and S. 1177, for the same reasons which I have indicated. Both organizations stress that they would support a bill which includes voter registration by mail—but not mass mailing of forms—and other incentives for increased voter registration. These exact provisions are contained in my proposal, H.R. 6079.

The text of the resolution follows.

VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NACO MEMBERSHIP

The U.S. Congress is presently considering a measure that would mandate voter registration by mail for federal elections. The bills seek to register voters by mass mailing postcards to all postal patrons in the country.

The National Association of Counties (NACo) and the National Association of County Recorders and Clerks (NACRC) support the overall goal of the legislation which is to achieve maximum voter registration.

NACo remains strongly opposed to S. 1177 (the McGee Bill) and H.R. 1686 which would lead to this desired goal. As local officials facing the day-to-day problems of voter administration and management (999 elections out of 1,000 are non-federal), we maintain that this legislation would result in administrative chaos, voter confusion, voter disenfranchisement and waste.

We could, however, support amendments that would remove the undesirable features of the legislation. For instance, postcards made widely available but not mass mailed could be an effective way to register potential voters. Postcards should be used as a supplement to other proven methods of voter registration.

NACo and NACRC would strongly endorse a bill that would contain the following provisions:

Allow maximum flexibility to state and local government for developing methods to increase not only voter registration numbers but also voter participation rates. This could include registration by mail techniques.

Create a program to provide financial and technical assistance to state and local governments seeking to increase their capability to effectively manage and administer local programs.

Set federal standards that would have to be met in order to qualify for federal, technical and financial assistance.

Provide financial incentives to state and local governments to adopt postcard voter registration as a complement to other methods of registration.

Provide an adequate time-frame for states to adopt a registration by mail (i.e., postcards or affidavits) system.

Therefore, NACo and NACRC oppose S. 1177 and H.R. 1686 unless the Congress enacts voter registration by mail legislation containing the above provisions.

UNEMPLOYMENT: TO KEEP LABOR DISUNITED

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the administration plods along with its ill-fated and misguided economic policy regarding the high level of unemployment in the United States, a growing number of distinguished economists are beginning to recognize the negative side effects of Mr. Ford's policy. One such person is Mr. Frank Riessman, the editor of Social Policy magazine.

In a letter written to the New York Times on July 1, Mr. Riessman astutely observes that the recent layoffs in industries across the entire country have caused conflicts within labor over the seniority system versus affirmative action. Perhaps, as Mr. Riessman infers, that is the intention behind the administration's lack of commitment to a full employment policy for the United States by the end of 1976.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a copy of this letter in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

UNEMPLOYMENT: TO KEEP LABOR DISUNITED

To the Editor:

The largest single increase in the Federal budget this year was for unemployment insurance. Annual payments are now estimated at over $20-billion. In addition, the recent tax cut cost $22 billion. This total alone ($42 billion) could easily provide five million jobs in needed areas of work such as health, transportation, education, environmental conservation. Moreover, the workers thus employed would pay taxes and purchase goods, with the multiplier effect extending the benefits far beyond the initial input. Unemployment insurance, on the other hand, produces no services or goods.

A recent Congressional Research Service study reports that it would be possible to reach a level of 3 per cent unemployment by the end of 1976. The net cost of this program at the end of the first year, after taking into account returns to the Government in income and Social Security taxes, as well as reduced unemployment insurance payments, would be only $8.1-billion. Moreover, for every one million jobs lost, the Government loses $16 billion in revenue—$2 million in unemployment insurance payments and $14 billion in taxes. Surely job creation is less costly. Why is it not the favored method of dealing with the current economic crisis? Why is full employment rejected as being too costly, when in essence far more expensive programs are being accepted? Why is the economy being deprived of the goods and services that would be produced by full employment?

Some argue that full employment would produce huge Federal deficits, which are in turn inflationary. Actually, the data indicate that the deficits arising from unemployment seem to be at least as great as those that would be incurred if we moved toward 3 per cent unemployment and a full employment economy.

There must be some other reason. There must be something about unemployment that is important enough to the Administration to make various income transfer payments, such as unemployment insurance, welfare, food stamps and health insurance, attractive to conservative politicians.

George Meany, in a recent speech, suggested that the Administration prefers unemployment because it keeps labor weak and wages down, and it "disciplines the work force." No longer do we hear people talking about the quality of work, as they did in the sixties. Instead, massive layoffs have caused conflicts within labor over the seniority system versus affirmative action.

Perhaps it is not the cost of full employment that is decisive but rather that unemployment keeps the work force disunited and quiet. The Administration would rather pay for this than for jobs.

FRANK RIESSMAN,
Editor, Social Policy.

NEW YORK, *July 1, 1975.*

BEARING THE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently concerning the cost of operating Congress and, in particular, the Member's allowance system.

Unfortunately, discussion of the issues involved has tended to generate more heat than light. Rhetoric often is directed against "congressional extravagance," while essential questions about the capacity of Congress to meet increasing legislative and constituent demands are neglected.

Also overlooked in the debate are the alternatives to public support of the costs of representative Government: decreased congressional services or the election of Members who must either rely upon their personal fortunes or solicit private contributions to pay their expenses.

To help place these issues in proper perspective, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial by Chairman

WAYNE L. HAYS of the House Administration Committee, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 18:

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1975]

BEARING THE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

The auto industry has better resources to determine whether a new compact car will sell than the House of Representatives has when deciding on a declaration of war.

If the auto industry wants to find a new color scheme to capture the youth market, it has unlimited resources to call upon. Corporate executives commission expensive marketing surveys. The top brass fly to a secluded resort on the company's fleet of planes for a week of high level meetings until the proper decision is made. The entire extravaganza is at industry expense, which is, of course, passed on to consumers.

When General Motors makes the wrong decision, only money is lost. But if the Congress fails, it can cost millions of lives.

A congressman is confronting issues that affect the well-being of the entire nation, yet in his effort to arrive at the proper decision, his resources are limited.

Recent news accounts about the members' allowance system have been misleading at best. The average reader is led to believe that a member of Congress has a vast wealth of material assets. Yet, there are members of Congress who are forced to pay communication, travel and office expenses from their own pockets because the allowance system is inadequate for their needs.

News accounts have portrayed the allowance system as being personally beneficial to individual members of Congress, yet there are congressmen who cannot do as complete a job of serving the public as they would like because they lack financial resources.

The president of a major cosmetics firm earned enough in salary last year to pay the basic allowance for five congressmen.

The entire House of Representatives runs on an annual budget that is just slightly more than the $233 million Procter and Gamble spent on radio, television, newspaper and magazine advertising during 1973.

While there has been a lot of information bandied about lately concerning the expense of running Congress, the fact is that it costs a mere $1.25 per man, woman and child in this country to operate the House of Representatives for a year.

Taken in proper perspective, the price tag is less than one tenth of one per cent of the entire federal budget.

At the same time, the responsibilities of the Congress have grown. The workload has increased markedly over the past few years. In addition to overseeing an enormous federal bureaucracy, a member of Congress is often the only person that half a million constituents back home can turn to for help.

In its battle to make the executive branch of government more responsive, the Congress remains at a disadvantage. A bureaucrat in any federal agency can call every city in the nation without cost. A member of Congress has limited telephone time.

The executive branch of government operates more than 6,000 computers, while the House of Representatives owns just three.

President Ford requested a staff budget increase of $2.2 million for the coming fiscal year, while a congressman can receive an additional $22,500 for his employees.

On an average day recently, no fewer than 70 congressional committees or subcommittees scheduled meetings on issues ranging from oversight of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget to an investigation of Arab pressure on American businessmen.

The legislative calendar for a typical week will range from the complicated foreign aid appropriations bill to intricate and often confusing tax proposals.

At the same time, a member of Congress is called upon to travel back home and meet with local groups, advise cities on how to obtain federal grants, or assist an elderly constituent in retrieving a lost Social Security check.

It is vital that members of Congress have the tools to be effective legislators and representatives.

There are two schools of thought on how a member of Congress can go about serving his constituency.

The first holds that a congressman bear the full cost of representing his district himself. That is, he must be wealthy enough to pay for his office equipment, stationery, telephone service, trips between the district and Washington, staff and communications with constituents. Or, if he is not of the wealthy class and aspires to be in Congress, he must solicit private contributions to pay for these expenses.

The trouble with requiring a member of Congress to pay personally, however, is that it would surely pave the way for an exclusive club of rich representatives, or worse, open the door for rampant corruption.

The second school of thought, to which I subscribe, holds that the people ought to bear the cost of representative government.

DIFFICULTIES OF WASHINGTON STAR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the role of the newspaper in America, particularly in our Nation's Capital, is a vital one. Our political system works best when citizens have available diverse sources of news and, of course, competitive news philosophies.

This issue is pointed up in the matter of the Washington Star. The Star has been losing money at a staggering rate and its continued existence is in doubt. The Star management proposes to convey control over the newspaper and its sister television and radio facilities to a new owner. Thus the Star will continue, if it continues at all, as a part television, radio and newspaper entity.

To make matters worse, this can only be achieved by bending the Government's regulatory rules. The Federal Communications Commission has a rule that prohibits cross-ownership of broadcast and newspaper facilities in the same market, when the ownership of a major broadcast facility is transferred. Inherent in this policy is the expectation that, over a long period of time, a greater diversity of media ownership will result.

I hope that the FCC does not bend its own rule in this important test case. The policy to encourage a diversity of news ownership is sound. The city of Washington, in particular, needs competing newspapers. If the FCC upholds its rules in this matter the possibility exists that the Star can be bought and operated independently from radio and television outlets.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join with me in insisting that, at the very least, the FCC set this matter down for a full evidentiary hearing. The importance of independent news sources is too vital to be decided without the fullest possible record.

FAIR WARNING TO THE U.N.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kissinger has developed a pattern of using specific audiences to deliver policy statements on positions which our Government is pursuing. Recently, in addressing a gathering in Milwaukee, Wis., he commented on the developments at the United Nations and the U.S. Government's view on its impact on that world body.

In my judgment, it is imperative that the United States take a hard look at the U.N. and that we work to save it from shortsighted and thoughtless members.

This point is very properly made in an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of July 20. The commentary follows:

FAIR WARNING TO THE U.N.

In language strong enough to be heard around the globe, Sec. of State Kissinger has warned that the United States commitment to the United Nations is not indelible. If the UN General Assembly continues to follow the track it took in the last session, Kissinger said in a Milwaukee speech, the countries that need the UN most could "inherit an empty shell."

The meaning was clear. The UN depends heavily on the United States for both financial and moral support. Yet the recent trend has been for the so-called "third world" countries to gang up on the United States at every opportunity and with their numerical majority in the swollen Assembly to push through measures contrary to U.S. interests. Much more of this, Kissinger was saying, and Congress and the American people will be ready to withdraw their support from the UN.

Kissinger was not the first to issue such a warning. At the close of the 1974 Assembly session, U.S. Ambassador John Scali made the same point with his description of third-world tactics as a "tyranny of the majority." Scali's replacement at the UN, Daniel P. Moynihan, has been sounding the same theme both before and since his appointment.

But the Kissinger speech put the undoubted stamp of U.S. policy on opposition to the capricious goings-on in the global body. He referred, without naming names, to the "procedural abuse" that barred South Africa from its Assembly seat in the last session in violation of the terms of the charter; to the expulsion of Israel from some phases of the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and to the fact that the International Labor Organization has also been "heavily politicized."

In the background is the threat of a move this year to expel Israel from the UN via Assembly action, when only the Security Council can legally act on such a matter. Staving off such a move was undoubtedly one of the purposes of the Kissinger speech.

It is true, of course, and Kissinger acknowledged it, that the United States ran things in the UN pretty much its own way in the early days of the organization. Times have changed, and with the membership grown to 138 through decolonization and the appearance of mini-states, the United States can no longer expect to win on every point. But neither does it have to submit to coercion from nations that have been major

beneficiaries of U.S. help when they needed it most.

The American people for the most part still look to the UN as a vital instrument for carrying out global projects of great significance, and as a forum for airing grievances which, if bottled up, could lead to war. But the people are also, as Kissinger so plainly put it, "understandably tired of the inflammatory rhetoric against us, the all-or-nothing stance accompanied by demands for our sacrifice which too frequently dominate the meeting halls of the United Nations."

The message has gone out. The obstreperous bloc should listen.

FLAWS AND FALLACIES OF GUN CONTROL

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the rationale behind the current attempt on the part of some individuals to enact new gun control legislation. The entire issue of firearms is one which is intertwined with emotionalism since crime and shooting deaths are on the increase. It is important to make a distinction between crime control and gun control. We should be concerned with crime control. Gun control will not automatically bring us crime control. It is best that we carefully examine this matter and extract fact from emotion, regardless of the sincerity of most gun control proponents.

First of all, there should not be interference with the Bill of Rights, which provides important constitutional guarantees to every American. The second amendment grants the "right to keep and bear arms." This is an important guarantee in our body of liberties. Our Founding Fathers were aware that the presence of an armed citizenry is a strong deterrent to threats of dictatorship. If we compromise on this issue by restricting the right to own guns for law-abiding citizens, we must be prepared to accept the gradual erosion of our heritage of political freedom.

Dr. Alan Krug of Penn State University recently revealed a study which confirms earlier research by others that shows gun control laws fail to stop criminals from using firearms in theft, murder, and rape. Other examples from throughout the country show clearly that where registration laws exist, the only ones who abide by them are the lawful citizens.

The criminal element has no intention of complying with registration or confiscation laws. It is only the law-abiding citizen who will comply. If we restrict the purchase or possession of guns even in high crime areas, it is the law-abiding citizen residing in these areas not the criminal, who will be at a disadvantage. We were told that with the enactment of the Gun Control Act in 1968 that crime would be reduced. However, crime has increased since that time. The arguments then and now show that it is a mistake to equate gun control with crime control.

If we adopt registration or confiscation of guns, we are being unfair to our many law-abiding citizens. Statistics show that 99.9 percent of all handguns are not used to commit crimes. Yet, some individuals advocate controlling 100 percent of all handguns because abuse occurs with less than 1 percent of handgun owners. This is certainly a case of overreaction to a problem confronting our society.

There has been great concern in recent years over certain governmental agencies maintaining dossiers on individuals. If we adopt a national system of gun registration, there would be a record on each individual because that individual wanted to exercise the constitutional right to own a gun. A system of national registration of guns would interfere with individual liberty and cost us billions of dollars and add another level of bureaucracy at the Federal level. Despite all of this it would still not guarantee us that crime could be reduced.

It is time that we recognize the crime problem for what it really is—a problem of human behavior. It is a mistake to aim laws at people who want firearms and will not abuse them. The legitimate gun owner, who desires a gun for self-protection or for hunting, should not be made the scapegoat for a lack of effective law enforcement in our society. Rather than chisel away at the remaining freedoms of our people, more stringent laws regarding crime in general should be adopted. The use of a firearm in any criminal activity should increase the penalties for the criminal. Those who are repeat performers and use guns in their law-breaking should be dealt with more severely by our legal system. The issue of crime should be dealt with by reviewing laws already in effect, and strengthening the present laws where needed to make them more effective. Proponents of broad gun control legislation seem to forget that the criminal is at fault, not the average, law-abiding American gun owner. Our laws should be directed to controlling criminal behavior, not all behavior.

I strongly oppose the Federal Government interfering with the constitutional rights of the ordinary citizen to own a gun. It is essential that we preserve the freedom of our citizens while at the same time adopting laws which will control the criminal. Gun control would impose a burden on the citizen not the criminal. Congress should thoroughly consider the issue before adopting broad restrictions on the ownership of guns.

COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SPECIAL MINIMUM BENEFICIARIES

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide cost of living adjustments for special minimum beneficiaries under the social security program.

The special minimum benefit was enacted in 1972 in order to provide a more equitable system of benefits for these who have worked in covered employment for a long period of time, but at low pay. Under special minimum, benefits are computed by multiplying $9 by an individual's covered social security employment above 10 years but not greater than 30 years, rather than by income. To compute benefits for these individuals based on average earnings represented a gross injustice because their benefit levels did not reflect their contributions to the social security system. The special minimum benefit compensates individuals for their years of input to social security.

The program is a sound one. It is not a giveaway program. Recipients of special minimum, like other social security recipients, deserve benefits at least commensurate with their contributions. Currently, special minimum provides necessary assistance for individuals who would have otherwise been denied adequate benefits.

But there is an urgent need to perfect this measure. The bill that I am introducing is designed to make two important improvements. First, it would extend the automatic cost-of-living adjustment mechanism to special minimum payments.

When this provision was adopted in 1972, it was decided not to apply the automatic escalator mechanism to this measure, essentially for two reasons:

Additional time was needed to obtain information about these beneficiaries to determine whether there was, in fact, a clear-cut need to increase their payments when prices rise; and

SSI did not have a cost-of-living adjustment mechanism.

These reasons, however, are no longer applicable today. Quite to the contrary, the 12.2 percent increase in living costs during 1974—the steepest jump since 1946—provides very compelling reasons to extend the cost-of-living provision to special minimum beneficiaries.

Today the vast majority of retirees under Federal income maintenance programs have built-in protection against inflationary pressures. More than 30 million social security beneficiaries will receive a cost-of-living increase in July. Moreover, the SSI program now has an automatic escalator provision with the enactment of Public Law 93-368. Additionally, proposals are being advanced to extend similar protection for railroad retirees and VA pensioners.

There is no reason why special minimum recipients should be deprived of protection against increases in the cost of living in the same fashion. Surely they are no less deserving than other social security beneficiaries. In fact, they may be in greater need of this protection because they are ordinarily struggling on very limited incomes. They typically depend upon their special minimum payments for their primary source of income. In some cases these benefits are an aged person's sole source of support.

More than 120,000 persons now receive

special minimum payments. For retired workers who receive these benefits, the average monthly payment is $159. This contrasts with the average monthly benefit of $188 for all retired workers under social security.

Second, this bill would correct an inequity concerning the application of last year's two-step, 11-percent increase for special minimum beneficiaries.

This proposal would, in effect, pass on the second stage of last year's social security increase to these individuals. This would occur simultaneously with the provision to make the automatic cost-of-living adjustment mechanism applicable for special minimum beneficiaries, effective for June 1975.

I share the concern of Senator CHURCH, who is sponsoring this bill in the Senate, over the vital need for cost-of-living increases in special minimum social security benefits, and I am proud to join him by introducing this important legislation in the House of Representatives. Surely we owe our constituents and all the elderly in the special minimum category speedy action on this important proposal.

SLAUGHTER CONTINUES ON ANTIQUATED ROADS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Americans living in concrete-covered urban areas must hold a special detachment for freeways—those four-, six-, or even eight-lane slabs stretching from one end of most cities to the other, and all points in between. These super roads have become a source of frustration to most urban dwellers, seemingly as if with freeways come traffic snarls, air pollution, and frayed nerves. However, without them, as the saying goes, "you could not get from here to there."

But most important, Mr. Speaker—with modern freeways come traffic safety and saved lives. The people living in my primarily rural congressional district would welcome with open arms some of these "unwanted" urban super roads, because they know all too well that these roads are more than twice as safe as the 1920 vintage roads on which they must drive—and they do not have a choice, as do most city folks who can use public mass transit.

To illustrate this alarming but factual point, I am inserting in the RECORD the official Federal Highway Administration motor vehicle mileage fatality rates for the year 1973 through May 1975—the most recent data available.

This table makes my point painfully clear. If you travel in rural America, the chance of being killed on the highway is almost three times as great as urban travel. If you visit the beautiful countryside of my central Pennsylvania district, I urge you to wear your seat belts—at the height of the Vietnam war, 8 boys in my district were killed in combat while 211 people were killed on our highways. One might say it was 26 times safer to fight in Vietnam than drive on our roads.

If the highway trust fund is destroyed, antiquated roads will not be improved, and the highway slaughter will continue. America needs the highway trust fund.

MOTOR VEHICLE MILEAGE FATALITY RATE [1]

	1973		1974		1975	
	Rural [2]	Urban [3]	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
January	6.16	2.43	4.99	1.97	4.74	2.17
February	5.87	2.24	4.78	1.88	4.76	2.02
March	6.25	2.40	4.96	1.93	4.76	2.11
April	6.32	2.45	5.02	2.06	4.58	2.33
May	6.32	2.52	5.00	2.07	5.14	2.16
June	6.62	2.62	5.58	2.09		
July	6.29	2.50	5.36	2.09		
August	6.41	2.32	5.42	2.23		
September	7.02	2.39	5.92	2.27		
October	7.05	2.69	5.98	2.27		
November	6.57	2.44	5.97	2.58		
December	6.20	2.40	5.48	2.42		
Annual rate	6.28	2.61	5.29	2.31	4.81	2.16

[1] Fatalities per 100,000,000 vehicle miles for all motor vehicles, as reported by Federal Highway administration, July 18, 1975.

[2] Rural—Less than 5,000 population.

[3] Urban—5,000 and more population.

THE FDA AND CARCINOGENS: A WOMAN'S CONCERNS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, each year an estimated 90,000 women discover they have cancer of the breast; and yet, medication which has been shown experimentally to possess carcinogenic properties continues to be openly marketed and prescribed. Muriel Nellis, a coordinator for the 1975 National Drug Abuse Conference, terms the prevalent use of these carcinogens the result of "a myopic attitude" on the part of the Food and Drug Administration. In an article appearing in Engage/Social Action, Ms. Nellis explores this subject in detail. So that my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may have the benefit of her analysis, I include her article "Women Are an Endangered Species" at this point:

WOMEN ARE AN ENDANGERED SPECIES

(By Muriel Nellis)

Beginning in the first Nixon administration a clarion call was heard throughout the country proclaiming a national "Crusade Against Cancer." This program was signified by a massive public service television campaign which, by repeating endlessly available statistics that one in four of us would die of this scourge, urged Americans to make financial contributions and undergo self-examination.

Implicit in this orchestrated effort were several messages: this plague was skulking among us all as a non-respector of persons and currently unconquerable; awareness and preventive pursuit of such treatment as the limited state-of-the-art would provide might permit some of us to survive; and finally, that our partners-in-concern for the protection of our lives was and is the Federal Government.[1] Such statements of purpose that simultaneously evoked fear and support also raised expectations and inquiry. That is when beneficent premises began to crumble and our continuing fears challenged the consistencies that emerged between rhetoric and action.

WHAT SORT OF SOPHISTRY?

What sort of sophistry is it that urges the estimated 90,000 American women forecasted each year to discover breast cancer to find satisfaction in assuming the responsibility for that discovery—when they are simultaneously aware of the increasing numbers of eminent scientists decrying the mastectomy, the current treatment-of-choice, as "too routine"?[2] What sort of preventive medical process is that? Who dispenses such advice and therapy? Are these the same professionals who once swore "to first do no harm"?

They are the same people who continue to prescribe the use of the drug Metronidazole (Flagl) to more than *two million women* annually for the treatment of a localized vaginal irritation.[3] This drug, in an avalanche of reports, has been causally linked with breast tumors, mutations, birth defects, and stillbirths.[4]

These are the same medical authorities through whose auspicies the pharmaceutical manufacturers huckster expedient, if not fully efficacious, birth-control pills, abortion-prevention medications, and morning-after pills and injections. The one common ingredient in each of these prescriptions is estrogen, a vital hormone that remains undisputedly contra-indicated for any woman whose condition or family history suggests a possibility of mammary tumors or cancer.

Animal laboratory tests have indicated estrogen as the likely promoter of carcinogens in a variety of organs including breast, uterus, and ovaries. Moreover, recorded human tragedy sharpens the spectre of the irreversible contamination of hormone-based treatment, as evidence in 1971 emerged that led to the identification of 100 cases of cervical cancer in the daughters of those women who were given DES during pregnancy, ten to twenty years earlier.[5]

These practitioners of the art of healing have sought to treat the effects of hypertension and high blood pressure in about *3½ million current* patients with a drug called reserpine. This substance—the original tranquilizer—has been found in several recently published studies to more than treble the risk of breast cancer in women exposed to its use.[6]

A further exposition of the carcinogenic properties of the many prescribed medications that are currently being marketed for the alleviation of the broad spectrum of physiological or psychological symptoms of women would only serve to reinforce our

Footnotes at end of article.

well-founded anxieties. Moreover, condemnation of the use of these chemicals in prescriptions alone would be insufficient. If only that was done, a simple remedy for cancer contamination might appear to be found in patients abstaining from the use of these and similar substances and the villainy laid to the medical profession alone. But such a conclusion would deny the concomitant responsibility of both the source of supply and its supervision. Consider then, the activities of that other component partner-in-health, the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA has been vested with the authority and responsibility to protect the citizens of this nation from unsafe, useless, or contaminated chemicals, foods or other ostensibly therapeutic devices or substances. FDA's mandate is clearly enunciated in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and subsequent amendments, including the so-called "Delaney Clause." [7] This amendment is of particular importance to us in this context because its language intended that, in the absence of positive proof to the contrary, no substance containing any carcinogenic properties may be approved for human consumption or application, either directly or indirectly through food intake.

Nevertheless, over the years, FDA, the guardian of the nation's health, has not only approved various drugs to which earlier reference was made, but has permitted ten different natural or synthetic sex hormones to be used in the production of food animals, for growth promotion, and industry efficiency. DES is but one of several used that are identified as belonging to the cancer-suspect estrogen variety.[8]

The charge that the FDA is constantly using its "rule-making" powers to defy Congress and the legislative intent of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, is often countered by an appeal, usually publicly made by FDA leaders, for a more reasonable understanding of insufficient statistics and frequently accompanied by an arbitrary, interpretive leap-of-logic that is referred to as a policy of "benefit-to-risk." [9]

Aside from the fact that the binding regulations on the FDA do not support such theories, consider the impact of such an operational philosophy on the lives of women. Consider the cavalier reasoning which, in spite of public and private admissions of relative ignorance of the specific nature, substances, or measures of the precursors of breast, ovarian, cervical, or vaginal cancer, chooses to understate, not only the potential threat of specific medications, but appears to evince no interest in the need for an emergency review of the likely *cumulative* effect of the many individually approved tolerance-levels of ingested carcinogens, particularly on women and their progeny.

This myopic attitude persists, despite clear imperative signals at judicial, scientific, and congressional levels.

In a precedent-setting case,[10] the Court of Appeals noted in a 1972 decision that: ". . . the record also shows that it may take many years, as much as the greater part of a lifespan, for a carcinogen to produce a detectable cancer, and that the quantity of DES required to cause a cancer is presently unknown. All that is positively known is that there is a definite connection between DES and cancer. Furthermore, it was shown that prolonged exposure to even small amounts of carcinogenic substances is more dangerous than short-term exposure to the same or even larger quantities." [11]

More recently, in an effective effort to forestall the imminent approval of yet another birth-control drug, Congressman Fountain of North Carolina said, in an October 1974 letter to Secretary Weinberger, ". . . with the number of new cancer cases and the cancer mortality rate continuing to rise each year, I believe the greatest possible caution must be exercised in considering whether women should be exposed to still another proven carcinogen." [12]

Even now, USDA continues to report DES residues in beef cattle.[13]

Red Dye No. 2, which has been on "provisional" status since 1960 and has been under review since 1971—as a result of charges of that additive's potential cause of cancer and fetal damage—remains the most widely used food coloring in an estimated $10 billion worth of products last year.[14]

Representatives of the AMA continue to oppose legislation designed to impose restrictions on the promotional practices of drug companies and to provide the government with stronger tools by which the inappropriate prescription of drugs may be regulated, insisting that American physicians are knowledgeable with respect to good therapeutic practice.[15]

In March 1973 the National Council of Churches noted among its findings and conclusions of the "Project on Drug Advertising" ". . . Drugs have been extensively promoted to the public and physicians for uses beyond those that are medically indicated . . ," and that " . . . this widespread practice has contributed to . . . inappropriate prescribing of some drugs by physicians."

SURVIVAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The purpose of this article is neither to allay anxiety, nor merely to identify some of the major incongruities affecting the medical treatment of women. My interest is in raising the survival-consciousness of women. It is intended to inspire something other than supine reliance on the sufficiency of the current standards and procedures of a federal agency that has been continually found remiss by Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States.[16]

It is meant to motivate deeper questioning and oversight of physicians who, trusting to their limited sources of information and pharmacological education, prescribe one available therapy or another. Constructive changes in the Congress and through local initiatives are needed.

Such remedies might include:

1. A review of the existing laws governing the Food and Drug Administration, with special attention to the need for a drug to be proven "effective" and "safe" for the long clinical run, rather than for the immediate chemical duration of application purposes.

2. An intensive basic research project, established for the purpose of determining the degree of retention of carcinogenic substances in the body, its systems and organs, and the results of interaction with additional medications or foods containing measurable amounts ingested either simultaneously or sequentially.

3. New personnel requirements for the FDA, which would prohibit the employment of senior administrators whose major prior experience had been with an industry that is regulated by the Administration, and further, imposing a five-year moratorium on such industry employment upon leaving the regulatory agency.

4. The imposition of new criteria for certification of practicing physicians that would require a minimum two-year course of study in clinical pharmacology at an accredited medical college and/or a comparable course of study in continuing education programs to assure currency.

5. A congressional investigation of the investment portfolios of ostensibly non-profit national and local medical societies and associations, in order to determine whether and to what degree investments in various industries, which are indigenous to the practice of its membership-constituency, may be in conflict with ethical standards or the public interest.

6. A revitalization of the "Delaney Clause," relevant to harmful food additives and a similar statement of urgent purpose applied to the procedures that relate to other human chemical therapies, including the added expediency of injunctive powers; thereby diminishing human experimentation as the basis for statistical substantiation.

Until the time arrives when women join together in a *coalition-for-survival*, arising with intelligent indignation, to give the lie to patronizing suggestions that detection-after-the-fact is a viable prognosis for a life-saving crusade against cancer; until there is action taken that grows out of the certain truth that as women pursue their medical and nutritional needs they jeopardize their existence; until such time, women continue to be an endangered species!

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Public Health Services Act; National Cancer Act of 1971* (P.L. 92–218), as amended July 23, 1973 (P.L. 93–352).

[2] *Washington Star-News*, Nov. 1974; Mastecomy called too 'routine' ", by Judith Randall.

[3] *National Drug and Therapeutic Index*, 1972, Lea, Inc., p. 1277.

[4] *Washington Post*, October 1974: "Disclosure of New Findings Relating to the Drug Metronidazole" by Morton Mintz.

[5] *Cancer Research*, Vol. 23, p. 1503; 1963. *DES Congressional Hearings*, No. 1971, p. 8, p. 62, p. 33; House of Representatives, 91st Congress. ("We do not have enough data or knowledge at the present time to say what the smallest dose or the shortest duration of exposure to this drug is that could cause trouble." Dr. Roy Hertz, Rockefeller University and Dr. Mort Lipsett, N.I.H. [experts in hormonal cancer] . . . "the best available information suggests that all estrogens given at comparable doses for comparable periods of time as DES would cause the same carcinogenic effects." "Addition to any artificial estrogen beyond the natural estrogen produced in the body disturbs a natural balance which . . . is precarious [and] . . . one in 16 women will develop breast cancer . . . [Hertz]. "The amount of DES given daily as a Morning-After pill is about 500 times that produced daily in the body." [Lipsett]; *N.I.H. Center for Population Research*, Dec. 1972, report by HRG: "Most university health services are giving the Morning-After Pill." See. f.n. 8.

[6] *Washington Post*, Sept. 1974, "Three Studies on a Cancer Threat," by Stuart Auerback; (3 reports in the British Medical Journal, *Lancet*, and results of Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program, " . . . which compared the history of drug use of patients with breast cancer against the past drug use of non-cancer patients, more than three times as many breast cancer patients had taken reserpine than non-cancer patients."

[7] *"Report to the Congress"—Assessment of the Food and Drug Administrations Handling of Reports on Adverse Reactions from the Use of Drugs*, March 7, 1974, by the Comptroller General of the United States; ("FDA is responsible, under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act [F.D. & C Act], as amended [21 USC 355], for insuring that drugs in interstate commerce are safe and effective: "FDA is responsible for monitoring drugs to identify adverse reactions and, when warranted, taking regulatory action to protect the public." ". . . the system has not been adequately used for its intended purpose." ". . . it has not taken timely action." "The monitoring unit does not receive all adverse reaction information available to FDA nor does it attempt to collect it." ". . . the monitoring unit does not furnish to the regulatory divisions all the information it has on adverse reactions, even when the information is specifically requested." However, since Dec. '72 . . . ". . . will provide information only when requested . . . and only provide numerical information."

FDA's Drug Regulation has not been entirely effective, because its adverse drug reaction reporting system . . . intended to assist in regulating drugs is inadequate for that purpose.")

[8] *"Regulations of Diethylstilbestrol (DES) and Other Drugs Used in Food Producing Animals"*—12th Report by the Committee on Government Operations, Dec. 10, 1973 (House Report No. 93–708); 93rd Congress; (". . . the Delaney Clause . . . was intended to protect the public from the possible hazards of consuming carcinogenic [that is, cancer-inducing] chemicals. ". . . the Delaney Clause prohibited FDA approval of any food additive use "if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animals, or if it is found, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of safety of food additives, to induce cancer in man or animal." . . . "FDA regulation of [DES] for use as a drug in animal feed was inadequate because of errors in judgment and deficiencies in administration." "FDA was tardy in warning physicians that the use of DES during pregnancy is unsafe". "FDA made regulatory decisions concerning DES use in pregnancy on the basis of alleged analysis for which no records exist." "Current FDA policy concerning the danger from low levels of carcinogens in the food supply and environment is weaker than longstanding FDA and HEW policy and the recommendations of the 1970 advisory committee to the Surgeon General." "FDA has excessively delayed regulatory decisions concerning some widely used animal feed drugs of questionable safety.")

[9] *Address of Alexander M. Schmidt, M.D.,—Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration; before the AAAS Symposium on Food Additives, Beneficial or Deleterious;* Feb. 25, 1974, San Francisco, Calif.; ("In FDA decisions, as in all aspects of human endeavor . . . accept the probability of nonexistence of absolute safety. We usually make our regulatory judgments based on an ACCOMMODATION between benefits and risks."

[10] *Bell* v. *Goddard,* 366 F. 2d 177 (CA 7, 1966).

[11] Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Case No. 72–1864.

[12] *Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1974;* "New Birth Control Drug May Be Linked to Cancer," by Morton Mintz.

[13] *Associated Press* release to *Washington Star-News,* Dec. 31, 1974, "DES Residues in Beef Cattle."

[14] *Washington Post,* Nov. 1, 1974; "Red Dye No. 2 Under Attack by Nader Health Research Group", by William Rice.

[15] *Washington Star-News,* Oct. 1974, "Prescription Drug Deaths Minimized".

[16] See also Footnotes 7 and 8.

(NOTE.—The author is a special Consultant to the Office of Drug & Alcohol Concerns, United Methodist Division of General Welfare; Project Editor of the Nat'l Institute of Mental Health's "Resource Book for Drug Abuse Education", 2nd. edition; member, Administrative Law Associate, American Bar Association; Mid-Atlantic Regional Coordinator, 1975 National Drug Abuse Conference.)

FRANCINE MORRISON DAY TO BE OBSERVED IN FORT WORTH

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, August 10, 1975, will be a very special day for the city of Fort Worth and one of its finest citizens. Francine Morrison Day will be observed on the occasion of this superlative singer's 25th year as a resident of Fort Worth.

Francine Morrison came to Fort Worth on Christmas Day, 1950, from Paris, Tex. We did not fully realize then how precious that Christmas gift from Paris to Fort Worth really was.

Over the past 25 years Francine has thrilled the hearts of people all over the world with her beautiful, God-given voice. Her spiritual and patriotic message in song has been heard throughout Europe and the Holy Land and in the Soviet Union.

Francine sings only spirituals, hymns and patriotic songs. "When she sings 'God Bless America,' you know you have been sung to," exclaims Mr. Don Woodard, a prominent Fort Worth civic leader.

The list of Mrs. Morrison's appearances and honors is long indeed. She has sung for gubernatorial inauguration ceremonies and in 1969 she sang at the celebration in Fort Worth honoring Apollo astronaut Alan Bean and his fellow space travelers. Also in 1969, she was honored by the Press Club of Fort Worth which named her Female Newsmaker of the Year—the first black to receive that award.

Last year, at the invitation of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, she sang before an audience at the L.B.J. Library at a meeting of Gov. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER'S Commission on Critical Choices for America. Again this year, Mrs. Johnson invited Francine to sing for a meeting sponsored by the Texas Bicentennial Commission.

Francine's love for her God, her country, and her community is an inspiration to us all. She is to be commended for her work as a "singing ambassador" for the United States. I feel certain that the good will resulting from her appearances will last for years to come.

I join the citizens of Fort Worth in expressing appreciation to Francine Morrison for all she has done for us. It is my hope that in the future her message in song will be heard by thousands more.

VOLUNTEERS FOREGO HOLIDAY, CONSTRUCT PLAYGROUND

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, all too often the only news to which we are exposed is the reporting of disasters, of human suffering of conflict. The real cooperation, the sharing and the good will which are so much a part of our daily lives is generally considered too commonplace to be "newsworthy." Because of this, I feel an obligation to bring to the attention of my colleagues one small example of community action and innovativeness.

Over Memorial Day weekend, military personnel stationed at Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa., volunteered their weekend to work with the parents and teachers of Richland Elementary School students to construct an experimental playground. The plans drawn up previously by planner Paul Hogan of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs called for the utilization of castoff materials such as worn tires, railroad ties, and cable wheels. The servicemen and area businessmen contributed their time, muscle and machinery to help realize this plan, while the parent-teacher organization coordinated the project and provided food for the 2-day affair.

Following is the article which appeared in the Allentown Morning Call on May 27:

VOLUNTEERS FOREGO HOLIDAY, TOTS HAVE NEW PLAYLOT

(By Sonya Sharp)

It was a study in cooperation. The end result has people in the Quakertown area smiling.

It's for kids—whatever their age—and they love it.

The Richland Elementary School, in particular, and the Quakertown area, in general, became richer by an experimental playground over the weekend, thanks to a massive effort by a peace-time military unit under a new directive, local developers and commercial establishments, as well as parents and citizens who provided the bulk of work in 90-degree heat, the equipment and raw materials to build an obstacle course playground at the rear of the school.

Teacher-parent Organization President Noel DeSusa, who is also a teacher at the school, called the cooperation "a good thing, with economic conditions as they are."

He pointed out "We're getting thousands of dollars worth of work done here for $100 worth of food."

The TPO provided food and beverages for the workers for two days. The crowds of helpers at one point swelled to 150. Willow Grove Naval Air Base, commanded by Capt. J. G. McDonald, sent 37 men. They represented the Navy Seabees, Army, Marines and Air Force. With them came a considerable amount of Navy, Army and Air Force heavy equipment on loan for the weekend to do the heavy work on the project.

It all came about because of A1C. Jeff Johnson, an aviation storekeeper at the Willow Grove base. Johnson lives in Richland Meadows Mobile Home Park in Richland Township and has a daughter Lauren, age 6, in kindergarten at the Richland School. He saw an opportunity because of a new Navy directive which says the Navy may be involved in civilian youth projects. Each serviceman who participates will have notation made on his permanent record which will be reviewed at the time promotions are handed out.

Johnson had heard of proposals by elementary physical education instructor Jane Stover and others to get an experimental playground for the community that provides options for the youngster and invites the child to use his imagination.

The hope was to get internationally-known master playground planner Paul Hogan to design the project. Hogan was invited to talk to Quakertown Borough Council last year, which he did, and, at the same time, looked over Memorial Park in the borough as a site

for such a playground. He found a suitable site close to the wading pool area. The area was to get the parents and other local citizens to build the playground in a day with cast-off materials no longer usable in the adult world. But for some reason, that project has been stalled.

So, Johnson talked to Mrs. Stover and Michael Hertsko, principal at the school, who is also a Quakertown Borough councilman.

The teacher-parent organization came up with $200, then the school board followed with a matching $250 and the federal government came through with $500, working through Bucks County Intermediate Unit. That kicked it off.

Hogan planned the project without charge as part of his duties as playground designer for the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs. He and Johnson came up with a load of telephone poles from a national park service.

Quakertown Mayor Philip Richter heard about the project and provided a truck so a local policeman, who has children in the school, could drive to Ivyland to pickup a load of used tires. These were planted over the weekend on the playground and became a squishly, zig-zag walking wall. Other large tires were planted to crawl through to give the youngsters the crawling experience.

The high school's environmental group contributed some railroad ties that the military rapidly turned into a bridge. A huge dirt hill was already there, but Hogan put it to better use. A wide, stainless steel slide in two sections was stretched down the east side. The steel had to be purchased, but the plastic tubing installed on the sides of the slide was contributed by Willow Grove Plumbing & Heating Supply Co.

The kids get to the top of the hill by walking up an old coal conveyor belt donated by Quakertown Borough. Workers removed the metal rods on Saturday, leaving the rubber belt a smooth, flat, slip-free surface.

The youngster who wants to walk up the other side of the hill may do so—up over a swinging bridge made from a planted cable reel and a length of the conveyor belt stretched loosely to almost the top of the hill. Or, he has another option. Coming off the hill, he finds a telephone pole jutting out at an angle and braced about three feet off the ground. After the balancing act to walk the pole, it's just a hop from the bridge, which leads to the climbing area. A 15-foot high bright yellow climbing net (which had to be purchased) is stretched over a telephone pole frame, which also holds a heavy swinging and climbing rope.

Another alternative to getting to the climbing area is walking first a wooden peg path at alternating heights, then onto secured cable reels, then still higher on planted lengths of telephone poles. There is also a wall of boulders to walk. The volunteers found these took some doing to plant. An entranceway to the playground is made of boulders. The boulders were brought in by local contractor Ray Breiner, who had a problem unloading them because they stuck on the tailgate lifting the front of the truck high into the air. He used a claw to rectify the problem.

Richland Meadows Mobile Home Park donated use of a 10-wheel dump truck and a front-end loader as well as a tag-along trailer.

Quakertown developer Peter DePaul donated enough topsoil from his new development, Quakers Green, to build one soccer and two baseball fields.

Heresko explained the school district has had trouble draining the north area behind the school. The playground is located in the much dryer south side. A grader was donated by DePaul to level the area. He also provided several dump trucks to haul some of the topsoil.

The Navy came up with four heavy trucks and four pieces of earth-moving equipment. There was also an Army three-quarter-ton truck and an Air Force 2½-ton truck.

The naval contingent senior man in charge was Johnson; the Army sent Sgt. Charles Freeman, USA National Guard, Co. C., Doylestown; the Marines, Stephen Okruhlica, Marine Air Detachment, Group 7; the Seabees, Edward Worley, builder first class, all of Willow Grove Naval Air Station.

Heresko explained grading of the soccer and baseball fields is not finished. Johnson plans to wait until Wednesday when this area is expected to be dry, then he will return with five men from the Willow Grove base to complete spreading the topsoil.

Following that, Johnson explained, the job will be turned over to high school students and senior citizens who have volunteered to complete raking of the area and planting of grass seed.

Heresko commented yesterday:

"This project should be dedicated to the people who helped create it, particularly the people from Willow Grove Naval Air Station. Without them it couldn't have been done, and we're grateful for the parents who stood there and cooked for these men for two days."

He pointed out the project is not really limited to school activity, saying:

"We also were thinking of the people who live in this area where there is nothing there for them in the way of recreation."

Ms. Stover, who is Quakertown Borough's summer recreation director, asked the media to "send a real thank you to all those people who helped show kids that they really care about the things kids know are important."

1975 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to present the results of my 13th annual public opinion poll conducted over the past several months in the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina. A questionnaire was distributed to every household in the district, and I am pleased to say that the response this year was enthusiastic. Over 17,300 constituents responded to the poll.

This year's poll included six questions and covered the issues of energy policy, food contributions to other nations, voter registration and Federal handgun control. Since the questions were designed to cover subjects foremost in the minds of the American public and the Congress, three of the six questions sought opinions from my constituents on energy policy.

Question 2 offered respondents a choice among several alternatives for reducing fuel consumption. The great majority of my constituents favored the alternative that would impose the least governmental control over fuel prices and supply. Many of those responding wrote in a fifth alternative—to completely deregulate fuel prices. Less than 15 percent favored any form of increased fuel tax and only 20 percent supported gasoline rationing. I agree with the sentiment expressed by the majority of these responding. I have been a strong proponent of gradual deregulation of fuel prices, and I have voted against higher taxes on gasoline. To increase domestic energy supplies and availability, I have sponsored legislation that would alleviate our present energy shortages by allowing the free market mechanism to operate as much as possible. I have also proposed several measures to increase short-run supply of natural gas. Legislation to establish a windfall profits tax on oil companies is also needed.

The response to questions 3 and 4 indicates that those answering are concerned about energy conservation. By a 3-to-1 margin, they indicated they were in favor of measures to conserve fuel by achieving better gasoline mileage and by purchasing home appliances that minimize the use of energy.

Two more questions drew equally resounding responses. Question 1 dealt with foreign aid policy and question 5 dealt with voter registration. Three-fourths of those who responded were against increased U.S. food contributions to other nations. The twin burdens of inflation and recession, I am confident, were factors affecting the responses to this question and justifiably so. H.R. 6972 which I introduced in May of this year would limit food contributions to those nations that make reasonable and productive efforts to control their nation's population growth and thereby reduce the need for continuued American assistance.

The response to question 5 indicated an equally strong response against allowing voter registration by postcard rather than by personal registration.

In contrast to the decisive responses elicited by these issues, the response on question 6 dealing with a Federal bar on the sale of handguns unsuitable for sporting purposes was about equally divided. This is the only question where response based on sex made a significant difference. By narrow margins, men opposed such legislation while women favored it. In an attempt to deal with this problem, I have introduced H.R. 4890 to amend the Federal criminal code. This legislation would penalize persons who use firearms in the commission of a felony by imposing mandatory sentences for a crime committed with the use of a handgun.

Total responses to each question averaged about the same, but significantly higher responses were elicited on energy issues. I believe this reflects my constituents' concern about energy problems. Another interesting observation indicated by the response was that husbands and wives tend to hold basically the same views on the issues. Despite this tendency to agree, there was always a minor degree of overall difference in the percentages.

The views indicated in this poll have proved quite informative and helpful to me as have the polls of the previous 12 years. I would like to thank the thousands of residents of the 10th District of North Carolina for their time and interest in responding. The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

[Figures in percentages]

	Yes	No
1. Would you favor increased U.S. food contributions to starving nations if it meant that Americans would have to pay more for food?		
His	26.6	73.4
Hers	21.8	78.2
Total	24.3	75.7

2. Which of the following suggestions for reducing consumption of petroleum products would you prefer? (Check one) (a) gasoline rationing; (b) higher taxes on gasoline, heating oil, and all petroleum products; (c) higher taxes on gasoline only; (d) a plan to allow purchases of a limited amount of gasoline at normal price, with additional amounts at a higher price?	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
His	15.2	5.7	11.5	67.6
Hers	24.2	3.8	8.9	63.1
Total	20.0	4.5	10.0	65.5

	Yes	No
3. As a way to achieve increased gasoline mileage, would you favor a freeze on today's clean air standards for automobiles and a delay for 5 yr of tougher requirements?		
His	75.7	24.3
Hers	73.3	26.7
Total	74.5	25.5
4. Do you favor legislation requiring labeling of home appliances to show how much energy they use?		
His	74.5	25.5
Hers	73.8	26.2
Total	74.2	25.8
5. Do you favor voter registration by postcard rather than the present requirement to register in person?		
His	28.3	71.7
Hers	29.4	70.6
Total	28.8	71.2
6. Do you favor Federal legislation barring the sale of handguns which are unsuitable for lawful sporting purposes?		
His	48.7	51.3
Hers	54.4	45.6
Total	51.4	48.6

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, SR. RETIRING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, after more than 41 years of service to Ebenezer Baptist Church, the city of Atlanta, and the larger community, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Sr. will retire from the pastorate on July 31. I would like to take this opportunity today to pay tribute to this "giant of a man."

The teachings of Reverend King, like those of his beloved son, envision an America existing in harmony, free of racial prejudice, His method for achieving this ideal is nonviolence. He has held true to this conviction all his life. Even when faced with the tragic deaths of his wife and son at the hands of assassins, he did not succumb to feelings of resentment or hatred. Reverend King would often tell his listeners:

I am not bitter. I carry no ill will in my heart against any man. I shall never stoop low enough to hate anybody. And don't any of you hate either.

Suffering, Reverend King would say, makes a man whole.

For a true understanding of the sources of Reverend King's dedication, strength, and service to community, one must return to the southland of his boyhood, Stockbridge, Ga. Born on December 19, 1899, Reverend King was the oldest of 10 children in a household of sharecroppers. Longtime friends remember him as an industrious and serious young man with a burning desire to become a preacher.

To pursue that end, Reverend King traveled to Atlanta to attend Morehouse College. There, he courted and married Alberta Williams, the daughter of Rev. A. D. Williams, whom he followed, eventually, as the pastor of Ebenezer Church.

Reverend King's ministry was marked by its compelling activism. He was always willing to involve his church in the secular affairs of his congregation and fellow Atlantans. Whether it be community development work, leadership in civil rights boycotts, or as an arbiter in a union dispute, Reverend King brought to his ministry a deep spiritual commitment coupled with an acute awareness of the outside world. Ebenezer Church was never a used-on-Sunday-only monument, but an alive, active participant in the political and social development of the community, indeed, the Nation.

As Reverend King's retirement date approaches, let us all pay tribute to his commitment, faith, and laudable achievements. But more importantly, let us learn from his teachings the great lesson of moral leadership. Rev. Martin Luther King, Sr., thank you.

THE FOOD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1975

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING of Ohio recently introduced H.R. 7620, a bill to establish grants for research endeavors for the purpose of assisting in the development and utilization of new and improved methods of food fertilizer production. I was pleased to be a cosponsor on this legislation, entitled Food Research and Development Act of 1975.

This bill is pending before the Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and will probably be taken up this session.

With regard to this legislation, I asked four professors at Purdue University if they would comment on this legislation. I believe that their letters are informative and analytical and will help everyone in understanding the implications of this legislation. I highly recommend their comments to my colleagues in the House. Their letters are reprinted as follows:

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind., July 15, 1975.

Hon. FLOYD FITHIAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FLOYD: I think your Bill H.R. 7620 is good and that more research in these areas will benefit the U.S. citizens and the World. I support it.

I have the following comments about it:

1—It is sound to include up to 10 percent for foreign use. This is where much applied research is needed if we are to improve the diets of the people of the World. We cannot export enough to feed them over any time period.

2—Much of the research you are calling for includes plant breeding. This is not a short-time type of research. Therefore, you may need to allow for the renewal of certain projects beyond the five years.

3—If many of these changes are brought about in U.S. Agriculture, it will require the active participation of Cooperative Extension. Cooperative Extension is just what the name implies and not a direct-line organization of the Secretary of Agriculture like most of the agencies of the Department. Therefore, you might wish to have on your Committee a representative of the Cooperative Extension Service.

4—I think if you are going to get much fundamental research in the areas outlined in this Bill, you are going to have to contract heavily with the Agricultural Experiment Stations. It might be wise to indicate that a certain proportion of the funds be allocated this way.

This is my belief that both society and Purdue would benefit from such legislation.

Sincerely,

J. CARROLL BOTTUM,
Professor Emeritus.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., July 10, 1975.

Hon. FLOYD J. FITHIAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FLOYD: This is with reference to H.R. 7620, "To establish grants for research endeavors for the purpose of assisting in the development and utilization of new and improved methods of food and fertilizer production."

As you know I have no experience in the administration of research, so I speak as a researcher who first spent almost four years in underdeveloped countries concerned with resource utilization and different institutional structures to enhance basic food production. Since I joined the staff at Purdue, domestic agriculture and resource utilization policy have been the focus of my work, but I believe I am still able to place our domestic concerns in the context of the world food situation.

With agricultural research funding having contracted somewhat in recent years, the research establishment has not picked up new trends and problems as quickly and energetically as many would like. Its very natural that with stable or decreasing resources it is difficult to conduct the constant reassessment of current work which might result in the termination of a portion of this

so resources could be transferred to new problems. It was easier to get on to "new" problems when resources were constantly expanding as they did during much of the 1960's.

With this as a background let me comment on some specific provisions.

As I am sure you recognize, the preamble on page one with respect to world food supplies and the adequacy of production techniques is open to different interpretations and answers. For example; with respect to rice production and consumption (which was my major concern for a number of years in the Far East), I believe we may have some surplus quantities on commercial markets soon, particularly as our vast exports to Vietnam and Cambodia have been terminated. Even if these countries continue to run deficits it may not be our lack of productive capacity that results in areas of malnutrition, but the political unacceptability of bilateral trade or aid. I have far more confidence in mankind's ability to produce food both domestically and around the world than I do in our ability to make sure that available surplusses reach those in need. However, this is not meant as a criticism of the bill; it is on the right track. We do need to concentrate more of our resources in the areas it mentions, but we must not convince ourselves that abundance and productive capacity will automatically solve nutrition problems domestically or internationally.

Page 2, lines 1–6. I believe we are already beginning to make some progress in this area. High grain prices have led to renewed interest in the better utilization of forage and pasture for livestock.

Lines 7–11. Current direct energy inputs into the production of most agricultural commodities are still a relatively small proportion of total costs, as illustrated below:

Input costs and prices received per bushel of corn

Energy input costs:	
1970	$0.05
1974	.09
Difference	.04
Total variable costs:	
1970	$0.44
1974	.73
Difference	.29
Price Received:	
1970	$1.31
1974	2.87
Difference	1.56

Agricultural producers are not going to turn their operations inside out to save a few cents. I believe we are on to some very worthwhile things that we can do to save substantial amounts of energy, but there is going to be no quick or easy fix and incentives for adoption of new technologies will be limited with current energy prices. Our research proposal to the National Science Foundation addresses itself to this concern in a broad context. I have enclosed a very brief summary of this project which may be of interest to you. We still do not know whether it has been funded or not.

Lines 12–14. Again, I think we are already beginning to make a little progress here. For example; our pest control models can substantially reduce pesticide use. I have enclosed a report on one of these, and more work should be very productive.

Section 2(b). No one can argue with this, and we should be doing it if we are not already engaged in such efforts.

Sections 3–17. Given that you want to encourage a shift in the emphasis in research towards the concerns of Sections 1 and 2, it would be nice to do this with the creation of as little new bureaucracy as possible. I don't know whether sections 3 through 17 fill this bill or not. My limited experience would induce me to fight the initial battle with the traditional line agency and require it to make whatever changes Congress might wish rather than set up a parallel structure. The course this bill takes appears to be somewhere in between.

I hope these few comments have been helpful.

Sincerely,

OTTO C. DOERING,
Assistant Professor.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind., July 1, 1975.

Hon. FLOYD FITHIAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FITHIAN: Thank you for sending a copy of H.R. 7620, a Bill to be cited as the "Food Research and Development Act of 1975".

Let me first say that I applaud your intent. It is important that this work be supported. On the other hand, I am highly disappointed in the approach.

There are literally thousands of granting entities in existence in Federal government, in State government, in various foundations, both public and private, and in industry. Each "donates" funds to a public institution like Purdue for the purpose of temporarily bending the University's activities toward its specific aims. This Bill creates one more granting agency in Federal government.

Section 2(b) specifies the purpose but does not define the scope nearly as well as Section 2 of the original Hatch Act of 1887 or Section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. Section 4(a) specifies a 12 member committee who will award temporary grants on the basis of proposals received, whereas; the original Act of 1887 (Sec. 2) appropriately specifies ". . . researches bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States . . . having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States . . .".

The last legislation of this type was PL 89–106 which provided for special competitive grants administered by CSRS, a division of USDA. This year 3.4 million dollars was distributed under PL 89–106 in 5-year grants. Twenty-six out of about 300 proposals were funded. Cost of developing the proposals is estimated at about $300,000 in staff time. Indirect costs to universities is estimated at about 1.1 million which leaves about ⅔ of the appropriation for gainful research. But since these are temporary grants, there is no provision for developing a lasting capability over time which can be directed to new problems as they arise.

This picture is in contrast to the Land-Grant college concept under which agriculture has been brought to its present reasonably high state of efficiency. I would note that the $50,000,000 appropriation suggested in the Act would constitute more than a 50% increase in the Hatch appropriation where it would be used more effectively and efficiently.

I appreciate having this opportunity to comment on H.R. 7620. I am certainly appreciative of your concern for improving our food production capacity. These concerns are exactly parallel to our own, so that the question is not one of whether or not this kind of agricultural research should be supported but rather how it can be done most logically and efficiently.

Very truly yours,

H. H. KRAMER,
Associate Dean.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind., July 17, 1975.

Congressman FLOYD FITHIAN,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FITHIAN: In your letter of June 20, you requested my comment on H.R. 7620. I have read the bill and am pleased that you are directing your attention to this particular area. I am also pleased that you have asked for my comments and analysis of the bill.

Before I get into the bill, I would like to make a few comments which express my view of the world food situation and the U.S. position relative to it. The world is facing a serious shortage of food, primarily in the developing countries. The problems of malnutrition and starvation are likely to continue to grow as population grows at the rate of 2% per year or greater. However, the U.S. has no immediate fear of food shortages. Nor do I think it will in the next 10 to 15 years. The recent food scares in the U.S. which resulted in much higher food costs for consumers were a result of an unusual set of circumstances which I believe are not likely to be repeated. Current crop prospects indicate that this year's harvest will bring prices down significantly. And, as you know, they already dropped substantially from 1974 levels. Attention in the U.S. may again turn to the questions of how to support farm prices and farm incomes.

The foregoing suggests that agricultural techniques plus ongoing research are adequate for producing food supplies for U.S. needs. Further, it suggests for U.S. needs that there is not the interest in shifting away from consumption of grain by livestock in order to make cereals available for direct human consumption. These comments imply that the problem is not primarily one of increasing food supplies, but one of transferring of food to peoples who do not have means of paying for the food. If we can solve the problem of transferring food, then the need for increasing supplies becomes more important.

In the long run, from a world point of view, there is need to increase the supplies of food and do it in such a way as to not place intolerable burdens on the environment. There is also a need for getting better balance between growth in world food supplies and growth in population. I realize that this bill cannot and should not address itself to both the food and population problems, but it does seem futile to me to put all the emphasis on increasing food supplies with the resulting burden this places upon the environment without putting any emphasis on bringing population growth rates under control.

Since the food problem is a world problem and given the U.S. situation, I believe that our country does have a definite role to play in expanding world food supplies. No other country in the world has the research and organizational capability for producing food that we have. This means we can play a significant role as a humanitarian nation and also contribute to expanding world trade in agricultural and other products. Expanded world trade should result in more efficient use of the world's resources.

I believe my comments put the bill in a somewhat different focus. However, I recognize it may have been your and the other sponsors intention to use the focus presented here for strategic purposes.

I do have a few specific comments to make about the bill. This bill sets up an organization for evaluating research proposals and provides for increased funding of agricultural research. To the extent that this would increase funding of agricultural research over a time, the bill would represent a contribution to solution of world food problems. However, I could see that over time, this Act would compete for funds and would be competing against such things as the Hatch Act and other ongoing authorizations for research in the agricultural experiment stations. This could be harmful if it tended to diminish the support which ongoing research now receives. This is particularly true since the way the proposal now reads reseachers would be required to submit project proposals, await evaluations, and receive grants

before doing the work. This would be a less dependable source of funds than some of the current sources of funds, and would make it somewhat more difficult to expand or retain permanent staff for doing the work.

In my opinion, one of the past problems of research which has been sponsored by AID has been its lack of certainty of continuity. For many years, they did not put much emphasis on research. In more recent years, they have shifted toward more funds going to research. But, the problem of certainty of funding continues to plague the organization. It certainly plagues the researcher who is working under such a grant.

Section 15 of the proposed bill is concerned with the impact of the new methods on the economic conditions of small farmers. Given that an evaluation would require at least a two-step process, it appears to me that the 18 months limit written into the bill is too short. It wil take at least a year or so before significant results are available from the study of methods. This would mean there would simply not be time in the 18 month period for any evaluation to be done on the economic conditions of small farmers.

My comments may come across more negatively than I intend. The bill does represent a step in the right direction and to the extent to which it would add funds to agricultural research it would merit the support of many people. It would be a bill which I think you would be proud to have had a part in over the long run.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. JONES,
Associate Professor.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind., July 15, 1975.

Hon. FLOYD FITHIAN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FLOYD: I am in full support of H.R. 7620 which you introduced on the floor of the House. The purposes which the bill are designed to achieve are most worthwhile and timely, and I hope it receives favorable consideration.

I would raise the following points for your consideration:

(1) The kinds of research objectives which appear to be envisioned under the project seem to be rather long run and basic rather than short run and applied. Such an emphasis seems to me to be correct, and it gives rise to two implications:

(a) Often a period of time longer than 5 years is required to achieve fundamental research breakthroughs, in some of the areas mentioned in the bill. I would like to see provision made for some of the research contracts under the bill to run longer than 5 years or be considered for renewal beyond the initial 5 year period.

(b) The types of research called for are the types for which the Agricultural Experiment Stations have a comparative advantage in undertaking. Many of the stations have lines of work under way which would complement the work called for. There is also a tradition of research problem-solving know-how in the stations, along with a research environment, which would contribute to effective use of research resources. I believe it would be wise to earmark a portion of the funds specifically to support and strengthen the work of the Agricultural Experiment Stations in the lines of work mentioned under the bill.

(2) There are a couple of minor points on page 2 concerning emphasis. The implication under paragraph (3) that meat and dairy products in the U.S. should be reduced to free greater amounts of food resources for direct human consumption might be modified. In any country, some combination of livestock products and food directly from plant sources would probably provide greater nutritive potential and abundance than food from plant sources alone. Some feed resources would be wasted entirely without livestock. The question is the appropriate balance between plant and animal products, given a variety of factors which must be taken into account. Relative incomes, prices, preferences and food production costs are always working toward a balance. It might be possible, for example, that a fundamental breakthrough in efficiency of feed production or in livestock nutrition would enable more people to be adequately fed with even more livestock than putting total emphasis on shifting consumption away from meat and dairy products. On the other hand, it could be that the development of high protein grains would lessen the need and place of livestock products in the diet. My point here is that some qualification to the statement as it is now written would seem appropriate.

The other point which might be qualified is under (5) on page 3. The flat statement that "the large amount of chemical now used is having an adverse effect on the environment" seems overstated. There may be areas or situations where this is true. There are probably others where chemicals are neutral or improve the environment.

In summary, the worthy objectives of the bill far outweigh any possible deficiencies. If some modification of the bill is considered, I would emphasize particularly the points I mentioned under (1) above.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to comment.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. FARRIS,
Head of Department.

NEEDED: FOOD STAMP REFORM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with a number of my distinguished colleagues to cosponsor the National Food Stamp Reform Act of 1975.

The food stamp program has been our fastest growing welfare program. It was a program originally designed to dispose of our surplus food by providing this food to low-income Americans at a reduction in normal cost. The method was through the purchase of food stamps which could be redeemed for food enabling low-income people to buy more food at their local stores. A bulletin from the U.S. Department of Agriculture describes the program:

Under the Food Stamp Program a household pays a certain amount for an allotment of food coupons having a greater monetary value. The amount a household pays—called the purchase requirement—is determined on the basis of the household's size and income after certain deductions have been allowed. The purchase requirement represents a reasonable investment on the part of the household, but, by law, may not exceed 30 percent of the household's net income. Households with little or no income receive their food coupons free.

The coupon allotment is based on the cost of the economy food plan which has been developed by the Agricultural Research Service. The coupon allotment is adjusted to reflect changes in the price of food semiannually.

This food stamp program has mushroomed into a program which encompasses not only the low income, but also middle-class Americans including the so-called voluntary poor. This program has been in addition to all of our other welfare programs. The growth of the food stamp program has revealed a program with too many loopholes and a system open to easy abuse. It is time to halt the growth of this program, close the loopholes, curb the abuses, and bring the program back to its original purpose—a program designed to help the truly needy.

A look at the statistics reveals an alarming trend. When the food stamp program was initiated, the total caseload numbered 442,359—March 1965. Within a decade, the caseload jumped to 19,142,359—March 1975. Expenditures in this period have skyrocketed from $36,353,797 in 1965 to almost $5.2 billion. The food stamp program caseload grew by 4,227 percent and the expenditures increased by 14,203 percent—all within 10 years.

Another amazing development is the potential of future growth for this program. Although there are an estimated 21.8 million participants presently, the potential eligible to participate has been estimated to be 52.8 million persons or one out of every four Americans. Recent attempts at an "outreach" program and self-certification mechanism would greatly increase the number of participants. It is time to enact a major reform of this program.

The objective in any welfare program should be to help those who cannot help themselves; no program should become the means by which the voluntary poor or those who do not wish to work can live at the expense of the hardworking taxpayers.

It is my firm belief that if we adopt the National Food Stamp Reform Act, we will be able to cut out the abuses in the program while providing assistance to those who really are in need. Although this reform bill contains 41 specific proposals, I would like to comment on some of the major changes.

The food stamp program is a welfare program and does not belong in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The administration of this program through USDA and the administration of our other welfare programs through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare constitute unnecessary duplication. Such a division of responsibility leads to additional paperwork, two separate administrative bureaucracies, a lack of coordination over our total welfare effort, and opens the door to errors and illegal activities. Presently, more than 50 percent of the individuals who receive food stamps are eligible for assistance under the aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—program administered through HEW. Despite this fact that more than half of those on food stamps would have their eligibility established, the eligibility worker must still fill out two forms, one for each agency. The Na-

tional Food Stamp Reform Act (H.R. 8145) would shift the entire program from USDA to HEW to improve administrative efficiency.

If enacted, H.R. 8145 would eliminate individuals with high incomes from participation in the program, provide better benefits to the genuinely needy, close eligibility loopholes, eliminate some present administrative complexities, provide a more responsible system for cash and coupon accountability, allow local jurisdictions to make a choice of commodities or food stamps, require an annual report filed with Congress by the HEW Secretary discussing the implementation of the program and reforms, provide State participation through block grants, and enact new measures to tighten controls in order to prevent fraud and theft.

A very significant change in the present program will be a change in the formula for eligibility. Eligibility should be based on gross rather than net income. The deductions allowed under the present formula have been responsible for putting many high income individuals on the food stamp rolls. Under the provision in H.R. 8145, anyone whose gross income exceeds the poverty level established by the Office of Management and Budget—$5,050—could not participate. Other considerations; that is, value of property—would be evaluated in order to assure that the program reaches the truly needy.

The genuine needy would receive benefits based on the low cost diet plan which is 129 percent of the economy diet plan. This change, assisting the poor and needy, would provide a 29 percent increase in food stamp coupons for the recipients.

Cost of food stamps for the elderly would be reduced with a special deduction of $25 per month for all households in which the head of the household is 65 years or older.

Restrictions would be placed on those who are voluntarily unemployed; that is, strikers, college students—so that the food stamp program will not provide a subsidy for them.

Individuals who receive cash or in-kind assistance for food or housing from other governmental programs would have this factor included in determining their eligibility for food stamps.

The "outreach" program would be redirected toward nutritional education—rather than merely increasing the number of people receiving food stamps.

Stricter controls would be placed on receipt and handling of coupons; for example, identifying all receipts as Federal funds and prohibiting any use for individual or corporate profit.

A clearance system would be established to gather information and a referral system would act to prevent recipients from receiving food stamps in more than one jurisdiction. This device would also check actual earned income against income reported by households in order to detect understating of income.

Food stamp coupons would have to be countersigned by recipients—similar to endorsements on travelers checks. Recipients would have to provide a monthly income report each month.

Financial assistance would be provided to localities for costs resulting from investigations and prosecutions of fraud in the food stamp program.

The present tremendous growth of the food stamp program should make it obvious to all concerned with the best interests of our country and the taxpayers that action must be taken to bring this program into reasonable and sensible limits. Abuses in the food stamp program are becoming more and more widespread—high-income individuals receiving stamps, fraudulent use of stamps, counterfeiting of stamps, and overpayments to recipients.

The time is now to take meaningful action before the food stamp program escalates into a $10 or $15 billion program.

If we enact the provisions of H.R. 8145, the national food stamp reform program, we will be able to stop the overwhelming growth of this program. We should be able to reduce the recipients from 21.8 million to a more reasonable figure, 10 or 12 million. We should be able to reduce expenditures from $5.2 billion to a more desirable amount, $3 billion. This reduction would save the taxpayers at least $2 billion. If we adopt this program proposal, we would be able to eliminate much of the waste and abuse in the food stamp program while providing assistance to the poor and needy.

It is my hope that Congress will enact H.R. 8145 into law as soon as possible.

BICENTENNIAL LEGISLATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution which asks that we celebrate our Bicentennial by enacting a significant commemorative piece of legislation.

The Subcommittee on Census and Population has oversight responsibilities for the Bicentennial. In hearings before that subcommittee, we have heard some positive and encouraging reports of activities being planned in the local communities, among various ethnic groups, and by privately funded programs such as the American Issues Forum. There has been criticism, too—some based on the way funds have or have not been spent—and we have heard also a general expression of dissatisfaction and of the sense that we may be losing an opportunity to do something great.

My own expression in the hearings was that what the Bicentennial lacked was not funds, but dreams.

In responding to criticism by a committee member that the festival and commercial aspects seemed to be getting too much emphasis—with the wristwatches, T-shirts and ballpoint pens all being officially emblemized—a staff member of ARBA stated that "we want everyone to have something to remember the Bicentennial by."

But how well will we remember the Bicentennial after the firecrackers have stopped exploding, the image has faded from the T-shirt, the wristwatch has broken a spring, and we have permanently misplaced that ballpoint pen? Will the speeches and bellringing—or even the dialog—be sufficient to make us remember how we celebrated 200 years of independence and freedom? Or even why we bothered?

We have heard people say that we should avoid the "bricks and mortar" approach to commemoration—that a statue or monument is not what we need. And perhaps that's true. But there are other possible dreams—many ways we might use this opportunity to commemorate our gratitude for the past and faith in our future.

We might launch a dramatic cultural enrichment program for the entire country; or begin a student assistance program for all Americans, old and young, patterned after the G.I. Bill; or make a national commitment, in specific terms, to the recognition that all human beings on the face of the Earth have the right to an adequate diet; or we might—as suggested by the National Committee for a Bicentennial Era—recognize a period of 13 years for concentrated effort toward the achievement of specific goals. I could list dozens more, and others will have many more ideas.

House Joint Resolution 540 asks that a panel of citizens be appointed by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration to look carefully at possibilities and then recommend to Congress the program we can enact to make certain that we and our children will remember the Bicentennial and how and why we celebrated.

In 1876, during our Centennial, our Nation was not in a reflective mood. The keynote was growth and development and limitless faith in the ability of man to lift himself through technology. Americans expressed that mood in a giant trade fair in Philadelphia. But they left no lasting commemorative of the celebration.

In 1976, I hope we will be in a more reflective mood. We have more of a history—with both proud and shameful moments—to contemplate. And we can no longer have an unbounded faith in the genie of technology, because we have learned about the payment it extracts. But if we are older and more reflective, we can, perhaps, be wiser, too. We can see an opportunity and seize it. We can, if we choose to, give all Americans something to remember the Bicentennial by bceause it made a lasting impact on our lives.

The text of the resolution follows:

Joint Resolution to require the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration to establish a committee to report to the Congress ways to significantly commemorate our Nation's Bicentennial.

Whereas this Nation is celebrating in 1976 the two hundredth anniversary of its birth; and

Whereas this will be an occasion for important activities in communities across the Nation now being planned by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration and local leaders; and

Whereas it can also be a period of self-evaluation; and

Whereas the Bicentennial should be an opportunity not only for celebration and reflection, but in the year 1976—in tribute to

our heritage and as an expression of confidence and hope in our future—this Nation should also take the opportunity to initiate a significant commemorative act for this country, which would give some permanent significance to the Bicentennial observance; and

Whereas the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration has not been specifically directed to produce such a concept by its legal mandate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration shall appoint, within sixty days of enactment of this resolution, a committee of thirteen members to examine the possibility of initiating a significant Bicentennial Commemorative for the Nation through congressional action in 1976, and that the thirteen-member committee so appointed solicit ideas from citizens throughout the Nation as to what the nature of this action by the Congress and the executive branch of the Nation should be, and that the committee report to the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, to the President, and to Congress by February 15, 1976, so that hearings and action by the Congress can be completed by July 4, 1976.

THE UNLEARNED LESSON

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Ford suggests we look forward and forget the evils of Watergate. We cannot, however, bury our heads in the sand—at least not until we take steps to prevent a repetition of the abuses of power that characterized the Watergate matter.

Philip Kurland, a professor at University of Chicago Law School, made some important suggestions for preventing future Watergates to the Delaware Bar Association on June 4, 1975. While I do not agree with every proposal he makes, I commend his remark to my colleagues' attention.

The text follows:

THE UNLEARNED LESSON OF WATERGATE

We are beginning to celebrate the bicentenary of the Declaration of Independence. But I would remind you that this nation was not born in 1776; It was born in 1787 with the American Constitution. And before we can celebrate the bicentennial of the American Constitution, we must successfully get past "1984." If I were in charge of some bicentennial celebration this year, I would require the participants to read George Orwell's "1984" to show what the new nation was created to avoid.

It is hard for me to accept the fact that it was a bare 10 months ago that a President of the United States was forced to resign his office because of abuse of power by him and his administration. The successor in office, after pardoning his predecessor, has behaved as if the events of Watergate never occurred.

Like Nixon, President Ford has asked us to look forward and not backward, to forget—indeed, to ignore—the evils that occurred. Unlike Mr. Nixon, President Ford has been rather successful in this effort. So successful that he has invoked the same processes with respect to the Vietnam war as with Watergate. I expect this success is due to the fact that none of us likes to recall pain and unpleasantness. But nothing is clearer than the fact that the events of Watergate demonstrated real and continuings dangers to American freedom and justice.

There were two principal aspects of Watergate: one personal, the other institutional. The first was concerned with the removal from office and punishment of those who committed Watergate crimes. Since almost all of the Watergate culprits from Mr. Nixon down have been granted clemency, I would say no more of those personal derelictions than to quote John Stuart Mill's dictum: "As for charity, it is a matter in which the immediate effect on the persons directly concerned, and the ultimate consequences to the general good, are apt to be at complete war with one another."

REFORM NEEDED

Watergate, however, revealed more than the weaknesses of men in high places. It revealed basic institutional deficiencies that have not and will not be corrected unless and until an aroused American public or an aroused Congress demands and secures reform.

I must concede that there are many whom I respect who would deny even the existence of institutional problems, who believe that the transgressions of "The White House" and the Nixon administration, were merely personal malefactions and that the removal and replacement of evil men has cured the disease.

Perhaps they should read Ben Bradlee's book about Kennedy, or, more to the point, George Reedy's morality tale about the White House, introduced with these words: "It is not that the people who compose the menage are any worse than any other collection of human beings. It is rather that the White House is an ideal cloak for intrigue, pomposity and ambition. No nation of free men should ever permit itself to be governed from a hallowed shrine where the meanest lust for power can be sanctified and the dullest wit greeted with reverential awe. . . . It is not enough to say that the White House need not be like this if it is occupied by another set of personalities. . . . The fact remains that the institution provides camouflage for all that is petty and nasty in human beings, and enables a clown or a knave to pose as Galahad and be treated with deference."

As Madison put it in the 51st Federalist: "If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a goverment which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed, and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity for auxiliary precautions."

The real problem of the post-Watergate era is not to assign blame for the creation of the imperial presidency. Nor should the objective of reform be the destruction of power. The problem is rather to provide legitimate and necessary presidential power. The problem is rather to provide those "auxiliary precautions" of which Madison spoke, that will make the exercise of presidential authority responsible to "We, the People." Some of these proposed "auxiliary precautions" are the subjects of my consideration.

ATTACK THE REAL ISSUES

(1) The first is the suggestion that responsibility to the people is fulfilled by the election process and tinkering with that will do the trick. The responsibility of a quadrennial election is not enough to assure such responsibility, for at least two reasons: First, the period between elections is too long; too much damage can be done to the fabric of our society between elections. Second, there can be no real accountability, even at an election, when the actions of the administration have been shrouded in secrecy, so that the public never knows what miners and sappers have been at work at the substance of a free society. This is a clear lesson from recent events. Some would nevertheless tinker with the presidential election by a constitutional amendment for direct popular elections or for national presidential primaries, or to provide for election of the Vice President by the people rather than by Congress when that office becomes vacant, or any combination thereof. I don't believe that any of these addresses our fundamental problem, and, in fact, may well divert attention from the real issues.

(2) A different constitutional proposal does address the basic issue. This would substitute a parliamentary system for the presidential system. Administrations could be changed when the confidence of the legislature was lost or the people impressed their representatives with the need for change. But this constitutional revision is a most unlikely event, even if it were a desirable one. The proposed system could work in this country only if there were a real two-party system in this nation. Today there is not. The so-called national parties are faction ridden. And in a parliamentary system with a multiplicity of parties, the instability overweighs any possible gain from responsibility.

(3) We need not, however, think of reform of the presidency in constitutional terms. The work of the Senate Watergate Committee was ultimately overshadowed by the impeachment proceedings, the Nixon resignation and the Ford pardon. The committee did, however, file a lengthy report which not only detailed the facts that were uncovered by the Senate investigation but also contained a series of legislative recommendations. Just before the close of the 93rd Congress, Senator Ervin introduced a bill based on the committee recommendations. It was too late in the session to hope for serious consideration, but it has been revived in the current Congress under the principal sponsorship of Senators Ribicoff and Percy. At the moment it is languishing in the Senate Government Operations Committee and it may well rest there, for the leadership of neither party has come forth to move it toward realization.

The bill has many important provisions, but I would mention only two. The first would create a permanent office of Special Prosecutor, essentially to be concerned with the revelation and prosecution of criminal activities by high government officials, and the other would create the office of Public Attorney within the Congress. For me, the second is more important than the first.

There is ample machinery within Congress for the revelation of misbehavior by Executive Branch officials. There is, however, a dearth of personnel to deal with that misbehavior except in the context of partisan political action. A permanent, well-staffed, legal office charged with real oversight of Executive Branch activities could not only uncover illegal actions, which are the lesser part of the wrongdoing, but the far more common and deleterious executive actions in disregard of congressional commands or in frustration of them. Even the judiciary could be subjected to such scrutiny, not for purposes of impeachment and removal, but rather so that statutory construction that flies in the face of the plain intent of the lawmakers could be subjected to legislative correction and amendment.

(4) Another legislative proposal of Senator Ervin's that died in the 93rd Congress seems to me of more dubious merit. It called for the

separation of the Department of Justice from the Executive Branch of the government. The consensus seems to be that this separation would be constitutionally doubtful and practically unwise. And yet the reason for the proposal is sound and deserves further attention. For as the incumbent Attorney General said when he took his oath of office: "We have lived in a time of change and corrosive skepticism and cynicism concerning the administration of justice. Nothing can weaken the quality of life or more imperil the realization of the goals we all hold dear than our failure to make clear by word and deed that our law is not an instrument for partisan purposes and it is not to be used in ways which are careless of the higher values within all of us."

(5) Legislation by way of a new reorganization act may be the appropriate answer to another problem of governmental irresponsibility. There are at least two cancerous growths on the American body politic. One is the burgeoning power of the Executive Branch. The other has occurred within the Executive Branch itself, where power has shifted from the departments and old-line agencies to what is called "The Executive Office of the President." In fact, it is here that a government policy is made, and except for the President himself—and in the case of Mr. Ford, including the President himself—the wielders of that power are all unelected, and with little or no responsibility to Congress except through the appropriations process.

The White House office shares some power with other branches of the Executive Office, particularly the Office of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, the Council on International Economic Policy and the Federal Energy Office. It is here, in the Executive Office of the President, that the "presidency" is to be found.

There are perhaps two ways of solving the problems of lack of responsibility of "the presidency," of these governors of the American people. The first, which I would prefer, would be to dissolve these agencies and distribute their powers and authorities among the old-line agencies and departments which are creatures of the Congress and can be made accountable to the Congress. The second is to attempt to make these branches of the government directly responsible to Congress, although leaving them with their present authority. Among the ways to create such responsibility is to see that all the major domos in the Executive Office are required to have the approval of the Senate before they assume control of their fiefdoms.

(6) If nonresponsibility is the basic problem, it is most seriously demonstrated by the so-called "intelligence agencies" of our government. Aside from the presidential tapes themselves, the most startling revelations of the Watergate period were the hints of the perversion of these intelligence forces into political police forces. It is of quintessential importance, therefore, that our intelligence and counterintelligence agencies be confined and restricted to the limited functions they were created to deal with. If oversight by Congress is not to be the answer, it is hard to conceive of an answer. It is only through an agile and exercised press that we have had any information about the scope of the efforts of our intelligence agencies. Grateful as we should be to the press, we must accept the fact that the press is a necessary but not a sufficient safeguard against a dreaded politicization of intelligence services.

(7) This brings up the fact that in recent years the government cloak of secrecy has been erected into an impenetrable screen by the assertion of "executive privilege." One need not go so far as Prof. Raoul Berger did in his volume on "Executive Privilege" to recognize that the doctrine of recent growth, is a tool for the preclusion of the power of legislative oversight, which is the only real check on abuse of executive power.

THE SUPREME COURT'S ROLE

Watergate has left us a legacy here, too. For the Supreme Court in the form of a decision in Nixon vs. United States has created out of whole cloth a privilege of constitutional statute, a privilege apparently breachable only by the Judiciary itself for the purpose of carrying on its criminal processes. Having created the privilege, the court abstained from saying whether Congress could assert for its purposes the power to breach the privilege that the court asserted for its own ends.

Since I believe that there is no basis in the Constitution for such a privilege, and since I believe that there is no warrant in the creation of such a privilege by judicial fiat, and since I believe that there are times when such a privilege should exist, I believe that pursuant to its authority: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof," Congress should provide a statutory definition of executive privilege and a statutory definition of the appropriate procedures. These are necessary conditions to the reality of responsibility of the Executive Branch to the people through the Congress.

King John had his Magna Carta; King Charles had his Bill of Rights; King George III had his American Constitution, and the Nixon administration should have no less glorious a monument to reform.

PENSION CUTS: OFFICIALS SPEAK OUT

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 3, 1975, social security recipients received an 8-percent cost-of-living increase. If past experience holds true, many of these individuals will suffer subsequent reductions in other pensions or subsidies because of an oversight in existing law.

In fact, many Members of Congress are already hearing from their contituents about such benefit cutbacks. This development should not come as anv great surprise to legislators.

Last year, the Congress enacted an 11-percent social security cost-of-living increase. As a direct result of this action, over 300,000 veterans and their dependents suffered unexpected reductions in their non-service-connected disability pensions, and an additional 2,000 individuals were dropped from the veterans' pension program altogether. Similar benefit reductions were encountered by social security recipients who also receive other Federal benefits, such as supplemental security income, low-income housing, and aid to families with dependent children. These cutbacks occur when the greater social security payment places the recipient in a higher income bracket, thus allowing other Federal agencies to reduce or withdraw support which they had previously extended to that individual.

And what can we expect to be the result of this year's social security cost-of-living increase? The potential impact on veterans alone is staggering. Over 75 percent of recipients of veterans' pensions receive both social security and veterans benefits. The Veterans' Administration has already estimated that they will be able to reduce veterans' pensions by $219 million in 1976 as a result of the July 3d increase in social security benefits. This would effectively cancel the relief provided by that much needed cost-of-living increase.

In the July issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, the commander-in-chief of the VFW, John J. Stang, discusses the problems created by the existing situation for veterans and their dependents. Included in the article are responses from the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Veterans Affairs, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance. As the reader can readily perceive, the officials most immediately responsible for the administration of veterans' programs are deeply concerned about the existing problem.

I believe that the need for prompt congressional action on the entire question of social security cost-of-living increases and their impact on other Federal pensions and programs is apparent. It is imperative that congressional hearings be held on this issue as soon as possible so that the Congress can take timely and responsible action to prevent a recurrence of last year's situation.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Stang's article and the responses as printed in the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PENSION CUTS: OFFICIALS SPEAK OUT

(By John J. Stang, V.F.W. Commander-in-Chief)

"My pension was cut $11.63. How come? I thought we were going to get a raise."

"I'm 78 and a veteran's widow. I can't afford to live on what the VA pays me and now my pension was cut."

"I used to eat a steak once in a while, now I can't afford hamburger."

"I fought for my country. Why do I have to fight again?"

These and thousands and thousands more are comments requested in the V.F.W. Magazine in May from veterans or their widows whose sole income was from Social Security and whose pensions were decreased or terminated.

If thousands responded to the small notice, imagine the thousands more who missed it or were unable to reply.

Originally, it was thought—erroneously, as it developed—that the law which went into effect last January raising the income limits by $400 and increasing the monthly payments by 12% would take care of last year's 11% raise in Social Security checks.

In fact, in the report of the House of Representatives on its consideration of the bill, it was stated that the VA assured the Congressmen that no one would be dropped from the pension program if the bill was passed.

Instead, the VA has now informed the V.F.W. that over 2,000 were terminated. In addition, approximately 345,000 lost some money in the small amount received under the nonservice-connected veterans and widows pension provision.

Two things happened to create this situation. First, unless the Social Security and VA pension checks were about equal, those with larger Social Security payments got a higher percentage increase than was covered by the increase in their smaller VA check. Eleven percent of a large amount is greater than 12% of a smaller amount. Increases in income automatically reduce the VA pension check.

Second, the cut-off limits for decreases in the VA pensions as other income—such as Social Security payments—increases, were changed in the new law in January. This means that if you were in the bracket last year that reduced your VA check by four cents for every one dollar you received over a certain amount, you might find yourself being reduced by five or six cents this year.

The result was that even though a veteran or widow thought the increase in the VA pension would offset the increase in Social Security, some 345,000 people received the shock of their lives.

What can we do? The first thing has already been done. Thanks to your letters and cards, our Washington Office has visibly demonstrated to key members of Congress and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs that your pensions were reduced or terminated. Their reactions may be seen in the accompanying pictures and statements.

We wish that each and every one of the thousands of letters could be answered individually, but we do not have the manpower and we are sure that you would have this effort and cost go to a better cause—that of working to right these injustices. I personally thank each veteran or widow who wrote Cooper T. Holt, the Executive Director of your Washington Office. If official documents were sent with the letters, they will be returned as time permits.

What is the answer? Hard work by Congress and the VA to right this injustice. Almost everyone connected with the pension program agrees that it is inequitable. The program must be fair and it must be based on need. It also must decrease with increased income to some point where it is no longer needed.

But it must allow a veteran or widow to be assured that welfare need never be accepted. A man who fought for his country should be too proud to accept welfare.

We will work to establish an income level which will assure that no veteran need ever apply for welfare. Once this level is agreed upon, it should be adjusted as the cost of living increases—and at the same time, as other income receives the adjustment. A more equitable treatment must be found for counting a spouse's income. It does not seem justified to count her retirement check at a time when the two need the little received. And, when medical expenses are determined to be "unusual" by the VA, should not all of them be counted rather than a certain percent?

We pledge to those receiving pensions that the V.F.W. will lead the fight to eliminate the injustices of the pension program. Injustices which now exist, as shown by the thousands who answered our request for letters, must be corrected.

BY SEN. VANCE HARTKE (IND.)

Chairman, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs

The letters presented to us, together with other information we have received, is strong evidence that the veterans pension program must be thoroughly revised and expanded to insure that all eligible veterans and their widows can live out their lives in dignity.

Such a new pension program must provide a truly adequate income above any subsistence level so that no veteran will have to turn to welfare assistance. This new pension program would also treat veterans of equal needs identically and provide greater assistance to those with greater needs.

Finally, a new pension reform act, which I will introduce shortly, must guarantee regular automatic increases in pension that fully account for all the increases in the cost-of-living.

In addition, it is my intention to introduce with my close friend, Sen. Strom Thurmond, who also has been long concerned with their problems, the "World War I Veterans and Survivors Pension Bonus Act" which will provide special additional and needed assistance to our veterans of World War I and their widows.

BY REP. RAY ROBERTS (TEXAS)

Chairman, House Veterans Affairs Committee

The Committee is engaged in a continuous study of the veterans non-service-connected pension program and we are pleased to receive information and assistance from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We receive a great many letters from veterans and widows when there has been an increase in income and a corresponding reduction in the pension. Most of these letters mention Social Security, but, as a matter of fact, most of the cases we look into involve increases in income of other types such as rental or interest income, additional income to be reported by the wife and increased retirement income. Unusual medical expenses may have caused an increase in the pension one year, but are reduced the next causing the pension to be reduced.

Invariably, when the pension of a veteran or widow is reduced, it is because his other income has been increased. This is the nature of any program which operates on income limits.

BY RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

Administrator of Veterans Affairs

The V.F.W. is to be commended for the voluminous material it has gathered for presentation to Congress concerning the impact of Social Security payments on VA pensions.

As a former member of Congress, I can assure you that our legislators do welcome having all possible data on hand when they are considering legislative matters.

Recently, VA Deputy Administrator Odell W. Vaughn and Director of the Compensation and Pension Service Charles Peckarsky joined me in discussing with Executive Director Cooper T. Holt the tremendous volume of mail he had received in regard to the pension change notice carried in the V.F.W. Magazine.

We were, quite frankly, impressed by the great outpouring of mail in response to the magazine notice and the VA has offered to review all of the individual letters just to make sure there has been no error on the VA's part in adjudicating pension cases in keeping with the current law.

BY REP. G. V. MONTGOMERY

Chairman, Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance

The Subcommittee is quite concerned that the program operates equitably and fairly with all veterans and widows. In general, most major retirement programs such as Social Security, railroad retirement, company and union pensions, civil service and so forth have increased over the years. At the same time we have kept the pension program in line with changes in the cost-of-living. In this way we have attempted to protect the veteran and widow. In addition, we have continued to raise the upward income limitation.

The Subcommittee has also tried to maintain a perspective and proper relationship between the non-service-connected pension and compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

KIDNEY PATIENTS AND DRUG COSTS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, persons who have undergone a kidney transplant or are undergoing kidney dialysis incur very large drug expenditures, often running as high as several thousand dollars yearly. To investigate whether or not there would be an appreciable savings if a renal disease patient purchased the needed drug items under their generic names, I requested the Oversight Subcommittee staff of the House Ways and Means Committee to conduct a telephone survey to examine the amount of difference an end stage renal disease patient must pay if the drugs he is taking are purchased under their brand names as opposed to their generic names.

Two phone calls were made to each of 10 pharmacies in Washington, D.C., and Maryland. The purpose of the first call was to determine the cost of 100 tablets of the generic name product, Prednisone, one of a number of drugs required by kidney disease patients, at a strength of 5 mg. The follow-up call asked for the cost of 100 tablets of Deltasone, the brand name of Prednisone that is manufactured by the Upjohn Co., also at a strength of 5 mg.

At all 10 pharmacies, the brand name drug item, Deltasone, would have cost the patient from 5 percent to 226 percent more than if he had purchased the drug under its generic name, Prednisone. In one year an individual requiring 50 mg. of Prednisone per day could spend over $300 more if purchasing the brand name product instead of generic name. This is a substantial burden on patients who already face crippling medical expenses. When the example of Prednisone is added to the other drug purchases needed by kidney disease patients, the difference between generic versus brand name costs could amount to over a thousand dollars for some patients.

During the Oversight Subcommittee's hearings on June 24, I asked Dr. Robert Van Hoek, Acting Administrator, Health Services Administration, HEW, what assistance can be provided patients in obtaining the lowest priced available drugs. Dr. Van Hoek pointed out that where drugs are reimbursed on an outpatient basis under medicare and medicaid, they will now be subject to regulations which call for a maximum of allowable cost for such drugs. He said:

> Where we do not reimburse, where the patient pays directly for the cost, we have no direct influence over that. We hope that the physicians and pharmacists would take into account the economic factors for patients where they are going to be on prolonged therapy and they would hopefully advise them on what is the most effective and least costly drugs to use.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this "hopefulness" is adequate. Kidney patients cannot easily face out-of-pocket expenses—even after medicare assist-

ance—of $6,000 to $8,000 per year. It is time that the Social Security Administration took a more active role in advising patients of lower cost services wherever possible. Recent revelations have shown that some physician groups and pharmaceutical firms are hand-in-glove. I believe that the Federal Government must take the leadership in advising patients of drug pricing.

MILITARY RECOMPUTATION AND OTHER ISSUES—CONCERNS OF HAWAII CHAPTER, ARMY RETIREE COUNCIL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 I had the distinct honor and pleasure of addressing an open house of the Hawaii chapter of the U.S. Army Retiree Council at Fort Shafter in Honolulu. My purpose was to bring the 3,500 registered—as well as the many unregistered—Army retirees in Hawaii up to date on my continuing efforts to legislate a long-overdue recomputation of retiree pay, the latest effort of which is H.R. 1168, introduced by Mr. WILSON of California and cosponsored by myself, among others.

Prior to my speech, Maj. Gen. Charles R. Hutchinson—U.S. Army, retired—chairman of the council, made some introductory remarks which I feel convincingly sum up many of the recomputation-related and other problems which all military retirees now face. In further support of my efforts and those of my colleagues to effect legislative reform in this area, I insert his thoughtful remarks in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. ARMY RETIREE COUNCIL, HAWAII, OPEN HOUSE, MAY 17, 1975

The Army Retiree Council, Hawaii is appointed by the Commander, U.S. Army Support Command, Hawaii. The Council membership is 10 enlisted and 10 officer Army retirees of which I am the Chairman. We meet the first Saturday each month at 0900 at the Personnel Center at Fort Shafter, which is located in the building just diamond head of this theater. We welcome your attendance at any or all of our meetings.

We consider our primary mission to determine problems and needs of retirees and do what we can to assist them. We are receiving top notch support from General Bolton's command in solving local problems, but our major problems can only be resolved at the Washington level.

There are some 3,500 Army retirees registered with the Retiree Section of the Personnel Center—we feel sure there are many more not registered. You are urged to get these unregistered on our rolls so they can participate in our programs.

You have told us, over and over again, that, by far, the most important needs of retirees are: (1) Recomputation of retired pay. (2) Holding the line on entitlements, i.e., medical-dental care, commissaries, PX's, etc. Your Council has taken a very strong position, that the Government has breeched an unwritten contract by changing the basis for computation of retired pay, and curtailing long established entitlements, something that wouldn't have happened if the military were strongly organized like Federal civil service employees are.

What have we (the Council) done about it? We have written dozens of very forceful but polite letters to the President's office, the Secretary of Defense, Chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and Appropriation Committees and to the Hawaii Congressional Delegation. We have hit hard at the recomputation and commissary problems.

Regarding recomputation, there is no money in the President's budget, and the Secretary of Defense opposes recomputation. Thus it appears that our only remaining avenue to eliminate this gross injustice is to the Congress. For several years now the U.S. Senate has voted for recomputation, but it has been thwarted by the House Armed Services Committee. So it is particularly important we work on the U.S. House members.

We have pointed out that ⅔'s of the one million retirees, all services, retired prior to 1958, when the tie-in of retired pay with active duty pay was eliminated. One half of this group receives less than $4,000 per year retired pay. And the average retired pay of this group is 35% or more below that received by current retirees. There is something radically wrong when we find a 1958 M/Sgt retiree drawing $5,000/year while a 1974 M/Sgt retiree draws over $10,000/year, both with 30 years service. And a 1958 Brigadier General retiree with less pay than a current Lieutenant Colonel retiree. Worse yet, the gap widens every time there is a cost of living increase.

In reply to our letters, Senators Fong and Inouye and Representatives Mink and Matsunaga definitely state they support recomputation.

The DOD budget calls for commissaries to become self supporting—one half commencing 1 July this year and the other half 1 July 1976. The present overall average commissary savings is 24% plus or minus depending on locations. For a family of four, buying $200 monthly from commissaries, this is a savings of about $50/month. The DOD plan would mean an additional 12% surcharge later this year and another 12% next year. Commissary savings would drop to practically nothing. No matter what language DOD describes this action, our Council calls it a cut in pay for every military member, active or retired who uses commissaries.

In reply to the Council's letters on commissaries:

Senator Fong states the Council's views will be given full and careful consideration.

Senator Inouye states he will keep the Council's view in mind as he studies them.

Representative Matsunaga states that efforts to retain present commissary system will meet stiff resistance, but will support measures to reasonably compensate persons detrimentally affected.

Representative Mink states that full consideration will be given to this matter.

Why is the military in its current predicament? The answer is simple—we have avoided getting into politics and thus have little political punch. In the long run, active and retired military need a strong central organization, instead of a loose affiliation of many associations going in many directions. As of today only ⅓ of all active and retirees have membership in the many associations such as Association of the U.S. Army, Air Force and Navy, Retired Officers Association, Retired Enlisted Association, National Association of the Uniform Services, etc. But until we get a strong central organization, I urge you to join with the National organization appropriate for you such as the Retired Enlisted Association, Retired Officers Association, and in particular, the National Assoication of the Uniformed Services, whose membership includes enlisted, officers both active and retired. These organizations are carrying the torch for us in Washington, but they need more members to improve their political punch.

I think there are too many of us who just sit around and gripe and then complain that nothing happens. I urge you to write letters to the President, Secretary of Defense, and Members of Congress. And why can't neighbor, social, and organization groups get up petitions to the President with copies to Members of Congress? Believe me, if in sufficient volume, attention is paid to them. Ask Members of Congress how they stand on the recomputation and commissary issues.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. A week or so ago, the U. S. Civil Service Commission announced a reduction from 15% to 12½% in the Hawaii cost of living allowance for Federal workers. I am not in a position to judge the validity of the Civil Service Commission's decision, but if it is correct, there would presumably be no reduction in purchasing power of civil service employees. Even, if in error, the cut would be smaller than the cut in pay for military commissary users, under the DOD proposal.

Did you note the headlines on page B-10 of the Star Bulletin day before yesterday? Senators Fong and Inouye are jumping into this problem with both feet. Why? Let me read from the article: "Hundreds of letters, telegrams and petitions have been pouring into our offices."

I haven't heard of anyone jumping into the commissary problem like this. And I haven't heard of any concerted letter and petition drive here by Army active duty military or dependents to fight for their commissary entitlements. I hope there has been some that I haven't heard about. I do know a number of veteran and retirement organizations that are conducting such a campaign.

For sometime now, I have felt there is a pretty general feeling among Army retirees that the Army Washington HQ isn't doing anything to restore and hold the line on entitlements so vital to retirees. Or if the Army is doing anything we are not being told about it.

Therefore on behalf of the Council I wrote a letter to the Army Chief of Staff, advising him of the situation, and recommended: 1) That the Department of the Army two Councils be made on joint Council and 2) The Retired Army Bulletin be drastically revitalized and mailed on an expeditious basis—and be made a medium for the Army Joint Council to inform retirees what is happening to their entitlements, and what retirees can do to combat their erosion, ie, information of the type found in publications of National Associations. I'm certain we're all aware that the present content of the Retired Army Bulletin is almost worthless, since it doesn't hit the vital issues of all retirees—recomputation and entitlements.

Our program today includes presentations by the Veterans Administration, The Pacific Exchange Service, and Representative Matsunaga who has been a long time and solid supporter of recomputation of military retired pay.

U.S. ARMS SALES TO JORDAN: ANOTHER DISTURBING CHAPTER IN THE MIDEAST ARMS BUILDUP

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 1975, Congress was informed of the administration's proposed sale to Jordan of

$350 million worth of sophisticated weaponry. This notification was carried out in accordance with section 36(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1974, which stipulates that the President notify Congress of any proposed military sales in excess of $25 million. Congress then has 20 calendar days in which to disapprove any sale, if it so desires, by adopting a concurrent resolution in both Houses. Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM and Senator CLIFFORD CASE have each introduced such resolutions of disapproval. Action on them must take place by July 30.

The events surrounding the proposed sale, the motivations behind the request for the weapons and the potential impact of such an arms transfer in the Middle East deserve the careful study of all Members of the House as they determine within the next several days how they are goingt to act on the Bingham resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 337, the first working test of section 36(b), the disapproval process.

The first administration disclosure of Hawk missile sales to Jordan, in May of this year, stipulated no more than a $100 million price tag. Now the figure is $350 million for the antiaircraft missile system, over three times its original amount. Why the increased dollar figure within a 2-month period is an issue which remains questionable.

Timing represents another curious and troubling factor. King Hussein has wanted an up-to-date air defense system for his country for several years. Congressman ROSENTHAL has pointed out that the administration granted such a request during the Middle East policy reassessment period when, according to the White House, there would be no new arms sale to any Mideast nation. I must agree with his observation that such an action certainly at least raises the question as to whether Israel is being punished "for the failure of American diplomacy in arriving at a Middle East settlement."

Not as shrouded from scrutiny as the aforementioned are the weapons which make up the package and their awesome capabilities. The so-called defensive system consists of 14 improved Hawk batteries of 6 launchers each with a total of 532 missiles, 100 Vulcan radar-directed antiaircraft guns, and 300 Redeye shoulder fired heat-seeking missiles. The capabilities of each of these weapons and similar weapons produced by other countries are clinically described in 1972–73 Jane's Weapon Systems. These weapons are not either modest—as they have been called by the administration—or strictly defensive.

The Vulcan weapon system "can be made available on a variety of platforms" including a towed trailer or a self-propelled land vehicle. The Redeye is also portable. The Hawk, described as a "homing-all-the-way-killer" is approximately equivalent to the Soviet SA–6. The Hawk can be operated from mobile carriers. Clearly, all three types of weapons are easily moved from one place to another and, therefore, can provide cover for offensive operations.

The regular Hawk is in the inventories of Belgium, Denmark, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, and West Germany. However, the improved Hawk, that which the administration proposes to supply to Jordan, is only presently being used by our own troops. Given Hussein's recent statement on a cooperative military arrangement with Syria, it appears all too possible that the improved Hawk system will fall to the scrutiny of the Soviet advisors in Syria. The Soviets could conceivably test the Hawk's capabilities and develop weapons systems to overcome it, thereby threatening one of the mainstays of our NATO defense system.

Recently, I was in Amman, Jordan and had the opportunity to discuss this matter personally with King Hussein. The King maintains the Hawk missiles are essential for Jordan's defense and would be placed only in and around Amman and several major airfields in Jordan. He said Jordan was highly vulnerable to every air attack from any source and needs these precautions. The King said further that if the sale were not completed with the United States, Jordan would be forced to do business elsewhere. I presume he meant Russia since that country is the only one that produces a comparable weapon.

I also met with Premier Rabin and other Israeli leaders on my tour of the Middle East. They are convinced that a complete antiair defense system would give the Jordanians enough security to join Egypt or Syria in a further confrontation with Israel. They believe that Jordan abstained from direct involvement in the Yom Kippur war because of its vulnerability in Israeli air attacks.

Jordan is an integral part of the Arab-Israeli balance of power which military asymmetries among the nations involved. Israeli balance of power which is based on military asymmetries among the nations involved. As long as these asymmetries remain within the ratio of three to one in major weapon systems, Israeli could, despite difficulties, cope with the situation. The moment these asymmetries grow above the ratio, such as Hawk missiles to Jordan, it will increase the probability of Arab attack or force Israeli to take premature action.

Mr. Speaker, any reasonable person must wonder at the thought processes of the administration officials who advocate arms transfer of such sophisticated materiel and of such magnitude. I am not opposed to selling Jordan defense weapons but they must be of a reasonable amount and provided within a phased time period. Congressman BINGHAM has suggested that any future delivery of weapons to Jordan should be piece meal and contingent upon the situation in the Middle East. I fully endorse that position.

Finally, as we are all well aware, this proposed arms transfer is not occuring in a vacuum. Last year, $6.5 billion in weapons from the United States went to the Mideast with the Arab countries receiving the lion's share. The Persian Gulf area this year alone has purchased $3.6 in weapons from the United States. Quite simply, there is more than enough in armaments in the Middle East to royally support any of the conflicts which might flare up at any time. The United States is the major supplier of these tools of war.

I question the absence in our Government of a framework for decision making with respect to governmental grants, credits and sales and private sector sales. The provision of military weapons or lack thereof is every much a part of foreign policy as is the signing of a treaty. Developing and changing power bases by the provision of military weaponry should be a carefully thought out, openly arrived at process, not an after-the-fact justification. I believe that Congress must immediately serve notice to the administration of its determination to force such a process. By voting for House Congressional Resolution 337 to prevent the proposed sale to Jordan, we will be taking an important first step in this direction.

THE 1915 GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I introduced House Joint Resolution 148, which would have designated April 24, 1975, as a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man" in commemoration of the 1915 Armenian genocide. Over 50 Members joined as cosponsors of this resolution which was passed by an overwhelming margin in the House on April 8, 1975. The Senate failed to act on this important measure; nevertheless, Americans of Armenian origin and their friends throughout the world set aside that day, the 60th anniversary of the first heinous act of genocide of this century, to reflect upon man's past inhumanity to his fellow man.

In the course of my efforts in behalf of this resolution, I received a very large volume of correspondence from all parts of the country concerning the tragic plight of the Armenians who perished in Turkey in 1915. Although the proposed day of observance has since passed, I would still like to commend to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues one particularly scholarly and moving letter written to me on the necessity of preserving an accurate historical record of this horrible episode, as well as other acts of wanton human destruction, to serve as a compelling reminder to us that we must constantly guard the infinitely precious quality of human life.

Following is the text of this excellent letter from Marjorie Housepian (Mrs. M. Dodkin), associate dean of studies and associate in English at Barnard College, on leave this year and working as research fellow at Bryn Mawr:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HELSTOSKI: I am writing in support of your Bill H.J. Res. 148. As author of, among other books, The Smyrna Affair (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971) which concerns the burning of that city

(now called Izmir) in Turkey, in 1922, and the massacre of its Armenian and Greek population, I spent eight years doing research not only on that event but on the historical background which led to it. This necessarily included the Armenian genocide during World War I, and the stance of the great Powers, most especially of the United States during both these periods. Much of my research was done in the archives of the U.S. Department of State and in the Naval Records, as well as the manuscript division of the Library of Congress. In addition, I consulted unpublished British documents, the private papers of American Consul George Horton and the diaries of some of the U.S. naval personnel stationed at Smyrna during the fire to protect American installations. I read exhaustively in French, as well as British and American sources and in translation from Greek, German and Turkish sources—some of the latter are on file in our State Department archives.

My primary interest is in the historical record, which has been consistently distorted by Turkish sources, and also—sometimes wittingly and at other times unwittingly, by Americans and Europeans. The leadership in the U.S. of the Protestant missions in Turkey, for example, found it expedient, after a time, to hush the accounts of their missionaries who had been eyewitnesses to the events, especially those which occurred during World War I. In the same way the Department of State in its press releases concerning the fire of Smyrna and massacre of minorities in 1922, contradicted the testimony of U.S. Intelligence sources in that city whose blow by blow accounts of Turkish atrocities are on file in the archives. Since that time considerable confusion has resulted regarding both the genocide of 1915 and its sequel, on a far smaller scale, toward Greeks and Armenians in Smyrna, in 1922. Few history books deal with the minorities in Turkey during and after World War I, and the few that do have aodpted the Turkish view and minimized the happenings; while the majority of Americans have very little notion of the Near East, and even some "experts" concerned with that area have very little understanding of the attitudes and feelings which have resulted from the events of the not-so-distant past. Those who know better have either ignored the touchy issue of genocide and massacre of minorities in Turkey (foreign historians seeking to do research in Turkey can obviously investigate only areas approved by those who control the Turkish archives and would moreover be considered persona non grata were they to concern themselves with investigations unpopular with the Turks), or have accepted the Turkish view in a persistent effort to appease the sort of xenophobia which is ironically enough fostered by these very efforts. Therefore, what was indeed the first genocide of the 20th century has never been officially acknowledged by Turkey and has been largely forgotten by mankind.

The danger of such forgetfulness is that it contributes to ignorance and self-deception, the victims of these being the peoples of every nation, including our own. It is therefore in our own self interest to foster the remembrance of things past, so that the present and the future may profit from those principles which the chain of events we call history brings to light.

While secondary sources (books based not on first hand documents or witnesses, but at second-hand, on hearsay and other books) have largely ignored or distorted the treatment of Turkey's minorities after the turn of the century, there is no lack of impartial primary sources, both published and unpublished, to verify that a genuine genocide—as we now call a concerted, deliberate effort on the part of a government to exterminate a race or group—did indeed take place. In other words the Turkish view that the massacre of Armenians was largely a measure of self-defense because the Armenians were aiding and abetting the Allies during World War I, is absolutely false according to all the available evidence. Our own American Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau, has stated that the Turks were intent on wiping out the entire Armenian population, using the War as an excuse to rid themselves of a group that could be potentially troublesome. ("Those who are not guilty today may be guilty tomorrow," the Ambassador was told by the Turkish leaders.) German documents, as well as American consular reports emphasize that the Turkish leaders were moreover desperately in need of a scapegoat for their initial staggering defeats in the Caucasus at the outset of World War I, a war which was unpopular with the masses of Turks who had no appetite for fighting the British, or indeed for fighting at all at that time. The relative prosperity of the Armenian population was also a sore point; by banishing the Armenians into oblivion the Turkish government could also confiscate and redistribute their properties.

There is not a shred of evidence to substantiate Turkish claims that the Turkish Armenians were traitors to the Turkish war effort; and this in spite of the fact that a considerable Armenian population in Russia was fighting with the Russians against the Turks. The motives for the attempted extermination of the Armenians are complex, too much so to sum up in a short statement, but the evidence is glaring that the Armenians provided no provocation whatever despite considerable attempts to provoke them into retaliating, and that at least three-fourths of the Armenian people—approximately 1,500,000 men, women and children at conservative estimate were wiped out by "deportation" into the deserts where they were at the mercy of the gendarmerie and tribesmen. Those not killed outright, or more often after sadistic torture, very effectively perished from a lack of water and food.

Thus the "Armenian problem" was settled, indeed before it ever arose, for the vast majority of Armenians had not until this time been seeking territorial independence. Only those Armenians remained who were fortunate enough to live in Constantinople or Smyrna (where the leaders of the communities were sent to their deaths) where there were too many foreigners to witness sterner measures; or those who managed to escape over foreign borders. Many of these last returned after the war, under promises of Allied protection, only to be massacred later when the Allies vied with each other to gain Turkey's favor; each hoping to beat the other to the exploitation of the oil fields of Mosul, then a part of Turkey.

In the end, of course Turkey lost Mosul to Iraq, and became nothing more than a sieve for foreign—largely American-aid. For all their pains the Board of Missions lost their schools, one by one: at this writing three remain out of an original 353. Turkey's most profitable export has been heroin. The fields once cultivated by the Greeks and Armenians and which provided the breadbasket of Turkey have been devoted, since the demise of the minorities or their expulsion (in the case of the Greeks) to the less strenuous production of poppies—U.S. aid providing the grain. And then one wonders, in the age of the airplane, of exactly how much value is Turkey's geo-political position. Not enough, surely, to maintain a historical deception and in so doing to encourage others to take the cynical view expressed, in 1938, by Adolph Hitler when he asked, "Who, after all, remembers the extermination of the Armenians? . . . The world believes in success alone." Hitler, let it not be forgotten, was a great reader of history.

Yours sincerely,

MARJORIE HOUSEPIAN.

H.R. 7014 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the consideration of my colleagues a newly revised draft of my proposed amendment to the bill, H.R. 7014.

The revisions made in this amendment are, for the most part, technical. I have made one substantive change to assure that acquisition of sites, construction of facilities, and acquisition of raw materials shall not be accomplished by condemnation.

The article follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7014 AS REPORTED—OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

Page 338, after line 25, insert the following:

Liquefaction and Gasification of Coal

SEC. 607. (a) The Administrator shall establish a program of assistance to private industry for the construction and operation of one or more facilities for the liquefaction or gasification of coal. In order to effectuate such program, the Administrator may make loans and issue guarantees to any person for the purpose of engaging in the commercial operation of facilities designed for the liquefaction or gasification of coal.

(b)(1) For the purpose of making loans or issuing guarantees under this section, the Administrator shall consider (A) the technology to be used by the person to whom the loan or guarantee is made or issued, (B) the production expected, (C) reasonable prospect for repayment of the loans.

(2) In making such determination, the Administrator is to give preference to projects which would provide additional employment opportunities in depressed areas and increase competition within the coal and petroleum industry.

(3) The Administrator shall not make any loan or issue any guarantee to any person which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly, by any foreign government or instrumentality of such government, including any national oil company of such foreign government, unless the President finds that such loan or guarantee is in the national interest and authorizes the Administrator to make such loan or issue such guarantee.

(c)(1) The Administrator may enter into purchase agreements to assure a market for the output of such facilities when the cost of production exceeds current market prices.

(2) The Administrator shall, in order to assure adequate supplies of material, equipment, and market outlets for the output of such facilities, guarantee performance of contracts by persons receiving loans from the Administrator for the purchase, construction, or other acquisition of equipment and supplies necessary to develop, construct, and operate any such facility.

(d) The construction plans and actual construction of any facility (including any exploration) financed, in whole or in part, under this section shall be reviewed from time to time by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency who is authorized to require the use in such facility of the most thorough pollution control devices then available. The cost of such devices shall be included in the total cost of each such facility and shall be taken into consideration by the Administrator in granting any loan or entering into any guarantee agreement or purchase or price support agreement under this section.

PURCHASES OF SITES, RESERVES AND CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

SEC. 608. (a) the Administrator is authorized—

(1) to acquire sites by purchase, except by condemnation, and construct facilities deemed necessary by him to carry out the gasification and liquefaction of coal under section 607 of this Act.

(2) with respect to each such project, to acquire, by purchase, except by condemnation, such reserves of coal as he may deem necessary to assure supplies of raw materials adequate for the attainment of the objectives of such project, and

(3) to acquire, except by condemnation, from private interests such facilities as may have therefore been constructed or acquired by such interests, whether in whole or in part, in connection with any project for the liquefaction or gasification of coal at prices to be negotiated by the administrator with such private interests: *Provided, however,* That in connection with any such acquisition the private interests shall be granted an option to lease such facilities.

upon the terms and conditions provided for in subsection (b) of this section, such option to be exercised within six months from the date on which the facilities were transferred to the Administrator, if complete, or within six months from the date when such facilities are completed by the Administrator.

(b) (1) Facilities acquired or constructed under this section shall be leased to any person at such rentals and upon such terms and conditions as shall be agreed to by the parties.

(2) Each such lease shall provide that the lessee may sell at prevailing market prices or acquire for its own account at such prices, the output of such facilities.

(3) Each lease shall further provide that the lessee shall have options to purchase the facilities at any time within ten years after the date of the respective lease at a price to be agreed upon by the parties. Each option shall be conditioned, however, upon the right of the Administrator within the ten-year term to offer the facilities for sale at public auction and the lessee shall be entitled to purchase the facilities if he meets the highest bona fide offer in excess of the agreed option price. In order that an offer may be considered bona fide, it shall be offered by a bidder who shall have been determined by the Administrator to be financially and technically qualified to purchase and operate the facilities.

(4) No private interest shall be permitted to lease or purchase any facility covered by this section if such interest is a person who is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by any foreign government or instrumentality of such government, including any national oil company, unless the President finds that such sale or lease is in the national interest and specifically authorizes such lease or purchase.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 609. As used in sections 607 and 608:

(1) The term "facilities" means land, mineral rights, mines, water rights, rights-of-way, easements, and other interests in land, pipelines, machinery and equipment, and all other property, real, personal, or mixed, used or to be used in connection with any project for the liquefaction or gasification of coal.

(2) The term "person" does not include Federal, State, or local governments or any subdivision or agency thereof.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 610. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated sums not to exceed $750,000,000 for fiscal year 1976 to carry out section 607.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated sums not to exceed $750,000,000 for fiscal year 1976 to carry out section 608.

ADMINISTRATION CONCERN OVER H.R. 6844

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from OMB, the Justice Department and the Civil Service Commission expressing concern over some of the provisions in H.R. 6844, the Consumer Protection Safety Commission Improvements Act. For the benefit of all my colleagues in the House, I am inserting these letters at this point in the RECORD in order to inform the Members about the specific objections raised regarding H.R. 6844.

The letters follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1975.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: We would like to call to your attention a number of problems in H.R. 6844, the "Consumer Product Safety Commission Improvements Act." We understand that H.R. 6844 is scheduled for House floor action in the near future.

We strongly object to Section 4 since it ignores the principle of the career/noncareer distinction in the Federal civil service system. CPSC would be allowed to appoint individuals to career civil service positions without having to comply with the rules and regulations governing such appointments applicable throughout the civil service system.

Section 12 of H.R. 6844 would authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to represent itself in all civil enforcement and subpoena enforcement proceedings. We strongly oppose this section because it violates the long-standing tradition of Justice Department control over the conduct of Federal litigation. Centralization of Federal litigation is necessary to present a uniform position on important legal issues before the courts, to exercise selectivity in the filing and presentation of cases in order to place the Government's position in the most favorable light, to provide greater objectivity in the handling of cases, and to achieve better rapport with courts through the daily working relationships developed by U.S. Attorneys.

We understand that the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Justice will be submitting letters to you shortly which discuss the above objections to Sections 4 and 12 in more detail.

H.R. 6844 would authorize $51 million for fiscal year 1976, $14 million for the transition quarter, $60 million for 1977, and $68 million for 1978. We believe that these appropriations authorizations in H.R. 6844 are excessive. We recommend that they be amended to be consistent with the President's Budget request for CPSC of $36.6 million for 1976 and $9 million for the transition quarter.

We also recommend repeal of Subsection 27(k) in the Consumer Product Safety Act, which provides for simultaneous submission to the Office of Management and Budget and Congress of all budget request and legislative information. Our experience during CPSC's three years of operation has been that this provision leads to confusion. Subsection 27(k) also prevents the coordination of legislative recommendations among CPSC and other Federal agencies. It does not allow CPSC to benefit from the views of other affected agencies before submitting its legislative proposals, or to comment on the legislative proposals of other Federal agencies before congressional submission. The provision, therefore, prevents necessary issue development and dialogue within the Executive Branch. Repeal of Subsection 27(k) would help assure maximum effectiveness of both CPSC and other Federal agencies through better coordination and development of consistent programs.

For all of the above reasons, the Office of Management and Budget strongly urges that H.R. 6844 be amended as recommended above.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. LYNN,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1975.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: The Department of Justice would be pleased to present its views on H.R. 6844, the proposed "Consumer Product Safety Commission Improvements Act."

Section 12 of H.R. 6844 would constitute a major abridgment of the Attorney General's traditional position of supervising the conduct of government litigation. Subsection (a) would delete references to the Attorney General in subsection 11(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2060(a)) concerning the judicial review of certain Consumer Product Safety Commission rules. Subsection (b) would amend subsection 27 (b)(7) (15 U.S.C. 2076(b)(7)) to authorize the Commission to initiate, prosecute, defend, or appeal (other than to the United States Supreme Court) any civil action in the name of the Commission for the purposes of enforcing the laws subject to its jurisdiction, and to initiate, prosecute, defend, or appeal any criminal action in the name of the Commission for the purpose of enforcing the laws subject to its jurisdiction, through its own legal representative with the concurrence of the Attorney General. Subsection (c) of section 12 of the bill would delete from section 27(c) (15 U.S.C. 2076(c)) the requirement that the Commission obtain the concurrence of the Attorney General before it brings its own subpoena enforcement actions.

The Department of Justice strongly opposes the amendments proposed by section 12. We consider them inconsistent with sound policy and precedent, and wholly unnecessary to assist in vigorous and effective enforcement of the important public safety statutes within the Commission's responsibility.

The basic and traditional policy with respect to Government litigation is declared by 28 U.S.C. 516, 518, and 519, which provide that, except as otherwise authorized by law, officers of the Department of Justice, under the direction of the Attorney General, are responsible for the supervision and conduct of litigation involving the interests of the United States or its agencies. The policies underlying this rule include the desirability of the government speaking with one voice on common issues of law and policy arising under diverse statutes; the necessity for consistency and fairness in law enforcement; the ability to exercise selectivity in the filing or presentation of cases in order to maximize the likelihood of a successful result, since court determinations frequently have

impacts beyond the particular agency involved; and the importance to success for the Government's cases against local defendants in local courts that they be presented by local attorneys from the United States Attorneys' offices. It also encourages a sensible division of responsibilities under which agency lawyers concentrate on the intricacies of administrative activities under statutes with which they are intimately familiar, while Department attorneys concentrate on the area of their familiarity and expertise—Federal court litigation.

Unfortunately, from time to time, Congress has made exceptions to the salutary principle of centralized control of Government litigation. Indeed, the Consumer Product Safety Act itself is such an exception, insofar as the Attorney General can authorize the agency to represent itself in civil enforcement matters. These statutory exceptions follow no consistent pattern, either as to subject matter of litigation or scope of independent authority. The Department of Justice has generally opposed these exceptions, and we continue to oppose further piecemeal deviations from what heretofore has been a consistent policy.

The Department of Justice and the Commission have a working arrangement whereby the Department has agreed to permit the Commission to represent itself in any civil enforcement matter which the Department declines to file. This agreement, which has been extended to any suit in district or appellate court in which the agency is named as defendant, insures that the agency's interest in any civil litigation, whether it appears as plaintiff or defendant, will be fully and fairly presented to the court. Interestingly, this agreement has never been utilized for the simple reason that every Commission recommendation for a civil enforcement action has been duly filed and prosecuted by the Department with the advice and cooperation of the Commission's General Counsel. Every request from the Commission that the Department represent the agency as defendant in suits filed in federal court has been honored by the Department.

The Department of Justice recommends the deletion of section 12 of H.R. 6844 because it ignores the principle of centralized control of Federal litigation and because it is simply unnecessary, offering no improvement in result, conferring no authority not already available as a practical matter, and holding only the promise of the loss of Department expertise and unnecessary duplicative expenses.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL M. UHLMANN,
Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1975.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: We wish to submit for your consideration the Civil Service Commission's views on the personnel provisions of H.R. 6844, the Consumer Product Safety Commission Improvements Act.

Section 4(b) authorizes the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to designate up to 25 positions as "noncareer" if their principal duties involve (A) significant participation in the determination of major Commission policies, or (B) service as a personal assistant or as an advisor to the Chairman or any other Commissioner. The Civil Service Commission (CSC) finds the provisions of section 4(b) highly objectionable in that they contradict the principle of the career/noncareer distinction in the Federal civil service system. The concept behind the creation of the so-called "noncareer" except (provided by the Executive Assignment System) was to place positions with politically oriented policy and advocacy responsibilities outside the competitive service. The "exception" provided by section 4(b) does not fit that context. Criterion (A) in the section is oriented strictly toward the management of CPSC programs which, according to statements by Chairman Simpson, may at times be controversial but are apolitical in nature and are not reflective of the political policies of a given administration. Under the Executive Assignment System positions that are principally concerned with internal management of an agency's programs do not qualify for exclusion from the competitive service. We believe that this principle should continue, and, accordingly, are opposed to enactment of section 4(b) since it would create an entirely new and unnecessary criterion.

Criterion (B) in effect duplicates the existing noncareer executive assignment criterion pertaining to positions filled by persons who "serve as a personal assistant or as an advisor to the Chairman or any other Commissioner." It is, therefore, superfluous. In fact, the CSC recently approved a GS–16 noncareer position in the CPSC on the basis of this criterion. This section in application could literally result in a situation where all the supergrade positions established in the CPSC could be "noncareer." We feel that it is reasonable to speculate that almost any supergrade position in an agency of this size would be assigned responsibilities that involve "significant participation in the determination of major Commission policies" (Criterion (A)). Those that are not assigned such responsibilities would probably be advisors or assistants and could be declared "noncareer" using Criterion (B). Such a situation would give a relatively small agency, that has a mission that is stated to be apolitical in nature, a higher percentage of "noncareer" positions than any other Federal agency. This would seriously truncate the career service within the supergrade ranks.

This section also vests the Chairman of the CPSC with the authority to except positions from the competitive service. This is a power that heretofore had been reserved to the Civil Service Commission, the President, and the Congress. It does provide for prior Civil Service Commission review to determine that the duties of a position actually meet the "noncareer" criterion. However, it imposes a 20-day time limit on the Civil Service Commission in reviewing proposed noncareer appointment authorities for positions authorized by section 4(b) and evaluating the qualifications of candidates proposed for these positions. As the provision is stated, the CPSC would unilaterally act on such proposals if the Civil Service Commission failed to complete action on them within 20 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays).

This provision is highly objectionable, both in terms of its negative impact on effective management and the extremely undesirable legislative precedent in regard to Federal personnel management that it would represent.

The imposition of such a time limit is completely arbitrary and creates a situation where evaluation of the true merits of administrative actions could easily become obsolete. The provision places the burden of performance entirely on the CSC. It does not require the agency to meet any standards of quality in making its proposals. Obviously, the agency could exploit this provision by forwarding inadequate submissions and then simply "running the clock out" while the CSC was trying to develop the information to make a fair decision. In this fashion, both the authority to except supergrade positions from the competitive service and the authority to determine that individuals are qualified for these positions would, in fact, rest solely with the agency. The agency could effectively remove itself from the provisions of statute and Executive order that are designed to protect the integrity of the merit system and that provide constraints intended to maintain the high quality of executive manpower management.

In terms of representing an undesirable legislative precedent, a proliferation of provisions of this type could literally render the present Federal personnel management system inoperable.

This section contains provisions for appointments to and removals from the "noncareer" positions it authorizes. It provides that (1) appointments and removals made by the Chairman, CPSC, shall be subject to the approval of that Commission; (2) appointments and removals of personal assistants to the Chairman or other Commissioners Criterion (B) of section 4(b), shall not be subject to the approval of any other Commissioner; and (3) appointments and removals shall not be subject to the approval of any officer or entity within the Executive Office of the President, or OMB, or any officer thereof, or by any office or agency of the Federal government other than the Commission. It further provides that such appointments and removals may be made without regard to any provision of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments and removals in the competitive service except for section 3324 (CSC approval of qualifications for supergrade positions).

The intent appears to be to exempt the positions authorized by section 4(b) from the same provisions of title 5 from which the existing category of noncareer executive assignment positions are exempted. As worded, however, it may go beyond that by, for example, exempting the positions from the removal requirements that apply to preference eligibles who serve in the usual noncareer executive assignments. We feel that this provision is another objectionable feature of section 4(b).

Accordingly, the Civil Service Commission strongly objects to section 4(b) in its entirety and feels that it should be deleted.

Section 4(c) authorizes the CPSC to establish 15 GS–16, 17 and 18 positions "without regard to chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code," except or section 5114. (Section 5114 is the reporting requirement for supergrade positions.) These provisions would give the CPSC 15 quota spaces that are in the general schedule but are not subject to provisions of law covering the classification of such positions. We feel that the legislating of supergrade spaces for specific positions or agencies is contrary to the effective management of supergrade spaces on a governmentwide basis. It is our opinion that if supergrade spaces are legislated they should be assigned to the governmentwide pool from which they may be allocated on the basis of a system of program priorities and national needs. We are strongly opposed to section 4(c) and feel this section should also be deleted. As written, the section has the additional negative aspect of removing the positions from coverage of chapter 51, title 5, United States Code. This means the positions even though they are in the general schedule are not subject to the laws governing position classification. While the Civil Service Commission would have the responsibility for reviewing the qualifications of candidates for these positions this review would apply only to an analysis of the individuals' qualifications against those of the position. There would be no CSC analysis in terms of the grade worth of the duties assigned to the position.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON,
Chairman.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert into the RECORD an address delivered before the World Anti-Communist League's mass rally in Taipei, Taiwan by our distinguished colleague from Idaho, STEVE SYMMS. As last week marked the 16th year of the observance of Captive Nations Week, the people of the Republic of China held a rally in support of freedom for those nations enslaved under the bondage of communism.

Congressman SYMMS, the featured speaker at this gathering, expressed the significance of the struggle for the promotion and preservation of freedom for all nations and victory over oppressive Communist rule. In view of the Communist aggression in Indochina and the fall of Cambodia and Vietnam during this past year, the importance of this mass rally against communism and the participation of Congressman SYMMS in the cause, provides spiritual support to those held captive.

It is a great honor to insert this address by STEVE SYMMS which was delivered on July 15, in Taipei:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN STEVE SYMMS BEFORE THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE, TAIPEI, TAIWAN

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference, it is a great honor for me to be with you in the Republic of China today to observe Captive Nations Week with one of America's oldest and best allies.

The theme of this Week is Freedom. Reflecting upon this, I realize that those of us who have lived in freedom and known nothing else are really not able to fully appreciate its blessings. Americans, for example, have never felt the heel of tyranny bear heavy upon their necks. They have never witnessed their freedoms being stripped away at the hands of communist oppression. The Italian poet Dante tells us that the greatest tragedy is to be living in slavery and despair while remembering liberty from the past. No one understands the value of liberty more than those who once enjoyed it and then watched it slip away. For this reason, I dedicate my remarks today to all those in the world who are now being denied their rights as free men . . . to those who live in the Captive Nations.

The peoples of the Soviet Union certainly yearn to be free, as one quickly gathers from the writings of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn. Recently, this great spokesman for Russian liberty described the pattern of events which has led to the enslavement of so many hundreds of millions during the past three decades:

"When we study the course of these last thirty years," he tells us, "we see it as a long, sinuous descent—an unbroken descent toward enfeeblement and decadence. The powerful Western states, having emerged victorious from two previous world wars, in the course of these thirty years of peace have lost their real and potential allies, ruined their credibility in the eyes of the world, and abandoned to an implacable enemy whole territories and populations: China (which had been their most important ally in the Second World War), North Korea, Cuba, North Vietnam, today South Vietnam, today Cambodia. Laos is being lost; Thailand, South Korea are in danger, Portugal is throwing herself irretrievably into the abyss; Finland and Austria are resigned to their fate, powerless to defend themselves and unable, on the evidence, to expect help from outside. There is no room to list all the little countries of Africa and the Middle East that have become puppets of Communism, and all the others, even in Europe, that hasten to grovel on their knees in order to survive."

The important thing for us to remember is that Communist victory is not inevitable—it can be stopped. Communist conquests are only inevitable if we consider them to be. Resigning ourselves to a fate of slavery is exactly what our enemies would like us to do. The chief aim of all communist propaganda is the erosion of our spirit and will to resist. We must never allow ourselves to play into the hands of the enemy by accepting the Big Lie that communism is inevitable.

Almost exactly 199 years ago today the founders of my country declared that "All men are created equal." By this they meant that all men everywhere are equal in their natural yearning for liberty. It is in the very nature of man to be free. They believe, as I do, that some day every man on this planet will be free. Yet believing in this alone will not bring it about. Freedom is not free. Mankind must fight to win it and must always be prepared to fight to defend it. The founders of my country were tired of the yoke of tyranny and took it upon themselves to throw it off. These were men who were determined to change the course of their destinies and, against tremendous odds, would settle for nothing less than total victory. If it could be done in America, then it can be done anywhere in the world. I have faith that it will be done. If not our children, then our grandchildren will join in burying the last vestiges of totalitarianism on this earth.

Many in my country urge that we "coexist" and cooperate with tyranny, but I am not one of them. The founder of my political party, Abraham Lincoln, once observed that no nation can endure half-slave and half-free, that liberty and tyranny are incompatible. The same axiom can be applied to the world at large. Freedom and slavery are in perpetual conflict and, in the end, one or the other must triumph. The leaders of the Free World must recognize that there can be no peace with oppression. The only real choices are victory or surrender. For this reason I am not interested in "detente" or "coexistence" with communism. I am interested in victory over communism! Only through victory can genuine peace ever be achieved.

When I say I look forward to the day when all men everywhere will be free, I am speaking as one U.S. Congressman. I am confident, however, that I speak for the majority of the American people, and a large contingent of my colleagues in Congress. The American people have always been willing to stand up for freedom, to fight for freedom and, if necessary, to die for freedom. That our State Department policies have seldom reflected the same dedication and the same resolve is one of the great tragedies of our time.

Your great leader Chiang Kai-shek has warned us that "Communists are communists, first, last and always." Unfortunately, many Americans still need to learn that lesson. Many of our leaders still do not understand the true nature of communism. As a result, American foreign policy over the past 40 years has amounted to nothing more than a steady string of disastrous concessions and backdowns to the Communist World. We have on the one hand supplied communist countries with huge quantities of U.S. aid, and on the other hand, with every conceivable type of American technology it wished. Meanwhile, we have fed its appetite for conquest with appeasement after appeasement at the conference table.

These policies have got to stop. In the aftermath of the Vietnam debacle, America must start anew. We must learn the painful lessons of a twelve year, no-win war, and re-dedicate our nation to the ideals of victory and freedom. We must reaffirm our unquestioned support for the government of Free China and regard as inevitable the liberation of the mainland from communist rule. America must proclaim to the world that it will tolerate no more stalemates and no more defeats. America's retreat has come to an end.

In saying this, I am not advocating the commission of U.S. troops to battle around the world. With all my heart, I pray it will never come to that. What I do advocate is a willingness of my country's leaders to extend moral and economic support to freedom fighters around the world, and to stop making senseless and suicidal concessions to World Communism. At the same time, it is of utmost importance that the United States maintain a strategic nuclear superiority that can be challenged by none. Only from a position of strength can we ever hope to achieve peace and freedom.

In the few days I have been in your country it has become clear to me that you are winning the struggle with the Barbarian rulers who are occupying—temporarily—the mainland of your nation. You have done so by showing to the world that freedom works. Your people, working in freedom, have created a far more prosperous economy than the slave-masters on the mainland could ever hope to accomplish with all their terror and coercion. Walking through the streets of Taipei, I have seen firsthand the liberty your people enjoy—freedom to buy what they want, and say what they want. Moreover, the Republic of China has kept alive the great cultural heritage which spans thousands of years of Chinese civilization. I only wish our Secretary of State would spend some time in your great country, and learn to appreciate the tremendous accomplishments of the free Chinese people.

This coming year is the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. At that time, I would like nothing better than to return to China and to celebrate the Fourth of July not only in Taipei, but also on a liberated mainland. There could be no greater birthday present to the American people than to know that one-third of the human race is once again free, and that the great Chiang Kai-shek lies in his proper resting place in the town of his birth.

One day soon, we will meet again to celebrate freedom—in all of China—in Taipei, in Shanghai, in Nanking, in Canton . . . and in *Peking!* In the meantime, be assured that this is one American who will never shake the bloody hand of Mao nor toast to the tryrant, Chou en Lai.

THOMAS J. FLANAGAN, GREAT AMERICAN

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate and offer my best wishes to an old and dear friend of mine Thomas J. Flanagan of Milton, Mass.,

who on July 20, 1975, celebrated his 75th birthday.

Torn was born in south Boston on July 20, 1900, the son of James and Mary Flanagan. He attended the Lincoln School and the High School of Commerce in Boston and the Knights of Columbus Accounting School. His business career has been in the field of accounting, starting with the Internal Revenue Service. After 10 years with the service, in 1929, he joined the New England Electric System's accounting department and in 1948 was appointed vice president in charge of taxes, a position he held until his retirement in 1965. He has also been a consultant on taxes to numerous companies and organizations and is still very active in tax consulting work today. He has also served on the boards of numerous banks in the Boston area.

In addition to his very busy professional life, Tom has always given freely of his time to charitable organizations such as the Holy Name Society and the 100 Club. Dear to his heart are the organizations of Irish background. He has long been a member of the Chowder and Marching Society, the Erie Society of Boston, the Charitable Irish Society and the Clover Club of Boston where he has been treasurer for more than 8 years. Tom was most proud of all when in 1947, His Holiness Pope Pius XII named him a Knight of Malta, the highest honor the Catholic Church can bestow on a lay person.

Again, let me extend my congratulations and best wishes for many more happy and productive years to come.

AID FOR SPECIAL VETERANS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House has recognized the needs of the members of the armed forces of Poland and Czechoslovakia who so valiantly fought against nations at war with the United States in World War I and World War II, and who after immigration to the United States, found themselves without adequate medical and hospital benefits. H.R. 71, long overdue legislation, would provide recognition to the Polish and Czech freedom fighters who have been American citizens for at least 10 years and who are not entitled to adequate medical care by a foreign government, and would provide them with that basic assistance.

Those brave soldiers who would benefit from the legislation fought with great courage in alliance with, and against the foes of the United States and its major allies. When the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia changed many of the freedoms for which these men fought were relinquished. In their subsequent quest for their freedom, many Poles and Czechs immigrated to the United States and became contributing and active citizens in our country.

As you know, similar legislation was introduced in the 93d Congress and received broad support from many Members and citizens concerned with providing aid to well-deserving defendants of the philosophy of freedom. The House passed the bill last session, however, unfortunately it did not receive consideration by the Senate before adjournment.

I hope that this bill can be expedited and the long-deserving recipients eligible to apply immediately. Those benefiting from adoption of this bill have lived in the United States at least 10 years. Recipients would be required to provide eligibility in the form of an authenticated certification from the French Ministry of Defense or the British War Office.

We must now recognize that these veterans have worked within the American system and made valuable contributions to our social well-being. It is time that we terminate any indication of second-rate citizenship, and provide them with benefits available to the veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has recognized the rights that all our veterans who fought side by side in the agonies and traumas of war, for the freedoms we cherish in times of peace. I hope the Senate will quickly verify that right, and provide hospital and medical care to these deserving veterans.

THE TORCH OF LEARNING AWARD

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of attending an especially impressive ceremony in my district. The occasion was sponsored by the American Friends of the Hebrew University, and its purpose was to honor four outstanding men for their contributions to education and to the welfare of mankind.

Those of my constituents who were recognized at the Torch of Learning Dinner of the American Friends of the Hebrew University are as follows: David Baker, former president of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Columbia, United Jewish Appeal, and B'nai B'rith campaign chairman of the United Fund, and vice president of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce; Irwin Kahn, past president of the United Jewish Appeal, president of the Beth Sholom Synagogue, Columbia Jewish Community Center, chairman of the United Fund, and member of the Board of Trustees of Benedict College Endowment Program and Human Relations Council; and Bernard Kline, past State chairman of Radio Free Europe, director of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, member of the Board of Trustees of United Community Services, and chairman of the South Carolina United Jewish Appeal.

A special posthumous award was presented to the late Samuel Rubin—1915–73—treasurer of United Jewish Appeal for 25 years, treasurer of the Columbia Jewish Welfare Federation, member of the board of the Columbia Jewish Community Center, commander chef de gare of American Legion Post No. 6, State vice commander of the American Legion, and judge advocate of the American Legion.

All of these gentlemen have contributed to the vitality of my home city and State, Mr. Speaker, and they are highly respected throughout South Carolina. I am proud that they have received this outstanding recognition from the American Friends of the Hebrew University, and I am proud to have them as my constituents.

The description of the Torch of Learning Award which appeared in the official program for the awards dinner, sets out very eloquently the meaning and significance of this honor:

THE TORCH OF LEARNING AWARD

The Torch of Learning Award was created by the American Friends of the Hebrew University as a mark of recognition for leaders of American Jewish communities who have influenced the course of Judaism and education in the United States and Israel.

Higher education and research have become the most significant endeavors in Israel next to the problem of security. To continue her progress as a viable, self-sustaining democracy, Israel must maintain a high level of qualified leaders for social, political, economic, educational and research programs. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, this year celebrating its 50th Anniversary, provides a treasured reservoir for this indispensable manpower.

The Torch of Learning statuette was sculptured by the noted American artist, Chaim Gross, who donated it to the American Friends as his tribute to the Hebrew University. Each bronze statuette, which depicts a young student holding high the emblem of the Hebrew University, is numbered and signed by the artist.

For both its artistic and symbolic value, the Torch of Learning ranks amongst the most cherished honors in American Jewish life.

ETHNIC PATRIOTS DESERVE RECOGNITION DURING BICENTENNIAL—PART I

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the near future I intend to introduce a resolution in the House calling on the President to set aside 1 day during next year's Bicentennial celebration to honor the many contributions of ethnic patriots. In the interim, I intend to pay tribute to these patriots of various foreign extraction who played such a critical role in our early history.

The first ethnic group I would like to salute are the Italians. As in the case of all major ethnic groups there were many great Italians who came to this Nation and contributed to our success as a nation. I would like to concentrate on two specific figures of the Revolutionary and early Independence periods of our Nation's history—Dr. Philip Mazzei and Mr. Vincent Paca.

Dr. Philip Mazzei was a man who loved freedom. He was a man invited to the United States to provide early American figures with his wealth of knowledge on

matters related to agriculture. Once here, he became an eloquent advocate for American independence. His theories were so in line with the emerging cause of American independence that they were adopted by some our earliest spokesmen such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.

Mazzei became respected in his own right through his scathing essays denouncing the tyrannical rule of the Colonies by the British Government. Mazzei spent a great deal of time working with the Virginia County Committee promoting the cause for American freedom His excellent and numerous contributions to early America were saluted by the late John F. Kennedy in his book a "Nation of Immigration" who referred to Mazzei as an "Assistant Founding Father." Incidentally, Dr. Mazzei did not forget his original purpose for coming to this Nation and provided this Nation with a great deal of new agricultural knowledge which served us well in the early going.

Vincent Paca was another Italian who brought much and gave much to his adopted Nation. He served in the Continental Congress representing Maryland. He, too, was a dedicated advocate of American freedom and his personal efforts were realized when he was bestowed the honor of signing the Declaration of Independence. Paca continued in service to early America by serving as Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland as well as Governor.

As this Nation's 200th birthday approaches, I feel it incumbent on us to make efforts to fully understand and salute the contributions of all men and women to our Nations beginnings. We remain a nation with a sense of unity as Americans but a unique level of ethnic pride. We are a nation where people of diverse backgrounds can and do live. I will continue my salute to ethnic patriots in future days.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER DAY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, next year we will be celebrating our Bicentennial. I believe that it would be most fitting if we were to include in our Bicentennial plans a tribute to a group of people who have contributed and sacrificed greatly on behalf of the public safety of this Nation—our volunteer firefighters.

From the earliest days of the Republic, volunteer firefighters have tirelessly worked to protect their communities from the ravages of fire. Today, many communities around the country still depend on the skill and vigilance of volunteer firefighters.

These volunteers represent the unselfish spirit and courage which have helped to make this country what it is today, and certainly we should take the time to honor their contribution during the Bicentennial celebration. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution designating January 17, 1976 as "National Volunteer Firefighter Day" in order to honor the many contributions that volunteer firefighters have made to our Nation.

A copy of the Joint Resolution follows:

H.J. RES. ——

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 17, 1976 as "National Volunteer Firefighter Day."

Whereas firefighting has been a basic public safety function since the founding of the American Republic; and

Whereas the first firefighters were individuals who volunteered their services in order to protect their communities; and

Whereas in many communities throughout the nation today this same public safety function is still performed by volunteers in the same tradition as the early colonists; and

Whereas this spirit of volunteering to protect the public safety from the ravages of fire is in the best tradition of the American heritage; and

Whereas it would be fitting to commemorate the many sacrifices and contributions made by volunteer firefighters during the Bicentennial celebration of our nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating January 17, 1976 as "National Volunteer Firefighter Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

STUDY SHOWS ORGANIC FARMING IS ECONOMICALLY SOUND

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, an important and far-reaching report on the economic viability of farming without inorganic fertilizers and pesticides has just been released by the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems in St. Louis, Mo. Headed by the widely respected Dr. Barry Commoner, this study, entitled "A Comparison of the Production, Economic Returns, and Energy Intensiveness of Corn Belt Farms That Do and Do Not Use Inorganic Fertilizers and Pesticides," presents the results of a research study by CBNS. The study was supported by funding from the National Science Foundation, and shows that farming without chemical fertilizers and pesticides is practical, and economically feasible.

The report compares crop production on a sample of 16 mixed crop-livestock farms in the Corn Belt on which no inorganic fertilizers and almost no pesticides are used, to that of a matched sample that uses conventional fertilization and pest control practices. There was no difference between the two group's crop production returns, that is, value of production less operating costs. The energy intensiveness—defined as energy input divided by value of production—on the farms that do not use fertilizer is an average of one-third as much as that of the conventional group.

The results of the study indicate that farms using organic fertilizer and pest control methods may be less vulnerable than conventional farms to further disruptive effects of the energy crisis. Because the organic farms are not dependent on the use of inorganic fertilizers or pesticides, they are protected against shortages and increased prices of these materials, which are likely to be aggravated by expected continued increases in energy costs.

Another important implication of CBNS' study is that the profitability of organic farms, as compared with conventional farms, is less vulnerable to a decline in crop prices. While yields were lower on the organic farms, these farmers still had a favorable return. This suggests that organic farming is economically viable, and should become more so as energy costs and needs increase. Operating costs are a smaller fraction of the total value of production for the organic farmers than for conventional farmers—19 percent compared to 27 percent. Thus, the decline in crop prices that occurred between 1974 and 1975 would make the economic returns per acre in the organic sample higher than those of the unconventional sample, if all other factors remained unchanged.

The study graphically points out the need to take a fresh, new look at the design of conventional farming methods. In turn, this calls for a new approach to agricultural research, one that is receptive to the idea of examining unconventional practices.

From the evidence in the CBNS study, it appears that certain fundamental changes toward more energy-efficient and ecologically sound agricultural methods have great potential for improving the agricultural production system in the United States. A new kind of research approach is needed if this potential is to be realized, as well as an expanded awareness by the agriculture community that organic methods are practical and economical. Secretary Butz has been in the forefront of the large agribusiness interests who claim we need more and more chemicals to grow more food, and this study, for the first time presents some documentation that we may not need all these chemicals.

The article which follows, from the New York Times of July 20, details some of the findings of the CBNS study. I would urge my colleagues to read this article and become familiar with some of the possibilities of new research directions in agriculture:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1975]

ORGANIC FARMS FOUND EFFICIENT

(By Roy Reed)

ST. LOUIS, July 18.—Research scientists here have found that a test group of organic farmers who used no inorganic fertilizers or synthetic pesticides made as much money last year as did a comparable group of conventional farmers who used those substances.

Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University, organized the study after fertilizer prices doubled and in some cases tripled last year as a result of the oil shortage. The price of manufactured nitrogen, which is credited with greater yields of many crops, increased most rapidly. Much of it is made from natural gas.

"Rising fertilizer prices have seriously cut into farmers' incomes," Dr. Commoner said in connection with the center's report, which will be made public Sunday. "We were interested in learning whether there is an economically viable alternative that would allow farmers to become less vulnerable to this kind of problem."

Dr. Commoner said that although the findings of the study were tentative, they suggested that organic farming should be further investigated as a possible way to get around mushrooming farm costs.

IMPLICATIONS NOT CLEAR

The implications of the study for consumers are not clear. One of the organic farmers interviewed had laboratory reports showing that his crops were much higher in nutrients than those raised by the conventional method. The researchers intend to compare nutrients from the crops of the two kinds of farms as the study continues.

Whatever the message to consumers, the study is a sharp challenge to the accepted farming practices of the last 30 years, during which farmers have turned increasingly to labor-saving technology and to manufactured substances to stimulate plant growth and control weeds and insects.

The report suggested that farmers and scientists might profitably take a new look at such "outmoded" practices as crop rotation, frequent and careful tillage, planting legumes to capture nitrogen from the air and fertilizing with animal and plant wastes.

That would mean a heavier reliance on human labor than on chemicals which raises a question of where the labor would come from. Millions of persons have fled the farms this century and farmers everywhere complain of being unable to find workers.

LESS FOSSIL FUEL ENERGY

The researchers found that the organic farms used one-third as much fossil fuel energy as the conventional farms to produce the same amount of crops. Both types were fully mechanized so the difference lay in the large amounts of fuel required to manufacture fertilizers and pesticides.

The study covered 16 organic farms and 16 comparable conventional farms in five corn belt states—Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska and Missouri. All raised livestock as well as such crops as corn, soybeans, wheat, oats and hay. All were full-scale commercial operations. They varied in acreage from 175 to 785, with the average being 476.

The study is continuing this year. Dr. Commoner and five members of the center's staff

* * * * *

Gertler, Sarah Fast and Daniel O'Leary—are conducting the investigation as part of a long-term study of energy problems in agriculture. The study is being financed by the National Science Foundation's program of Research Applied to National Needs.

The organic farms in the study produced crops with an 8 per cent lower market value than the conventional farms. But their costs were only 19 per cent of the value of their production compared with 27 per cent for the others, so that the organic farms made as much profit as the conventional.

CORN CROP RESULTS

The main yield difference was in corn, which is highly responsive to heavy doses of nitrogen fertilizer. The organic farms produced 69 bushels an acre compared with 77 on the others. The organic yields of oats were also slightly lower, but those of soybeans and wheat were about the same as those of the conventional farms.

Another question raised by the study is what would replace the commercial fertilizers as a source of plant food. Present supplies of livestock manure and decaying plants probably would be inadequate. Several American universities are studying the possibility of using human waste as fertilizer by carrying sewage sludge to the farms.

Organic farms are a small minority in the United States, but they have increased in recent years. One reason is the rising cost of fertilizers. Another is that some farmers have become fearful of the environmental and health impacts of synthetic pesticides and large amounts of inorganic fertilizers.

Another recent study by Dr. Commoner's group found that certain Middle Western streams contain levels of nitrogen from fertilizer runoffs that exceed Public Health Service standards.

In addition to those who call themselves organic farmers, many other farmers have sharply reduced the use of fertilizers the last two years because of their cost.

A southern Minnesota man who was one of the center's "conventional" farmers for the study said in an interview that the higher prices had forced him to cut his fertilizer application in half this year.

This farmer had read the center's report, but he was not persuaded to switch to organic farming. He said he still believed he could get higher yields with at least a selective use of commercial fertilizers. He said it was necessary for him to get the highest possible yields because he owed a large debt for land he had bought.

Three farmers in the study were interviewed. The center asked that they not be identified because the study is continuing. All the participants were promised anonymity by the center.

One of the largest farms studied was in eastern Iowa. It is more than 700 acres and has 500 hogs and more than 800 head of cattle. It has been farmed organically for 18 years.

RASHES CAUSED

The farmer said he stopped using inorganic fertilizers and synthetic pesticides after he and several members of his family began suffering from a rash that their physician attributed to chemical poisons.

He uses animal manure and periodic applications of various commercial orgemanic fertilizers such as fish ulsion. For insect control, he relies on ladybugs and crop rotation.

Along with many other organic farmers, he believes that "healthy soil"—that is, soil well supplied with micro-organisms—does not attract as many insects as "dead" soil that has been treated many years with inorganic materials.

Dr. Commoner and his staff said they knew of no scientific basis for that belief. They noted, however, that organic farmers counted heavily on the return of natural predators to feed on insects once they stopped using chemical poisons.

The Iowan had copies of laboratory reports showing that his crops, especially his corn, tested much higher in protein and other nutrients than crops raised on conventional farms.

He said his animals had grown healthier since he stopped using chemicals. He said a few of his neighbors, most of whom had "bitterly condemned" him, are switching to his methods.

A southeastern Minnesota farmer has been farming organically since 1970. He owns 339 acres of rolling hill land and a dairy herd of 42 cows. He raises corn, oats and alfalfa to feed the herd and soybeans and wheat as cash crops.

He became interested in organic methods after reading an advertisement for an organic fertilizer of marine sediment. He toured some organic farms elsewhere in the Midwest and came away convinced that their crops and animals were healthier.

He said his corn yield had dropped from 125 bushels an acre to "over a hundred" after he stopped using commercial nitrogen and switched to the marine sediment. But he saves so much on his fertilizer bill, he said, that his income has remained steady.

The center's report speculated that the lower cost of the organic farms would make those farms less vulnerable to declining crop prices than the conventional farms.

NEIGHBOR'S REACTION

The Minnesota organic farmer no longer uses herbicides so he spends many more days plowing to control weeds. He uses a chisel plow, a narrow blade that makes a much shallower trench than the huge moldboard plow that is widely used by conventional farmers. That leaves the humus and the soil bacteria relatively undisturbed, the farmer said.

He makes no special effort to control insects but says he has no problem with them.

"Any time you use poison, you're really destroying life," he said.

He said only one or two of his neighbors had abandoned chemicals. He was asked what the others thought of organic farmers.

"They just think you're a nut or something," he said.

Dr. Commoner said his research found that American farmers now use five times as much commercial fertilizer as they did in 1950. He said pesticides had increased 40 per cent between 1966 and 1971. And while corn yields have doubled since 1950, he said, the cost of fertilizers and pesticides now make up half the cost of raising it.

Earl L. Butz, the Secretary of Agriculture, said on a television program in 1971:

"Without the modern input of chemicals, of pesticides, of antibiotics, of herbicides, we simply couldn't do the job. Before we go back to an organic agriculture in this country somebody must decided which 50 million Americans we are going to let starve or go hungry."

Dr. Commoner's group noted that most agriculture research in recent years had been oriented toward the conventional system.

"It seems plausible," the report said, "that a comparable effort for organic methods could result in an even higher level of performance than we have observed in our sample."

HIGHER COST OF ENERGY IN NEW ENGLAND

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during debate on House Resolution 605, I referred to two documents showing the impact of price decontrol on Massachusetts and the higher cost of energy in New England. For the RECORD, these documents are submitted at the point:

[Memo from Massachusetts Energy Policy Office]

IMPACT ON MASSACHUSETTS OF DOMESTIC OIL PRICE DECONTROL PLAN

FACT SHEET

President Ford's plan to decontrol old oil would allow the cost of old oil to rise from $5.25 to $13.50. This would cause the following price increases for products in Massachusetts:

Gasoline, 7.8¢/gallon increase.

Home heating oil, 7.6¢/gallon increase.

Electricity, 0.1¢/kwh increase.

An average household heating with oil would face the following annual increase in energy costs:

1,600 gallons heating oil, $121.60 increase.

1,000 gallons gasoline, $78.00 increase.

4,800 kilowatthours electricity, plus $4.80 increase.

Total direct impact per household is $204.40 increase in energy costs.

The total direct annual impacts on the various sectors of the Massachusetts economy are as follows:

Sector:	
Residential	$90,474,980
Industrial	28,977,220
Commercial	114,971,440
Transportation	+190,093,200
Total direct impact on State economy	424,516,840

However, because this money would be leaving the state to go to oil producers located in other parts of the country, the effect on the total economy of the region is compounded. Because of this "multiplier" effect, the energy cost increases given above can be expected to have a total negative impact on the state's economy of about $850 million when the indirect effects are passed through.

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., June 24, 1975.

Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONTE: The attached paper is an update of a study done one year ago. It compares the prices paid for energy by the end user to those in the United States as a whole. In 1974 the prices paid for energy were 35% higher in New England than in the United States. This is an increase over the 1973 differential of 32% and the 1972 differential of 28%.

A new section in this paper is an estimate of the energy cost components.

The methodology used and sources of data are the same as those described in the June 1974 paper. Additional copies of the 1974 paper are available.

Please contact my office for any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. MITCHELL,
Regional Administrator.

THE PRICE DIFFERENTIAL FOR ENERGY BETWEEN NEW ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES—UPDATE

NEW ENGLAND—UNITED STATES ENERGY PRICES

In 1974, the price paid by end users for major forms of energy was 35% higher in New England than in the United States as a whole. This is an increase over the 1973 differential of 32% and the 1972 differential of 28%. The 1974 increase in the differential is attributable to the substantially higher electric prices. (The increase in residual fuel oil prices were much higher than those for coal or natural gas). Table 1 illustrates the trend 1970–1974.

TABLE I.—PRICE OF ENERGY TO THE END USER IN NEW ENGLAND AND IN THE UNITED STATES

	New England (dollar per million Btu)	United States (dollar per million Btu)	New England higher than United States (percent)
1970	1.7880	1.4003	27.7
1971	1.9638	1.5224	29.0
1972	2.0076	1.5739	27.6
1973	2.2909	1.7287	32.5
1974	3.4406	2.5410	35.4

If New England were taken out of the U.S. figure, in 1974 the energy prices in New England would exceed those in the rest of the United States by 38%.

The overall energy price is determined by weighting the price of coal, natural gas, residual oil, gasoline, distillate, and electricity by the nonutility consumption of these products. All prices are exclusive of taxes.

The 1974 breakdown by product is shown in table 2 and figure 1.

TABLE II.—1974 FUEL PRICES AND INDEX WEIGHTS
[Dollars per million Btu's]

	New England		United States		New England price higher than United States (percent)
	Weight	Price	Weight	Price	
Coal			8.0	$1.1290	
Natural gas	11.4	$2.4636	35.9	1.0786	128.4
Residual	21.0	1.9135	5.3	1.8657	2.6
Gasoline	27.8	3.2876	25.9	3.2340	1.7
Distillate	29.8	2.6174	12.9	2.4652	6.2
Electricity	10.0	10.6900	12.0	6.7425	58.5
Total	100.0	3.4406	100.0	2.5410	35.4

New England pays the greatest premium for natural gas and electricity. However, the prices it pays for oil products are not substantially different from those paid in the United States as a whole.

If New England paid the same prices for energy as the United States, the differential would only be 11%. So it can be concluded that the 35% differential is due primarily to higher natural gas and electricity prices, and to New England's consumption patterns which are concentrated in high price fuels, particularly distillate fuel oil.

COST COMPONENTS OF NEW ENGLAND ENERGY PRICES

It appears that cost components differ substantially among fuel types. Preliminary information based on a telephone survey indicate that the cost of crude is the major component in New England's oil costs, the price of coal at the mine is the primary component in coal costs, and distribution is in the case of natural gas. The components are shown in figure 2.

Gasoline and distillate show average U.S. crude costs to the refiner, $9.22/bbl, refining costs, and transportation from Texas to Massachusetts via pipeline and barge. To this is added terminalling costs in the region and the retailer's margin to make up distribution costs. The taxes shown are federal and state at the pump.

The natural gas production cost is the wellhead price, $26/MCF. Transportation is from Texas to the final distributor in Massachusetts, via pipeline. Distribution costs are the difference between the cost to the distributor and the end-user.

The coal costs are composed of the price at the mine in West Virginia, $25/ton, and the transportation from there to New Hampshire, $6.11/ton. Since utilities contract for nearly all of the coal directly there are no distribution costs shown.

It can be seen that the production costs amount to 80% of the total cost of coal, 59% of distillate, 42% of gasoline, and 10% of natural gas. Accordingly, further increases in the price of coal at the mine or in crude oil would have a large relative effect on the final end price. However, doubling of the wellhead price of natural gas would only result in a 10% increase in the final price.

SUMMARY

Forecasts of price differentials between the U.S. and New England cannot be made without taking into account the capital changes that may be required in the conversion to alternate fuels. However, it appears that some actions would probably lead to reduced differentials. These include: deregulation of the price of natural gas; increased use of coal; and increased use of nuclear plants for electric baseload. Further work is required to determine the optimum fuel mix for the region in terms of price, security, environmental, and economic objectives.

RUNAWAY SPENDING

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Lamplighter of La Mirada, Calif., calls attention to a study of obvious importance for this Congress. The problem of freeing ourselves from past program decisions cannot be overemphasized. The editorial entitled "Runaway Spending" from the June 21 issue of the newspaper is included at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

RUNAWAY SPENDING

Almost every president, congressman and senator talks at one time or another about economy in government.

Not many do anything about it.

One reason is that they have set up the system so that it's difficult for them to do anything.

A study by the nonprofit Tax Foundation demonstrates that the areas in which Congress and the President exercise control of expenditures are relatively limited. The federal budget is described by the foundation as "not so much a financial plan (as) a forecast of the consequences of program decisions made in earlier years."

Indeed, the foundation reports that about three-fourths, or $261 billion, of the expenditures projected in the original federal budget for the 1975–76 fiscal year were not subject to annual control by either Congress or the President.

That does not mean they are uncontrollable, the foundation points out. It does mean that if Congress and the President are to control such expenditures they will have to exercise care at the time new programs are created.

Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, housing assistance, food stamps, retirement pay for military officers—these and other programs are among those that lead the foundation to describe government as "a massive transfer agent, collecting dollars from some groups of people and then paying out those dollars to other groups of people."

All the programs listed are good ones. But it is easy for such programs to take over the budget—and require higher and higher taxes. That will happen if Congress builds into these programs automatic escalator clauses, if it inaugurates the programs without planning their financing, and if it sets them up in a form that restricts annual budget review.

The payments to individuals involved in these and other programs cost $41.8 billion as recently as 1967. In the current fiscal year, their estimated cost is $165.1 billion.

There are no easy solutions, but if such programs are not to go even more wildly out of control, solutions will have to be found. Among the solutions suggested by the Tax Foundation:

1. Require that program expansion or new programs be accompanied by tax increases or offsetting reductions in other programs.

2. Establish special goals and guidelines when programs are set up.

3. Provide an annual budget review for all programs.

4. Limit application of automatic escalators in benefit programs.

"In fashioning a new budget," the foundation says, "both Congress and the executive have to an important degree become prisoners of past program decisions."

So far as possible, they should release themselves from this thralldom and resolve to avoid imposing it on future Congresses and future presidents.

TO PROVIDE FULL-YEAR RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR U.S. COMMISSIONERS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I today have the privilege of introducing a measure allowing for full-year retirement credit for the service provided to the United States by former U.S. Commissioners prior to the enactment of the Federal Magistrates Act of 1968.

Prior to 1971, U.S. Commissioners performed valuable and necessary service to the United States. Under the commissioner system, prior to the appointment of the first magistrate in each Federal judicial district, the Commissioners were authorized by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to receive complaints, issue warrants, and conduct precommitment proceedings in criminal cases in the district courts. In certain instances, they were legally authorized to try and sentence persons committing petty offenses in places where the United States had exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction. In addition, these Commissioners were authorized to take depositions, to issue attachments and conduct subsequent hearings in internal revenue matters, and to settle or certify the nonpayment of seamen's wages.

The U.S. Commissioners were on call 24 hours a day, unless physically absent from their official station and not within reach, for the issuance of legal process and the conduct of bail hearings, which by law must be held without unnecessary delay following an arrest. When not conducting formal proceedings, the Commissioners were oftentimes obliged to justify sureties, entertain motions, alter bail conditions, issue release and commitment orders, and communicate with law enforcement personnel, defense attorneys, and court officials; as well as prepare the documents required in their duties such as docket sheets, orders appointing defense attorneys, status reports to U.S. attorneys and marshals, notices to probation officers, and receipts and accounts for fine and surety money.

Their full-time service, in the literal sense, is virtually without parallel in the past or present civil service. Yet, their salaried remuneration for this truly full-time service was statutorily set at $10,500 annually.

Based on a January 15, 1974, ruling by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, interpreting section 8332(i) of title 5, United States Code, those former U.S. commissioners now serving as U.S. magistrates can receive only one two-hundred-and-sixtieth of a year in civil service retirement credit for each day in which service performed by the then Commissioner is either shown on fee vouchers submitted or verifiable through the docket sheets retained in the court clerk's records.

Unfortunately, however, for the 28 former U.S. Commissioners who are now magistrates, the nature of their office required the performance of official duties on days other than those for which fees were claimed and docket entries made. Oftentimes, the provided fees were of the single fee nature "for all services rendered after the presentation of the accused" or "in lieu of all other fees provided in this section" where petty offenders were tried and sentenced, and did not reflect the fact that the Commissioner's efforts extended over more than a single day.

It is important here to note that these 28 former Commissioners, in order to qualify for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement System, had to earn at least $3,000 annually for 3 consecutive years after June of 1945. In view of the small size of the fees and the number of sequential proceedings which had to take place before any fee could be claimed, a Commissioner would have to conduct an average of 300 to 400 proceedings a year to have reached the $3,000 level.

Given the fact that these 28 magistrates met the above requirements during their service as U.S. Commissioners, I believe that it is fair and equitable to assume that they must have performed the 260 days of service required for a full year's retirement credit during their appointment as Commissioners. Such an assumption, which the measure I have introduced today would codify, is both just and necessary if we are to make the former Commissioners' compensation commensurate with the volume of their workload, the time they were required to expend, and their services to the people of the United States.

AFRICAN TALENT—ATHLETICS TO ART

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the United States of America-African Invitational Track Meet that will be held in Cleveland on Wednesday, July 23, 1975. This important and beneficial event is being sponsored by the Lake Erie Chapter of the Amateur Athletic Union of Baldwin Wallace College in Berea. I am sure my colleagues will agree that there is no better way to initiate much needed improvements in this country's working relationship with African nations than to participate in nonpolitical events such as this. The city of Cleveland is honored to sponsor this kind of cooperation.

The athletes involved represent some 15 countries, including Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda, Algeria, Ivory Coast, Egypt, Upper Volta, Mali, Senegal, Gambia, Tanzania, and Tunisia. After the Wednesday track meet they will stay in Cleveland 2 additional days to meet with city officials and visit a few of our fine tourist attractions, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They will also enjoy a soul food dinner and fashion show at the Karamu House. The festivities will culminate on Friday, July 25, with a welcome to Cleveland banquet at the Crawford Auto and Aviation Museum.

In addition to Mr. Buddy Rich, who is the coordinator of the meet, hosts and hostesses to the delegation include William H. Seawright of Seawright Enterprises, the official host; Mrs. Mae Stewart, commissioner of East Cleveland; Mrs. Cheryl Wills, of the House of Wills; John Nagy, commissioner of recreation; Dr. Donald G. Jacobs of the Greater Cleveland Interchurch Council; Artha Woods of the Artha-Jon Modeling School; George Anthony Moore; Larry Plants; and Charles Patterson.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of American-African interaction to all nationalities involved, and to black Americans in particular. I look forward to November 22, 1975, when this week's events will be reciprocated at the Second World African Festival of Arts and Culture in Lagos, Nigeria. Representatives from Cleveland are already making plans to attend, most notably the Karamu House.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues join me in extending their best wishes for a successful, rewarding, and unifying 3 days. A recent outstanding article on this event written by George Anthony Moore appeared in the Cleveland Press on Friday, July 18, 1975. I commend that article to my colleagues:

AFRICAN TALENT—ATHLETICS TO ART

(By George Anthony Moore)

On Tuesday 50 African athletes will arrive here to take part in the United States of America-Africa Invitational Track Meet sponsored by the Lake Erie Chapter of the Amateur Athletic Union at Baldwin Wallace College in Berea. They will represent some 15 countries of black Equatorial Africa and those north of the Sahara Desert.

Their presence in our city should be a gentle reminder to us that Nov. 22 of this year will mark the opening of the Second World African Festival of Arts and Culture in Lagos, Nigeria. It will extend to Dec. 29, exhibiting another dimension of African life.

Cleveland is making plans to send musicians, dancers, artists and dramatists to this event, and we hope the world famous Karamu Theater will be asked to perform. Mrs. Mildred Mitchell, a faculty member of Cleveland State University, is the coordinator for this area. I know that many Clevelanders are planning to attend as visitors.

When I visited Nigeria in October of 1966 I was impressed to learn that this is the most populous country in Africa and it accounts for almost 25% of black African people. It covers an area about the size of California, Nevada and Arizona combined, and has a population of 79.8 million people.

Among its natural resources are oil, tin, iron ore, coal, limestone, lead, zinc and timber. This nation ranks eighth in the production of oil and is the world's largest exporter of peanuts and palm products and second largest in cocoa. It also has significant rubber and cotton production.

A festival village is being constructed by the federal government of Nigeria in Lagos

for participants and visitors. There will be apartment complexes totaling 10,941 units. Some will have three bedrooms, sitting and dining rooms and other amenities. Others will have either two or four bedrooms and sitting-dining rooms. Additional accommodations will be available in a number of luxury ships.

Dr. Leopold Sedar Senghor, president of Senegal and Gen. Yakubu Gowon, Nigeria's head of state, are the patrons of the festival. Dr. Senghor is a world-famous poet.

Nigeria's new national theater will be the center of activities. The ultra-modern $40 million building is the largest of its kind in Africa. The theater complex comprises a theater hall seating 5,000, a conference hall with 1,000 seats and two large exhibition halls and two cinema halls of 800 seats each, all air-conditioned.

After the track meet at BW Wednesday, the African delegates attending the AAU meet will remain in Cleveland for two days before their charter plane arrives to take them to their respective countries.

The Cleveland community will be host for a series of events that will include sight-seeing, a visit with Council and the mayor, a soul food picnic outdoors at Karamu House, climaxed by a "Cleveland welcomes you" banquet and reception at the Crawford Aviation Museum that is open to the public.

I urge all citizens to attend and help improve international relations.

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON: A TRUE PATRIOT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic has as its lead article this week an excellent piece by our colleague, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, explaining, in detail and with precision, his exact role in the question of the CIA's involvement in Chile.

I urge my colleagues—especially those who have criticized Mr. HARRINGTON—to read this piece with care, and to note well that MIKE HARRINGTON followed every appropriate channel within the Congress to bring the issue to its proper conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Mr. HARRINGTON's only "crime" was to recognize the horror of what our Government did in Chile, in trying and indeed succeeding in overthrowing the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende. If that indeed is a punishable offense, then we have surely betrayed our basic constitutional beliefs in open and honest Government.

I applaud MICHAEL HARRINGTON's courage and conviction in recognizing bureaucratic crime in this country, and in attempting, by all appropriate means, to make our Government responsive not to a small elite group of decisionmakers, but to the needs and wishes of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the New Republic article in the RECORD:

CONGRESS CIA COVERUP—GETTING OUT THE TRUTH

(By Michael J. Harrington)

If a President engages in a cover-up of government wrongdoing, as happened in the Nixon White House, he can be challenged through the process of impeachment, which amounts to indictment and trial by the Congress. But what do we do if the Congress engages in a cover-up? Individual members can be censured or expelled, of course, but what if the cover-up is institutional, a product of the most time-honored rules and rituals?

This is precisely the problem that confronts us in the unfolding story of CIA and other intelligence agency misdeeds. To be sure presidential decisions and actions are involved here too, but now we have a situation where members of Congress, in their capacity as overseers of intelligence agency operations, had knowledge of the most blatant crimes and improprieties and nevertheless did nothing. The instance I am most familiar with concerns the CIA's accomplishments on our behalf in Chile in the early 1970s. The reactions to that record by those who came to hear of it are a sobering illustration of the great congressional weakness—the habitual reflex of avoidance and acquiescence, masked by the illusion of activity.

In April of last year, CIA Director William Colby appeared at a closed session of Rep. Lucien Nedzi's Armed Services subcommittee on intelligence and described his agency's long-term involvement in the political process in Chile, where a bloody coup against Salvador Allende Gossens in September 1973 had led to the installation of a military dictatorship. Mr. Nedzi had called Colby in at my urging, so naturally I wanted to know what the director had to say. Not being a member of Armed Services, I had to make special arrangements to view the classified transcript in the committee offices—the privilege of any House member—and after some initial difficulties with the staff there, I got my first look at the material on June 4. What it said left me appalled.

The authorization of bribery, the funding of political factions and propaganda campaigns, the fomenting of strikes and demonstrations, a myriad of destabilizing actions—all directed against the duly elected leader of Latin America's most sophisticated democracy—are now matters of public record. Not only does that record indicate violations of standing treaties and other affronts to Chilean sovereignty; it also shows that President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger had lied repeatedly to the American people about our involvement there and that some administration figures had apparently perjured themselves on the matter before certain committees of Congress.

Determined to get some congressional action that would bring these things to light, I approached Mr. Nedzi and asked him what he planned to do with this information. He replied with a philosophical shrug. He had taken the testimony as I asked—what more could one do? This information, after all, was secret.

Knowing full well from my short-term experience as a member of Armed Services (ending in 1973) that Chairman F. Edward Hébert would be even less inclined to pursue the matter than Mr. Nedzi, I spoke with several subcommittee chairmen of House Foreign Affairs, of which I am now a member, and then with some of my staff. I also sought the advice of Larry Stern of *The Washington Post*, a personal friend who clearly understood that the story was not to be released. But the reactions of the subcommittee chairmen and other Foreign Affairs colleagues, though generally sympathetic in tone, were equally lacking in commitment. Yes the Chile story sounded pretty bad, but that was the province of another committee and besides, the information was secret.

I finally wrote to "Doc" Morgan, chairman of the full committee, and to Senator Fulbright. In those two long letters of July 18, I reviewed Colby's April testimony and argued that "the Congress and the American people have a right to know what was done in our name in Chile . . . I urge you to turn this matter to the attention of the Foreign Relations [Affairs] Committee for a complete, public investigation. . . ." I pointed out that the Forty Committee, the interdepartmental body chaired by the President's national security adviser, had authorized the expenditure of about $11 million between 1962 and 1973 to help block Allendés election and then to "destabilize" his government after he won.

"The agency's activities in Chile were viewed as a prototype, or laboratory experiment," I noted, "to test the techniques of heavy financial involvement in efforts to discredit and bring down a government." I gave a general breakdown of the amounts authorized from 1962 through 1973, and explained to the respective chairmen that since acquiring this information I had tried to persuade well-positioned colleagues to pursue the facts but that nothing seemed to be happening. I said I was writing to them as a last resort. Rep. Morgan did not answer my letter. Sen. Fulbright replied, but not very substantively, suggesting that the real solution to the problem was the establishment of a joint committee on oversight.

I felt ambivalent at this point as to how I ought to proceed—I did want to stick with the congressional process but could see no obvious lines to follow. At any rate the matter was set aside in my preoccupation with the summer's major event: the impeachment proceedings of the House Judiciary Committee. Then on September 6, Seymour Hersh of *The New York Times* called me up to inquire about the context in which those letters had been written, saying that he had a copy of one of them. I told him I didn't want the issue raised in this manner and, suspecting he may only have heard a rumor, I said I wouldn't comment on the substance of the letter until I saw his story in print. He assured me I could read it in the *Times* on Sunday, two days later, which I did.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Nedzi asked me to appear before his Armed Services subcommittee to account for the egregious leak. I explained to the group, meeting against my objection in closed session, that the *Times* had not gotten the story from me or my office. But this was not satisfactory, for the point was raised that House Rule XI, Section 27(o) says that no evidence or testimony taken in secret session may be released or used in a "public session" without the consent of the committee. A further issue was the pledge I had to sign in order to read the Chile material, which said that classified information would not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Unauthorized persons, the ensuing exchange made clear, included other members of Congress.

This meeting did not maintain the highest level of discourse—one member compared me to Benedict Arnold—but I tried to make to the subcommittee a distinction between genuine concern for the national security and the facile use of that label to cover official acts of duplicity and illegality. Suggesting this distinction was one of the principal lessons of Vietnam and Watergate, I maintained that the cover-up of U.S. actions in Chile was yet another case of national security's fraudulent application. My remarks did not set well with the subcommittee.

Nevertheless the storm seemed to pass. The next day I wrote to Mr. Nedzi asking that a transcript of the session we had just completed be made available to me when it was prepared. The letter was never answered, and I concluded that Armed Services had decided to drop the matter. I went off to campaign for reelection.

Meanwhile Mr. Hersh had turned over another rock, and in December and January wrote a series of stories alleging that the CIA had conducted a program of massive surveillance of American citizens in direct violation

of its charter. Although cynics might have suggested that this only amounted to bureaucratic overlap with the FBI, the revelation jolted Congress in a way that harassment and assassination of foreigners never seemed to—possibly because some reports charged that the agency had snooped on senators and representatives. In any case hard on the heels of the President's establishment of the Rockefeller commission, the Senate voted to set up a select committee to investigate the full range of U.S. intelligence activities. I proposed formation of a similar committee in the House, and after a month-long minuet of maneuver and delay, we had a select committee, too. I felt pretty good about it until the Speaker announced his choice for chairman—Lucien Nedzi.

Lucien Nedzi, the man who had sat on his hands as chairman of that permanent subcommittee on intelligence since 1971, who had listened to the agency horror stories about the bludgeoning of a democracy in Latin America without so much as a murmur to his colleagues—this was the man assigned to conduct the special investigation that would logically include his own lack of action as a subject of inquiry. I went to the floor of the House on the day his chairmanship became official and said I thought it was an outrage. This indiscretion, I was told later by horrified staff and collegaues, was not likely to advance my career—I had been given a seat on the committee myself and would therefore have to work with him—but I felt it had to be said.

Other members of the select committee later came to agree with me. The press really had the scent by now, and it soon came out that Nedzi, as chairman of that Armed Services subcommittee, had been briefed on CIA assassination plots more than a year before and, once again, had done nothing. With this news in hand, the select committee Democrats rebelled, demanding a different chairman. But Speaker Albert balked at dealing with the controversy, advising patience, and the full House later gave Nedzi a resounding vote of confidence by refusing to accept his resignaiton. This left Nedzi in charge of a committee with which he refused to work, and the investigation came to a standstill.

A major reason for that vote and the subsequent select committee stalemate is what was happening back at Armed Services. Curiously that committee's leadership decided to take up the question of my access to its classified files—stemming from the Chile controversy nine months before—at the very moment when Mr. Nedzi's failure as an overseer of intelligence operations had come to national attention. On June 10, five days after *The New York Times* broke the story of Nedzi's inaction on assassination schemes and at the height of the controversy over his remaining as Select Committee chairman, House Armed Services met in an improperly announced closed session and, without a quorum present, voted unanimously to bar me from further access to its files. No notice had been given me that this action was being considered—in fact I didn't find out about it until two days later.

I won't dwell on the several ways in which this action, reaffirmed at a later date by a narrow majority of the total committee, was itself a violation of House rules, except to say that a committee cannot take away the privileges a congressman holds under the rules of the House as a whole—one such privilege being access to all committee records, regardless of committee membership. A more telling point is the action's glaring hypocrisy.

Columnist Jack Anderson, for example, was quick to say that he has received leaks of classified information from many members of House Armed Services on many occasions—"I have no difficulty getting secrets out of that committee when I want them," he said. There are tolerable leaks and intolerable leaks, apparently, and the characterization depends not on the strict dictates of the rules but on the current interests of the committee leadership or the Executive branch.

The Armed Services action was perfectly timed to shift the focus of debate on the handling of classified material from Lucien Nedzi to Michael Harrington. And at least over the short term, the tactic seems to have worked. Certainly it contributed to the outpouring of affection for the harried select committee chairman who just happened to have his resignation considered by the House on the day of the second Armed Services vote against me. From the swirl of publicity over another member's endangering of the nation's defenses, Mr. Nedzi was borne up on wings of angels. The vote was 290 to 64.

If one takes a step back from all of this, what emerges is not a narrow controversy over a chairmanship and a member's prerogatives, but a pattern of congressional acquiescence in the seductive game of shared secrets. It starts with the pleasant feeling of being privy to things unknown to the ordinary citizen, but it works very much like blackmail. The more you know about dubious secret operations, the more you are responsible for hiding, and the more you hide, the tighter the grip of the State Department or the CIA or the Pentagon. A large part of Lucien Nedzi's problem is that he got to know so many and such distasteful secrets that he was effectively bound and gagged by them.

There are only two ways to avoid that position. You can stick your head in the sand and let the administration handle such things, or you can challenge the terms of the game itself, for the game is basically a fraud. Certainly the United States needs a first-rate intelligence gathering system, and maintaining that system will require that we keep some secrets. But the acceptance of a classification system gone wild—the mindless rubber-stamping of every conceivable piece of information with the national security label—has obscured the distinction between legitimate intelligence gathering and manipulation of people and institutions. It has provided the cover for almost every kind of crime and impropriety at home, and it has sanctioned covert adventures overseas that have done tremendous damage to our international standing.

After 10 years of Vietnam and the Watergate affair, the American people understand this. They know that their leaders have lied routinely, cloaking arrogance and bullying and greed in terms of the national interest. They know that a secret agency that can overthrow a foreign government is a threat to democracy here. They know that a Congress that will turn away or masquerade to hide those kinds of actions can also dissemble in its handling of just about anything else. The Congress knows this, too, but refuses to admit it. And that is why the House investigation of US intelligence operations will remain a touchy undertaking no matter who is doing the investigating. In the back of every member's mind is the uncomfortable sense that the biggest scandal in the sordid story of CIA wrongdoing is the failure of effective oversight—the cover-up by the Congress.

HANDS OFF POLICY

Henry Kissinger, June 1970: "I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go Communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people."

President Nixon, February 1971: ". . . we are prepared to have the kind of relationship with the Chilean government that it is prepared to have with us."

Charles Meyer, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, March 1973: "(The US government) financed no candidates, no political parties before or after the September 8 or September 4 (elections in 1970)."

Edward Korry, US Ambassador to Chile (1967–1971), March 1973: "The United States did not seek to pressure, subvert, influence a single member of the Chilean Congress (which confirmed Allende) at any time in my entire four years."

Harry Schlaudeman, Deputy Chef of Mission, US Embassy in Chile (1969–1973), June 1974: ". . . we had nothing to do with the political destabilization in Chile, the US government had nothing to do with it."

James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense, June 1974: ". . . the United States government, the Central Intelligence Agency, had no role in the overthrow of the regime in Chile."

Henry Kissinger, September 1973: "The CIA had nothing to do with the coup, to the best of my knowledge and belief."

President Ford, September 1974: "There is no doubt in my mind, our government had no involvement in any way whatsoever in the coup itself."

MACOS AND MORAL VALUES

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, by now everyone is fairly familiar with the controversy surrounding the MACOS program. The Monday, July 21, 1975, issue of the Wall Street Journal contains an editorial entitled "MACOS and Moral Values." The editorial discusses the efforts of our colleague, Congressman JOHN CONLAN of Arizona, in bringing to the attention of the Congress the abuses of the National Science Foundation in promoting MACOS. I would at this time like to extend my personal thanks and appreciation to Congressman CONLAN for his perseverance in this matter, and I would now like to read into the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, the Wall Street Journal editorial:

MACOS AND MORAL VALUES

When the House of Representatives recently approved the appropriation for the National Science Foundation, it prohibited NSF from using funds to promote or market school materials. How the Senate will vote is anybody's guess, but the House action helps call attention to a simmering educational dispute that has received far less notice than it deserves.

NSF is involved because the federal agency spent nearly $7 million to develop a controversial fifth-grade social studies course that has been adopted by some 1,700 schools in 470 school districts nationwide. The course is called "Man: A Course in Study," a harmless enough title, but one that sounds like fighting words to a growing number of congressional and parental critics. MACOS, as it is known, has aroused passions much like the recent West Virginia textbook dispute, but the issue here is national rather than regional.

The purpose of MACOS is to foster an appreciation of alien customs among fifth graders. Students examine several species of animals plus the Netsilik Eskimos, a society of hunters who live in the Canadian Arctic. But critics say the course promotes cultural relativism by adopting a morally neutral attitude in its many references to cannibalism, adultery, bestiality, infanticide, incest, wife-swapping and gerontocide.

It's easy to brush aside that concern as ethnocentric or ignorant, but it should not be dismissed so lightly. Youngsters should be taught that other civilizations have much to admire, even so-called primitive peoples whose very survival is a miracle of adapta-

tion and resourcefulness. But the process of education is a process of drawing distinctions; what is civilization, after all, if it is not drawing moral judgments about cannibalism or infanticide?

Moreover, although the educational process necessarily must confront students with new experiences and break down existing barriers to understanding, there is no apparent excuse for subjecting pre-teenagers to vivid films of Netsilik killing caribou and seals, then drinking their blood and eating their eyeballs. Perhaps these scenes are no worse than the scenes of violence youngsters routinely see on television in their own homes, but there is no reason for schools to compound that error.

However, some serious questions about MACOS go beyond course content. Paramount among them is to what lengths federal agencies should go to develop and promote curriculums and textbooks. As Robert Merry outlined it in The National Observer, the original MACOS grant was awarded in 1963 to the Education Development Center, a nonprofit organization dedicated to innovation in education. In 1967, after receiving $4.8 million in NSF grants, EDC's curriculum was ready to market. But more than 50 textbooks publishers turned the course down because it was too controversial, too expensive or inadequate.

So EDC sought more NSF funds to establish a "dissemination network" to publicize MACOS. It established a five-week workshop to familiarize academics, teachers, and school administrators with the curriculum. Many participants, some of whom received college credits for attending, later applied for their own NSF grants to conduct similar lobbying activities. Other curriculums are reportedly being funded in part by NSF, and a multimillion dollar sequel to MACOS for high schools was recently developed at taxpayer expense.

MACOS officials say that no school district is forced to adopt the curriculum. But this argument ignores the potential corrupting influence of federal money. The course clearly would never have gotten off the ground without what Congressman John Conlan describes as "a sophisicated and aggressive promotion and marketing network being organized at taxpayers' expense. . . ."

No wonder a growing number of Congressmen are concerned about possible tax and financial irregularities within the MACOS program. They insist that the NSF peer review system, used as the basis for the curriculum grant awards, is rampant with cronyism and federal grantsmanship. Still, the more important question is why Washington is dabbling in curriculum matters at all. And since it is, why is it reluctant to affirm a preference for Western values, products not of ethnocentrism but of a proud and honorable moral tradition?

EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

HON. EDWARD P. BEARD

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 is the kind of legislation that makes me proud to be here in the Congress. The Education and Labor Committee, its staff, and those who helped to develop this bill are to be complimented.

It is a tremendous advance for our handicapped children to realize that decent educational opportunities are finally visible. For too long our country has neglected to understand the importance, ability and potential of our handicapped children. It is an inspiration to me to be part of a team that is helping to remedy the problems faced by our youngsters. Not only is this legislation needed, it is humanitarian and progressive.

PERSPECTIVE ON THE MILITARY SITUATION IN KOREA

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter printed in the Washington Post on July 1, written by Edward L. King of the Coalition of National Priorities and Military Policy. The letter points out some of the possible ramifications of the presence of U.S. troops in South Korea. Hopefully, Congress learned a lesson from our experience in South Vietnam and will guard against any further U.S. involvement in land wars in Southeast Asia.

[From the Washington Post, July 1, 1975]

PERSPECTIVE ON THE MILITARY SITUATION IN KOREA

(By Edward L. King)

The Evans and Novak article on Korea ("Strategy for a Short, Violent War," Post, June 16) is yet another in a seemingly endless number of recent factually misleading scare-stories about the gravity of the military situation in South Korea.

The situation in Korea should be looked at in a more balanced perspective. In their fascination with U.S. military operational details and portraying Kim Il Sung's inexperienced legions as ten feet tall, Evans and Novak ignore the main issues which the American people must consider in South Korea. These are the threats South Korea faces and our bona fide treaty commitments.

This year the Defense Department in stating the "threat" to South Korea said, "We believe both the PRC (Peoples Republic of China) and the USSR would see aggression in Korea as "contrary to their interests . . . North Korea could not sustain combat operations without support from one of these nations." There have not been any Soviet or Chinese military units stationed in North Korea since 1955. And recently press reports have indicated that both the Soviet Union and China have turned cold shoulders to Kim Il Sung's pleas for increased military assistance.

There is no article in the 1954 U.S.-ROK Mutual Security Treaty which requires the U.S. to keep troops in South Korea. The treaty states that in the event of armed attack the U.S. will consult with the South Korean government and then take whatever action we deem appropriate in accord with U.S. constitutional processes.

But how could U.S. constitutional processes be able to effectively function in determining whether or not to declare war, when our 2d Infantry division stationed north of Seoul would be almost immediately involved in combat in the event of an attack by either side in Korea? Evans and Novak say the division would be pulled back in reserve once the warning of invasion came. Why shouldn't it be pulled back from its position now to avoid the danger of automatic U.S. involvement in another land war in Asia that the Congress and the American people have not been consulted on or agreed to support?

Furthermore, why is a U.S. infantry division needed to help defend Seoul? The South Korean ground forces number over 612,000 men. Many of these soldiers and the one million reservists who back them up are Vietnam combat vets. These battle experienced troops that Evans and Novak inexplicably claim lack experienced officers for coordinating land-air operations, face a 450,000 man North Korean Army backed up by 900,000 reservists who have not been in combat since June 1953. Can't we assume the North Koreans have an even greater shortage of experienced officers? And it should be remembered that the more combat-experienced, numerically superior South Korean forces will supposedly be on the defensive. Under any military doctrine the North Koreans would have to be assured of at least a 2 to 1 numerical advantage to hope to launch any kind of a successful offensive against the well entrenched ROK Army.

Evans and Novak also cry wolf because the South is outnumbered in aircraft. But numbers of aircraft are relatively meaningless. South Korea is not inferior in the air, because most of the North Korean planes are old model MIG's that are no match for the qualitatively superior South Korean F-4's and F-5E's that have been furnished under the 5-year $1.5 billion U.S. military assistance grant program that is 60% delivered.

Plus the North Koreans would have to reckon with hundreds of land and carrier based U.S. fighters from Korea and Japan.

The most real danger to South Korea is not from a massive northern military attack. Such military insanity is highly unlikely even by North Korea. The real danger to South Korea's future is the repressive regime of President Park which denies segments of the South Korean people basic human rights.

Allowing U.S. generals to dictate the strategy and command the forces for the political and military defense of President Park's martial law regime is just the kind of mixed-up military meddling that brought us Vietnam. When are our civilian and military leaders ever going to learn?

A FOURTH STAR FOR GEN. CHAPPIE JAMES, AN AMERICAN HERO WHO NEVER QUIT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, many persons have observed that every generation should have its heroes. I firmly believe in this adage.

Among America's contemporary heroes, I am convinced there are few who surpass Lt. Gen. Daniel "Chappie" James, Jr. in his noble field as an inspiring American military leader.

Soon, when the Senate confirms his nomination for a fourth star, Chappie will be the first black man in American military history to be a full general. By his outstanding courage, by his patriotism, his faithful service and his remarkable ability, he has more than deserved such recognition and his new assignment as Commander, North American Air Defense Command.

Personally, I am proud to call Chappie

James—whom the Washington Post headline describes as "An American Success Story"—a friend. Indeed, he is the friend of every freedom-loving American.

All of us, I believe, should have known Chappie's mother, whom he relates in the Post article, told him "There is an 11th Commandment: Thou Shall Not Quit."

This is the kind of unwritten law that helps produce our American heroes, like Chappie James.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to reprint the Post article for the benefit of all those young and old Americans, regardless of color who need to know that individually we all must learn, "Thou Shalt Never Quit."

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1975]

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

(By William Greider)

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILL.—The general is a man of heavy presence, tall and broad shouldered, with a deep and serious voice, a natural "command voice" that subtly extracts deference from those around him.

So it was a rare moment, listening to this man after hours, over drinks, in the standard red-brick general's house assigned to the base's vice commander. His voice turned soft and rheumy as he stretched out in the lounge chair and sketched word pictures from his past.

"When I was going to school with my mother, we always did shows," he said. "We'd have an Easter operetta, a Fourth of July patriotic blast and I'd have the largest speaking parts."

Lt. Gen. Daniel James Jr., 55, talked about a small boy nicknamed "Chappie" standing on a stage, dressed in a pink tuxedo with white lapels, while his cousin Mabel sang to him a song written by his older sister.

The general's voice shifted to a falsetto imitation of his cousin Mabel and he began to sing:

"Handsome is as handsome does, So the wise man say. Feathers fine may make fine birds, But folks are not that way.

"It's what is in your heart that counts, Deny it if you can; I'm not impressed with how you dress, 'Cause clothes don't make the man."

The general laughed at his own singing. Why, he wondered, do those words stick in his memory after all these years? He was growing up poor in Pensacola, Fla., only he didn't know it. His mother never told him.

The television set in the corner was turned to the evening news, with the sound turned down, when the general's own face appeared abruptly on the screen. The general jumped up to turn up the volume.

A news announcer introduced him: Gen. Chappie James, the first black man in the history of the U.S. military to be nominated for four-star general. The first black man to win four stars in the Air Force, the first in any branch of the armed forces. When the Senate confirms his promotion, he will take charge of the North American Defense Command in Colorado Springs.

On the TV screen, the interviewer was asking Chappie James the same question that has followed him everywhere in his career, the question about racial equality. James gave the same confident answer he always gives.

"We still got another mile to run in that race for equality," the general said in his general's voice. "But we got a lot better track to run on and the trophies at the end are a lot better than they used to be."

James nodded unconsciously, endorsing the words of his filmed image. Some black people, he volunteered, resent that answer. Behind his back, they whisper the familiar put-down words—"token" and "Oreo"—and they talk about Gen. James, the fighter pilot who made it to the top, as though he were a 6-foot-4 puppet of the white man's establishment. Chappie James' "command voice" turned suddenly to an old soldier's growl.

"These young people today," the black general said scornfully, "suffering all these obstacles to equality. B-u-l-l--! Most of their obstacles are illusionary. You can vote. You can go to any school you want to. Most of them are making a career out of being black. They don't know what suffering is."

His tone shifted again, impatient but more sympathetic, almost pleading. "I hate to see kids going back, trying to pretend they have to do this all over again," he said. "These black kids aren't fighting any battles today—they're going back over plowed ground. All they need to do is solidify the gains that have been made."

James was there when the racial barricades were still up and, in his own way, he helped to push them down. He attended segregated schools and sat in the back of the bus. He entered the Army Air Corps when black cadets were carefully kept apart, when black officers couldn't get a drink in the white officers' club. James was there when the now celebrated "Tuskegee Airmen" and other black servicemen staged their frontal protests against Jim Crow in the midst of World War II, the agitation and demonstrations that some scholars believe were the seedbed of the civil rights movement.

On one level, his career is a striking measure of how much America has changed in a generation, how very far it has come from rigid caste system into which he was born. In another way, however, the success of Chappie James is an ordinary story in an old tradition—a strong-hearted mother, stern father, a home in which he learned upward American values: hard work, ambition, honesty, the precious rewards of education.

James is a complicated man. He comes on belligerently orthodox in his values, yet boyishly sweet in his gratitude to family. Faintly bitter in his memories of Jim Crow, but reluctant to dim the glow of success by recalling those shadows. Proud of that time when black officers stood up to defy the established order, yet mildly embarrassed, now that he is one of those in authority, to remember the time, when he struggled against its abuses.

Chappie James would rather talk about his mother and father, both dead now. His parents had 17 children, 10 of whom died before their last son, Daniel Jr., was born in 1920.

They lived in a small frame house on North Alcaniz Street in Pensacola, which, unlike the streets in the white neighborhood four blocks away, was unpaved and without street lights. "They just called it the sandbed," James remembered, "because that's where the pavement stopped. I remember pop trucks would get stuck down there and kids loved that. We'd run up and grab pop. If my mother caught me, I'd get it. That's one thing, we didn't steal and we didn't lie."

His father worked first as a lamplighter, then in the gas plant, pushing a coal dolly. As a boy, the general ran down to the gas plant to deliver his father's hot lunch. If the food was cool, dad knew that Chappie had stopped to daydream on the way.

"They used to say I was the baby," James said, "but I remember getting my whacks. It was pretty tough standands all the way through. Lot of love from Mom, lots of love, Dad, he was a tough taskmaster."

The general's mother, the daughter of New Orleans servants, fixed her life on education. She had a high school education, but she concluded that the segregated "colored school" in Pensacola was not good enough for her children. So she started her own school.

The Lillie A. James School at 1606 North Alcaniz St. started with her children, then grew to as many as 70 children as neighbors asked her to take theirs too. Tuition was a nickel a day for those who could pay. Others attended on credit, which had more dignity than charity.

"I don't ever remember being hungry or raggedy." James remembered. "We were middle class in that time. As Bill Cosby says, we were poor but we didn't know it. We worked hard. We were never on welfare, I'll tell you that."

Lillie James taught her children a great deal more than reading and writing. Today, when Gen. James makes speeches before young black people, as he often does, his preaching echoes his mother's sermons:

"My mother used to say, 'Don't stand there banging on the door of opportunity, then when someone opens it, you say, wait a minute, I got to get my bags. You be prepared with your bags of knowledge, your patriotism, your honor, and when somebody opens that door, you charge in.' "

And: "For you, my son, there is an 11th commandment: thou shalt not quit."

And: " 'Prove to the world that you can compete on an equal basis.' "

And: " 'Don't go somewhere else looking for your piece of the pie. Your piece is right here. You're an American, you're not an African and don't you listen to any of this stuff about niggers going back to Africa. You answer: "I didn't come from Africa. I came from 1606 North Alcaniz Street, Pensacola, Fla."

If those articles of faith strike some of his present-day audiences as naive or simplistic, James reminds them that faith in the future was about all that American blacks had going for them when he grew up.

When James went off to study at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, he thought he would become an undertaker, one business in which segregation by race was not a barrier to success. But he also wanted to fly.

"Pensacola was the Navy's main training base for fliers, the sky was full of airplanes everyday and naturally as a young man I wanted to fly," James said. "I didn't want to go into the Navy, although that was my first love, because I wanted to fly. I didn't want to cook," the task of many blacks in the Navy then, he said.

Even after the Army Air Corps began gingerly to accept young black men for flight training (an elite of the best educated, most ambitious recruits), they were kept apart, training at Tuskegee in everything from Piper Cubs to P40s. "It was a helluva traffic pattern," said James, who was commissioned in the summer of 1943. "With all the different speeds, surviving was a big thing."

After training at Tuskegee, the "Tuskegee Airmen" were transferred to different bases. Some went to Europe and flew combat with the 99th Squadron. Others went on to train in bombers and cargo planes. But they were always kept together, segregated, a black air force fighting for democracy, both at home and abroad.

At Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan, where James was assigned, the airmen encountered separate facilities for white officers and black, despite military regulations prohibiting segregation on bases.

The black officers, after a while, decided to change things. They started going to the white club. The club would close. When it reopened, they went back, again and again.

What started small was building to a crisis when the black airmen were abruptly transferred to other air bases—all in the South where they might be less eager to confront Jim Crow.

But, notwithstanding official threats that they could be accused of mutiny in wartime, the protests continued. At Godman Field, next to Ft. Knox, Ky., James and the others tried again to enter the white clubs. One of the aggressive leaders among them was a young labor organizer from Detroit named

Coleman Young, who today is mayor of Detroit.

"They shipped the bomber group to Freeman Field at Seymour, Ind.," Young remembered, "and took the noncommissioned officers club and gave it to the black officers. We had determined to do the same thing. They read an order warning us that we would be arrested and court-martialed if we tried to enter the [white] club.

"I was in the first wave arrested, then we persuaded others. The damn thing started to escalate and pretty soon every black officer on the place was marching on the officers club, demanding to be arrested."

That was April 5, 1945, and 101 black airmen were arrested, charged with mutiny, treason, disobeying an order, and conduct unbecoming an officer. One of the "barracks lawyers" among them was a bright, young law student from Philadelphia, William T. Coleman, who is now Secretary of Transportation. James remembers "Bumps" Coleman as a curbstone strategist.

"Coleman was smooth. He said, 'If you guys don't go too far, you listen to me, you won't get locked up.' So we listened to him and we got locked up. Next day, he came in and says, 'You guys went too far. But, don't worry, I'm going to get you out.'"

The "101" were flown back to Ft. Knox under guard and confined in their old barracks—with a new barbed-wire fence and armed MPs outside. But the nation hardly noticed. One week after the mass arrests President Franklin D. Roosevelt died and the Air Corps' embarrassment was obscured by the nation's grief.

It is a small point, perhaps, but some others in the "101" do not remember that Chappie James was one of those arrested. They do not remember that his name is on the list, which has become something of a latter-day honor roll.

But Coleman Young remembers that Lt. James aided the group in another way. James was piloting daily courier flights from Ft. Knox in a C–47 and he helped spread the word to the black press and official Washington that 101 black officers had stood their ground against segregation, almost unnoticed. Coleman Young would dictate press releases to a black orderly with a typewriter and would slip them through the fence to James, who would deliver them to newspapers in the East.

"Coleman would get the stuff out to me," said James, laughing at the memory, "and I'd drop it off in the big cities. Boy, they'd have killed me if they'd known I was doing that—using military aircraft."

The Army put three men on trial in July, 1945, and all were acquitted. One defense lawyer, sent in by the NAACP, was Thurgood Marshall, now Justice Marshall of the Supreme Court. Another was Theodore Berry, now mayor of Cincinnati. After the acquittals, the other charges were dropped and the men continued on their careers, in and out of the service.

Chappie James stayed in, though he remained at the rank of first lieutenant for more than six years, perhaps because of the shadow of that earlier episode, perhaps because promotions were scarce in those postwar years. President Truman, meanwhile, issued the historic 1948 order integrating all of the armed forces.

In Korea, where he became Air Force Capt. James, he flew 101 combat missions. He bailed out once, was picked up by helicopter and was back up in the air flying the same day. He also was living what his mother taught him about competing on an equal basis.

"Over a few beers, I've even had white guys say they like me, but you can keep all those others," James said. "They respect me. They've seen me roll in on that target when the flak was heavy, just like they did, and come scooting out the other side. They respect me."

As a colonel, James flew combat again in Vietnam, 78 missions, and led the 8th Tactical Fighter Wing. On one sweep over Hanoi, it destroyed seven MIG's, the highest total kill of any mission during the Vietnam war. On another day, he flew back to Thailand with 52 holes in his plane. He also was noticed by Washington—a black combat pilot willing to stand up for the war, for the government, for the flag. James won his first star in July, 1970 and, under the sponsorship of former Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, he has gotten an additional star every summer since. The steady promotions rankle some white officers who didn't get them, but others figure that James is just catching up for the lost time of the Jim Crow years.

His appointment in 1970 as assistant secretary of defense for public affairs made him a "name" in Washington and he still travels widely for speaking engagements, trying to convince young blacks that "equal opportunity" is a reality in the armed services, that the door is open.

His four stars, he said, are "important to me in the largest sense, the effect it will have on some young kid on a hot sidewalk in the ghetto, where I was as a youngster, needing an inspiration to show that better things are possible."

And, though he did talk about them, James would just as soon forget those earlier days when black officers were treated as different and conflict with authority ensued. "I hate to think of that time," he said. "It makes me bitter at a time of life when I ought to feel good."

HAWK SALE WILL FURTHER UPSET MIDEAST BALANCE OF POWER

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to wrest concessions from Israel, the administration appears to have embarked on a course of weakening Israel militarily. This ill-conceived policy has disastrous implications for peace in the Middle East and around the globe. Symptomatic of this short-sighted approach to Middle Eastern affairs is the administration's recently announced decision to sell to Jordan Hawk missiles and other highly-sophisticated military hardware costing in excess of $350 million. This sale threatens further to upset the delicate balance of arms between Israel and the Arab bloc. In the interest of world stability, Congress should exercise its right under the Foreign Military Sales Act to disapprove this sale by concurrent resolution.

The consequences of a failure to stop this sale are ably analyzed in a column by George F. Will, "Selling Arms to Jordan," which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. An excellent discussion of recent dangerous developments in the Middle East balance of power, including the effects of the proposed Jordan missile purchase, is contained in an article by Terence Smith in the New York Times, July 20, "The Real Threat to Peace is North of Israel, Not South."

I commend these pieces to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1975]

SELLING ARMS TO JORDAN

(By George F. Wills)

Congress, pursuant to its constitutional duty to keep the Executive branch on a short leash, has given itself power to veto, within 20 days of notification, any arms sale exceeding $25 million. It has until July 30 to veto the administration's proposal to sell Jordan a $350 million anti-aircraft missile system.

Jordan's King Hussein has said that one reason Jordan refused to join the Arab war against Israel in October 1973 was that Jordan lacked an air defense system. The proposed arms sale would eliminate that inhibition, and would enhance Hussein's offensive capability against Israel.

Hussein has told a Beirut magazine that he wants the weapons so he can help Syria in any future war against Israel. Equally alarming, the administration's proposal has about it a certain deviousness which, considering the lameness of administration arguments for the proposal, compels this suspicion: one purpose of the sale may be to make Israel more vulnerable.

The administration, which has been fanning war fears, may believe, contrary to experience and reason, that Israel will become more compliant to Arab (and U.S.) pressures as it becomes more vulnerable to Arab weapons.

In May the administration indicated that the sale would involve only three Hawk missile batteries and 36 Vulcan units. The Vulcan is a radar-guided anti-aircraft gun designed to cope with aircraft flying low enough to elude Hawks.

Even a three-battery system might have the destabilizing effect of diminishing the inhibitions Jordan felt in October 1973. But a three-battery system could be considered merely defensive: It could defend Amman, Jordan's capital, and could not be moved toward Israel without denuding Amman.

Now the administration wants to sell Jordan 14 Hawk batteries with 532 missiles (about the number of Israeli aircraft) and 100 Vulcans. Such a system would be useful to Hussein in the contingency for which he says he wants it—a joint Jordanian-Syrian war effort against Israel.

Israel, unable to match her enemies man-for-man or tank-for-tank, relies on air power. Fourteen anti-aircraft batteries on the east bank of the Jordan River could provide cover for Jordanian and Syrian ground forces advancing 22 miles into Israeli territory. And the batteries can be moved quickly with advancing forces.

The 1973 war revealed a fragile modus vivendi between Israel and Jordan. Evidently Israel will not attack Jordan unless Jordan first attacks Israel, which Jordan is only apt to do if it has the sort of anti-aircraft system the administration suddenly wants to sell.

The administration's primary argument for the sale is, predictably, that if the U.S. doesn't sell Jordan the anti-aircraft system, Jordan will get an equivalent system from the Soviet Union. This argument is implausible, and it is inharmonious with the administration's secondary argument, which is that Hussein is moderate and pro-Western but the weapons sale is necessary to keep him that way.

In fact, Hussein is not anxious to change his reliance on U.S. arms, in part, no doubt, because he is not anxious to receive the Soviet technicians who would come with any comparable Soviet missile system.

If Hussein is as moderate as advocates of the arms sale say he is, then he does not mean what he says about wanting the missiles for a joint war effort with Syria. In that case Israel will not strike at Jordan, and Hussein will not need 14 anti-aircraft batteries. If Hussein is not that moderate, he cannot

be trusted with the offensive advantage 14 batteries would give him.

Anyway, why does Jordan need 14 batteries of the newest version of the Hawk to defend itself against Israel, while Israel has only 10 batteries of an older version of the Hawk to defend itself against all its Arab enemies?

Unfortunately, it is possible that the proposed sale of anti-aircraft weapons to Jordan, and the current delays of aircraft and other weapons to Israel, are aspects of the same policy. It is a reckless and ignoble policy of U.S. pressure designed to achieve a Mideast settlement by extorting endless concessions from Israel.

Fortunately, Congress can veto this folly at no risk other than that of an admittedly tedious but otherwise unimportant recurrence of Secretary Kissinger's laments about congressional incursions into process of government.

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1975]

THE REAL THREAT TO PEACE IS NORTH OF ISRAEL, NOT SOUTH

(By Terence Smith)

JERUSALEM.—Nearly hidden amid the attention given to the future of the United Nations forces in the Sinai, almost lost among the speculations about a New Sinai accord, a small news dispatch last week began.

Baghdad—Iraqi President Ahmad Hassan al-Bakr called yesterday for the establishment of a "joint military front" between Syria and Iraq against Israel. . . . and for the presence of Iraqi troops in Syrian territory.

The proposal for a joint military command between Iraq and Syria could prove to be more of an omen in the Middle East than all the diplomatic activity over the Sinai. For it is on Israel's northern and eastern front, along her borders with Syria and Jordan, that the most immediate threat to the fragile Middle East cease-fire lies.

No one expects war there tomorrow, but there is an accepted consensus in Israel, shared by many American officials, that limited fighting is more likely than not. It may come late this year or early next, it may take the form of scattered commando actions or a controlled "war of attrition" in which the two sides pound each other with artillery from behind fixed lines.

Iraq's proposal for a joint military command with Syria was all the more remarkable for coming, as it did, after months of public friction between Baghdad and Damascus. The two regimes are headed by rival factions of the militant Baath (Renaissance) party and the relations between them were recently described by an Israeli expert as "roughly equivalent to Cain and Abel."

The Iraqi proposal was only the latest in a series of developments to the north and east that the Israelis have been watching closely. The most important include the following:

The rapproachment between Syria and Jordan. After an official visit by Syrian President Hafez al-Assad to Amman last month, the two countries announced the formation of a permanent joint high commission to coordinate their policies in military, political, economic and cultural fields. Although this stops short of a joint military command, it achieves what the Syrians wanted most, a close military coordination that will protect their south-eastern flank against an Irsaeli attack.

The Jordanian shift of infantry, armor and anti-aircraft units from the Jordanian-Syrian frontier to the Jordanian-Israeli front. Although the units involved apparently are not large, they will effectively block an Israeli flanking movement against Syria and have aready permitted Syria to pull troops from the southern Golan Heights and reposition them elsewhere.

New contacts between Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization. After their military showdown in 1970–71, and their political confrontation at the Rabat conference in September, 1974, the two have been groping towards a new understanding.

United States military assistance to Jordan. A battle for Congressional approval is in the offing, but the Administration has proposed the sale to Jordan of a modern, $350-million air defense system, including Hawk antiaircraft missiles. The system will provide Jordan with the kind of air-defense shield which King Hussein has admitted kept Jordan from all-out involvement in the October, 1973, war.

The fighting in Lebanon and the emergence there of a new, militant regime closely allied to the Syrians and on good working terms with the Palestinians.

Obviously none of these developments bodes well for Israel.

A NEGATIVE FACTOR

However, there is a constant factor in the formula that should not be ignored: the perennial inter-Arab friction that often causes these marriages of convenience to dissolve before they amount to anything.

Premier Yitzhak Rabin's strategy for dealing with the threat from the north is to conclude an agreement first in the south. That is, he hopes to sign an accord with Cairo that will effectively remove Egypt from the action if new fighting erupts in the north.

There are some in Israel who think that this is hopelessly naive, that Israel has no real chance to drive such a wedge into the Arab world, that Egypt would be forced by Arab pride to join in a new war.

Mr. Rabin concedes that a war in the north would be the ultimate test of the validity of any new agreement he is able to reach with Egypt. If Egypt joins in, he says, then Israel's doubts about Cairo's true motives will be confirmed. If Cairo stands aloof, a gap of seismic proportions will have been opened in the wall of Arab unity.

It is a high-risk policy, but Mr. Rabin's supporters say, there are no safe bets in the Middle East.

CHILD CARE AGENCY SCANDAL IN NEW YORK CITY EXPOSED—PART VI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to insert the final article in a six-part investigative series conducted by the New York Daily News into the private child care agencies in the city of New York.

The previous articles uncovered some very serious abuses in the system including misuse of funds, and abuse and neglect of children housed in these agencies. Yet the most serious charge leveled at these agencies deals with their failure to provide permanent adoption opportunities for children.

I intend to hold a congressional hearing on August 19 and 20 in New York to examine the problem and propose remedial legislation. I intend to call agency officials as well as children victimized by agencies as witnesses. It is my hope that meaningful legislation can be developed and passed by Congress to rid this Nation of this unconscionable scandal.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert the final article in the series entitled "Adoption Agencies Work Hard—at Keeping Kids."

The article follows:

ADOPTION AGENCIES WORK HARD—AT KEEPING KIDS

(By William Heffernan and Stewart Ain)

Private child-care agencies, intent on keeping homeless city children locked in long-term foster care, are openly resisting a new organization whose sole purpose is to find adoptive homes for children the agencies have labeled "impossible to place."

In a three-month investigation of the city's child-care system, The News found that thousands of children were being denied the chance of finding permanent homes while these private agencies collect millions of tax dollars for their continued maintenance.

The investigation found also that many of these agencies have refused even to meet with the new organization CS-Spaulding for children, the only private agency created specifically to find adoptive homes for difficult-to-place children.

Other agencies, it was found, have refused to give Spaulding information needed for the adoptive process and some have even "hung up" on Spaulding telephone contacts about possible adoptions.

Eve Smith, Spaulding's director, told The News that most of the private agencies her organization has contacted seem "to be geared to keeping children in care, rather than getting them back to their families or into adoptive planning."

She cited the case of a 2-year-old brain-damaged girl recently referred to her organization by the New York City Interagency Relationship Program. When Spaulding tried to contact the agency caring for the child, who is legally free for adoption, the agency "refused to meet with us, let us see the child or in any way look for an adoptive home for her," Mrs. Smith said.

In the few months Spaulding has been working to move children out of foster care, they have managed to place seven children in adoptive homes and are in the midst of placing seven others.

Mrs. Smith stressed that her organization's policy is to "cooperate with and serve agencies who refer children to us." But while some agencies have been cooperative, the others have thrown roadblocks in Spaulding's path.

"We have encountered various forms of resistance," Mrs. Smith said. "One agency's adoption worker talked about referring a black, 11-year-old girl to us. The referral was 'squashed' by the director of the agency because the director felt Spaulding was 'still too new.' So the child goes unplaced, even though we presently have a prospective adoptive family requesting such a child."

TRY TO "DUMP" KIDS

"There have been other instances when an agency showed a desire to use Spaulding to 'dump' kids for whom there is no other place," she said.

Mrs. Smith cited the case of a 17-year-old boy whom an agency worker referred to Spaulding. A check of the child's records showed that he was not legally free and had never been consulted about whether he wanted to be adopted. But the worker had to "move the boy and saw Spaulding as a convenient way of getting rid of the problem."

In another instance, an agency caseworker expressed "ambivalence" about the adoption possibilities of a 12-year-old black boy referred to Spaulding a year ago when the child became legally free.

"Although we have offered our assistance to the agency and spent many hours helping the worker prepare the child for adoption,

there has been no movement," Mrs. Smith said.

The child, Mrs. Smith explained, was abandoned at infancy by his mother and was placed in "foster care directly from the hospital where he was born." The child was never freed for adoption until he was 11.

Such examples of children who have been kept in foster care since infancy are not uncommon, Mrs. Smith said. One of the cases referred to her agency was that of a 5-year-old boy who could have been made legally free for adoption when he was an infant.

"Despite several overtures on our part, the agency has neglected to follow through," she said. "Because he has already been in several foster homes and is showing what seems to be an emotional disturbance, the agency has decided that he is 'unadoptable.'"

In still another case, Mrs. Smith said, an agency disagreed with a doctor regarding the placement of a 9-year-old, slightly retarded black girl. The agency wanted to place the child in an institution even though the doctor believed the child could be placed in an adoptive home.

When the case went before the courts for review, the judge agreed with the doctor and ordered the child placed for adoption. The agency was so furious that it declared it was "washing its hands" of planning responsibility for the child. Spaulding is now waiting for the agency's approval to print the child's picture to help recruit adoptive parents.

Mrs. Smith places part of the blame for agency resistance on the city child-care system itself, which is based on a daily reimbursement rate for each child in foster care.

AGENCY LOSES FEE

"When children are sent back to their biological families or placed for adoption, the agency loses the daily rates," she said. "That fact most certainly contributes to many voluntary agencies' seeming reluctance to 'let children go.'"

The children referred to Spaulding are those who are older, those who have been in foster or institutional care for some time and those who are considered the most difficult to place by the agencies themselves.

Nevertheless, Mrs. Smith said, all but one of the 14 children she has worked with could have been placed for adoption much earlier if they had been identified as adoptable and made legally free.

"Four could have been placed prior to the age of 1," she noted. "Three of the four were apparently not placed because it was discovered that they had physical handicaps."

USE HANDICAP AS EXCUSE

She added that her experience to date indicates that "many older and/or handicapped children are adoptable" but agencies must make an effort to find adoptive parents for them. But the News has found that agencies often use handicaps, both emotional and physical, as an excuse not to make a child available for adoption.

It has also found, however, that of the 1,203 prospective adoptive parents now listed with the State Adoption Exchange, 1,190 have actually expressed a preference to adopt a child with a handicap.

STORY OF STEVEN

One caseworker spoke about Steven a 4-year-old black child who is legally free for adoption.

In 1973, the caseworker said, Steven's picture appeared in the Amsterdam News so that an adoptive home could be found for what the newspaper described as a "bright, friendly, affectionate child."

A middle-aged, childless black couple living in Connecticut saw Steven's picture and immediately inquired about adoption.

"At first they were told they couldn't be considered because they were too old," the caseworker said. "So the husband (age 53) and the wife (age 40) contacted their lawyer and were told refusal on those grounds was illegal.

"But when they told that to the agency," the caseworker added "the reason was suddenly changed. The new reason for turning them down was that Steven had to be placed in a home with other children because that best suited his psychological needs."

GAVE UP FIGHT

"But they've recently adopted a child from Massachusetts," the caseworker said. "Meanwhile, Steven is still in foster care and the older he gets, the fewer chances he'll have of ever being adopted."

The News spoke with numerous couples who attempted to adopt children through the child care system and found an assortment of stumbling blocks thrown in their paths.

Those couples said agencies alienate potential adoptive parents by "putting them through the wringer" in a series of interviews that probe their innermost thoughts and sexual relations in an almost voyeuristic way. The interviews are often embarrassing, they said.

Couples are questioned both together and separately, and many wonder whether to reveal their true feeling or to recite answers they believe the agency is seeking.

Guidelines established by the State Department of Social Services clearly state that once an agency has completed its review of an applicant, the applicant must within a given time be informed where he stands.

But a number of persons have said they were never informed of whether they had met agency requirements and were kept on tenterhooks for months awaiting a possible call from the agency.

"Everytime the phone rang I died a little," recalled one woman. "For eight months I sat with a lump in my throat wondering whether or not the agency had approved our application. We lived on pins and needles, afraid to make a phone call in case the agency called to say they had found a child for us. We cut all of our phone conversations short and lived in suspense."

That woman was lucky. But other couples have not been so fortunate. A registered nurse in the Bronx has been waiting nine years. She has been to three agencies, none of whom have informed her whether her application has been either approved or rejected.

State guidelines emphasize also that "families with children by birth or adoption should be given the same consideration as childless couples. The important qualification is their capacity to extend parenthood to another child."

Nevertheless, The News has interviewed couples who said they were flatly rejected because they have children of their own.

The state guidelines stress also that the primary aim of child care agencies is to see that children get adopted as quickly as possible so long as no serious impediments are found when investigating prospective parents. Indeed, say the guidelines, "most couples do have the capacity for adoptive parenthood."

But Gary Rollnick, president of the Adoptive Parents Committee of New York State, said that he and his wife were turned down as adoptive parents on the ground that his wife was "too fat."

The Rollnicks eventually adopted a child from another state that did not believe his wife's weight precluded her ability to offer loving care.

ARMS SALES TO JORDAN

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my opposition to the administration's decision to sell $350 million worth of military armaments to Jordan.

The very existence of Israel is threatened by this proposed sale of arms, especially in view of the fact that Jordan and its neighbor, Syria, have announced the establishment of a joint military command. It is a distinct possibility that these weapons, intended for Jordan, could end up in the hands of a more aggressive Syria, thus bringing the Mideast to the brink of another war.

I wish to remind my colleagues, that President Ford has announced a "reassessment" of American policy toward the Mideast. I believe that a "reassessment" resulting in the announced sale of $350 million worth of military hardware is no reassessment at all, but rather is a conscious decision to "let twist slowly in the wind" our long-standing friend and ally, the state of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives, to voice their concern in this matter and to support House Concurrent Resolution 337 disapproving the proposed sale to Jordan of advanced missile systems.

WNBC–TV RUNS EDITORIAL SERIES ON NEW YORK CITY HOUSING PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, along with New York City's current fiscal problems is a serious housing shortage caused by abandoned buildings, many of them structurally sound, that are no longer on the city's active tax rolls. Actually, these buildings are on the delinquent tax rolls.

The city has developed programs of rehabilitation of these buildings for low-income groups, but they have failed. Recently, WNBC–TV aired a series of four editorials outlining the housing problem which effects part of my district that falls within the boundaries of New York City. One of the editorials described the efforts of private tenant groups and their homesteading program.

These groups have taken vacant, run-down houses and, unencumbered by restrictive bureaucratic regulations which have not worked, they have restored these buildings within the framework of building codes and subsequent examination by building inspectors.

These homesteaders have completed the restoration of these buildings themselves. Even more important, these restored buildings are now back on the tax rolls of New York City thanks to the energy and independence of homesteaders who have remained aloof from the city's own unworkable programs of a similar nature. Following are the four WNBC–TV editorials which outline the problem and present an alternative solution that should be examined by urban areas throughout the country:

SAVING THE CITY'S HOUSING I

The recent announcement by the Beame administration to spend millions of dollars

for the construction of new housing in rundown areas of the city can only be described as non-sensical. Skyrocketting construction costs make it impossible for the city to consider new construction as the solution to inadequate living conditions in low income neighborhoods. Rehabilitation of the present housing stock is now the most promising solution.

There are approximately thirty six thousand apartments abandoned every year in the city of New York. A great percentage of these are structurally sound units that can be renovated at relatively low costs. The key to successful renovation is to start immediately after abandonment and before the building is vandalized and burned. But, the city has failed to provide any successful program that can help low income tenants purchase and renovate these units.

The municipal loan program, for example, provides low income tenants with money to buy and renovate their future co-op apartments—but ties them up for thirty years paying up to 8½ percent interest. Ninety percent of those loans are currently in default. With the present budget crisis, it is estimated that all loans awaiting approval will be denied and new ones won't be processed for at least three months.

The Beame administration must make changes in the legal system to make it easier for the private sector to participate, and stop this piecemeal approach encouraging programs to rehabilitate whole blocks.

SAVING THE CITY'S HOUSING II

A tenant group interested in co-oping and renovating an abandoned or semi-vacant building, may have to wait up to two years until the project is finally completed. The tenant group usually sponsored by non-profit organizations approaches the city's Co-op Conversion Office at the Housing and Development Administration and goes through months of un-ending paper work and bureaucratic red tape.

Adopt A Building and Mobilization For Youth Legal Services, are two of the most active organizations aiding tenant groups in the lower East Side, where most co-op projects take place. Both organizations though, have produced only minimal results. After five years in operation, Adopt A Building is yet to see the completion of any of its co-op projects.

Mobilization For Youth Legal Services, responsible for offering legal advice to prospective low income co-opers, has seen the completion of only three buildings. A typical Co-op venture sponsored by this organization may take up to twenty four months, until it is finally completed.

The housing and development administration together with these two organizations are obviously producing poor results—and wasting a great deal of time on a system of Co-op conversion that is improperly handled.

Tomorrow, we will discuss the city's neighborhood preservation program.

SAVING THE CITY'S HOUSING III

The city's current financial crisis should move Mayor Beame to quickly eliminate city programs that only prove costly and ineffective. The neighborhood preservation program is one such program. Under the office of the housing and development administration, this program is responsible for preventing housing decay in five areas of the city.

The neighborhood preservation program is allowed to make loans totalling up to forty-five million dollars, has more than seventy full and part-time employees whose salaries cost the city approximately one million dollars a year: and, operates from six different offices.

After eighteen months in existence, the neighborhood preservation program has managed to complete only one apartment house. Two other buildings are nearing completion, but one hundred and seventy-nine are still in the first stages of bureaucratic paperwork. (End graphic)

We urge the mayor and the housing and development administration to encourage more efficient and less costly ways of rehabilitating our present housing stock, by making the legal changes necessary to enable the private sector to participate.

Tomorrow we will discuss a successful homesteading program in the lower east side.

SAVING THE CITY'S HOUSING IV

The lower east side around the Avenues B, C, and D, is a perfect example of urban housing decay in the City of New York . . . rundown houses, vacant burned down constructions and abandoned buildings deep in tax arrears, are a typical sight in this area.

Various city programs to rehabilitate neighborhoods such as this one have proven unproductive and a virtual waste of time and money.

A successful homesteading program by private tenant groups on East Seventh Street could teach the city a good lesson in housing rehabilitation. Ten buildings on this street have been "saved" by private tenant owners. (End film) Because the tenants do their own work in the building, the original seventy-five dollars maintenance per apartment from four years ago is still the same, compared to one hundred and twenty-five dollars to one hundred and eighty dollars maintenance for buildings under city programs. Unlike the public sponsored buildings, these private co-op buildings are paying city real estate taxes.

The city administration must encourage programs such as the one on Seventh Street, by establishing the following guidelines:

1. Forgiveness of all back property taxes and penalties on the abandoned building.

2. Permission to persons of any sex, color or economic status to be part of the co-op rehabilitation projects.

3. Assistance by building inspectors to co-op owners in saving, repairing and maintaining the structure.

4. Allow the public sale of apartments without expensive legal requirements.

We urge the city to adopt these guidelines so that other independent groups may have an easier time co-oping and renovating the hundreds of abandoned buildings now in danger of becoming derelict.

THE WORKERS WORLD PARTY: PROFESSIONAL COMMUNIST AGITATORS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Workers World Party, a militant, proterrorist Communist organization, is seeking to exacerbate a landlord-tenant dispute in Baltimore, Md., through the actions of its front, the Center for United Labor Action—CULA.[1]

The Workers World Party activists are not local Baltimoreans, but have been previously of the Wilmington, Del., or Washington chapters of the Workers World Party youth cadre, Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF.

On July 9, 8 women and 10 men were arrested after confrontations with police during the eviction of rent-striking families from the federally subsidized Uplands Apartments in Baltimore. The Baltimore media reported among those arrested the following persons who were nonresidents of the apartment complex:

Susan D. Lesser, 22, of Greenbelt, Md., a member of the CULA—and a former member of the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party.

Sharon M. Ceci, 19, of the 3200 block of Avon Avenue—until recently she and her husband, Raymond, were mainstays of the Wilmington chapter of Youth Against War and Fascism—CULA.

Eileen "Patty" Colligan, 33, of the 3000 block of North Calvert, CULA—extensively active with YAWF in the Washington metropolitan area.

Michael J. Pione, 21, of the 3900 block of Frisby Street, charged with obstruction of justice and released on $50 bail. The Baltimore Sun reported: Mr. Pione said he was a member of the Center for United Labor Action, a leftist political group.

Joe C. Bigelow, 25, of the 1400 block of West Lombard Street, a member of CULA.

John H. Sinnigen, 30, of the 3100 block of St. Paul Street, a teacher.

Garland Kearney, 25, of the 1800 block of Madison Avenue, a clerk.

Stanford P. Scribner, 21, of the first block of North Fulton Avenue, a student.

Robert M. Matthews, 28, a news photographer for the Baltimore Afro-American. Matthews was charged with hindering police officers and interfering with arrests and was released in his own recognizance.

With the exceptions of Pione and Matthews, all others arrested were charged with refusing to obey the request of a police officer and were released in their own recognizance.

WORKERS WORLD PARTY

The Workers World Party—WWP—is self-described in a 1972 internal history of the party, as:

An independent communist party that follows the ideas of Marx, Engles and Lenin and is oriented toward the development of a democratic centralist combat party based in the working class in the United States. * * * We support all socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism, in the development of the planned economy, and in the internal struggle against the forces of counter-revolution.

WWP supports all peoples struggling got national liberation. The party has made very important contributions in the United States to the development of the movement against the war in Indo-China (we organized the first U.S. demonstration against the war in 1962, struggled within the antiwar movement as it developed later for the position of immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces; and have undertaken much propaganda and agitation to unmask the imperialist motives for U.S. aggression); to building a movement of support for the Palestinian struggle and other Middle East liberation groups (Youth Against War & Fascism organized the only U.S. demonstrations at the time of the

---

[1] For convenience, the principal anagramatical abbreviations used in this report are: CULA—Center for United Labor Action; WWP—Workers World Party; YAWF—Youth Against War and Fascism; PSC—Prisoner's Solidarity Committee; ASU—American Servicemen's Union; CSMEL—Committee to Support Mid-East Liberation. These organizations are fronts of the Workers World Party.

June 1967 war, and then set up the Committee to Support Middle West Liberation which has kept up a high level of action and propaganda); and to support for the independence struggle of the Puerto Rican people. * * * "

* * * * *

Our party believes that the struggle between the basic classes in society—monopoly capital and the proletariat—is irreconcilable, and can only be ended with the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the socialist reconstruction of society. We feel that all compromises, all 'peaceful' interludes in the class war and in the struggle that exists on a world scale between the socialist and the capitalist systems, are only temporary in character and that the struggle will of necessity break out again and again. * * * Peace, in the age of imperialism, is only * * * a period for the preparation of new wars.

The Workers World Party originated in 1959 as a dissident splinter from the Socialist Workers Party, a Trotskyist Communist organization. WWP states that while it feels that Trotsky, the founder of the Red Army, made great contributions to revolutionary theory, "because most radicals associate Trotskyism with the degenerated parties of the Fourth International—particularly the WWP's rival Socialist Workers Party—a position on Trotsky is not a requirement of membership in our party, not is it a factor in our relationships with other organizations."

While the total membership of WWP does not exceed 200, the organization strives to give the impression of substance by the creation of issue-oriented subgroups. These subgroups are a part of the main WWP organization. Unlike the front groups of the Communist Party, U.S.A., WWP does not encourage non-WWP members to join its fronts or subgroups. In other words, Workers World Party fronts are disciplined cadre groups, not recruiting tools themselves.

Internationally, the WWP supports all Marxist-Leninist governments. While it does consider the U.S.S.R. worthy of support although a "deformed workers state," WWP's special praise has been reserved for Castro's regime, the North Vietnamese, and North Korean regime of Kim Il Sung, which WWP regards as the exemplar of what a Communist state should be. Andrew Stapp of WWP has twice visited Pyongyang, and in return, North Korean newspapers have printed statements of support from the WWP.

Since May the Workers World Party and its subgroups have waged a propaganda campaign in support of Kim Il Sung's saber rattling. On June 25, in New York City, the WWP and YAWF held a street demonstration supporting North Korea, and on June 27, participated with other revolutionary groups as sponsors of the Ad Hoc Committee in Solidarity With the Korean People at Washington Square Methodist Church. Other sponsors included the Third World Women's Alliance; the Indochina Peace Campaign, recently renamed Friends of the Indochinese People; Third World Newsreel; and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, whose representative at that meeting, political committee member Florencio Merced Rosa, had just returned from North Korea.

Workers World Party is a vociferous supporter of many Marxist guerrilla terrorist organizations including the MIR in Chile, the ERP in Argentina, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman, the Zimbabwe, Rhodesia, African National Union, and the Eritrean Liberation Front. WWP and YAWF frequently participate in demonstrations with U.S. groups of revolutionary foreign nationals in support of the terrorist liberation movement in their homeland.

Workers World has not restricted its support of the use of terrorist tactics to foreign countries. In March 1974, writing of the Symbionese Liberation Army, two members of which were recently convicted of the ambush murder of Oakland school principal Marcus Foster, Andy Stapp, an editorial staff member of the WWP newspaper, Workers World, and a leader of the party, charged those leftists who opposed the SLA's "premature" use of terrorism with having "forgotten the elementary lessons of class solidarity" and questioned whether they were "cowardly" in their "eagerness to prove that they are not to be confused with 'terrorists.' "

Workers World Party has also supported members of the Black Liberation Army, the terrorist urban guerrilla network which arose from the Eldridge Cleaver faction of the Black Panther Party, who have been tried for crimes ranging from murders of police officers through bank robbery, through the WWP's Prisoners Solidarity Committee working with several radical defense committees for accused BLA members.

The Puerto Rican terrorist FALN—Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion Nacionale—also has WWP's revolutionary approval. An article in Workers World, December 27, 1975, reporting the maiming of a New York City police officer in an FALN boobytrap ambush concluded:

In this action, the FALN has picked up the banner carried by the Black Liberation Army until their brutal extermination by the repressive forces of the state.

The Workers World Party operates several front groups of WWP cadre including Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF—its principal agitational arm; the Center for United Labor Action—CULA; the Prisoner's Solidarity Committee—PSC; the Committee to Support Middle East Liberation—CSMEL; Women United for Action—WUA; and the virtually inactive American Servicemen's Union—ASU.

The Workers World Party headquarters are at 46 West 21st Street, New York, N.Y. 10010. Members of the WWP National Committee include national chairmember of the Socialist Workers Party National Committee at the time of the man Sam Ballan, alias Sam Marcy, a 1959 split; Dorothy Ballan, alias Dorothy Flint—Mrs. Sam Marcy—also a former member of the Socialist Workers Party National Committee; Vincent Copeland, also a former member of the Socialist Workers Party National Committee; Deirdre Thaddeus Griswold Stapp, stepdaughter of Vince Copeland, editor of Workers World, wife of Andy Stapp, and was in 1964 executive director of NLG attorney Mark Lane's Citizen's Commission of Inquiry into the Kennedy Assassination; Fred Goldstein; Key Martin, National Chairman of YAWF; and Ted Dostal.

Workers World Party and its subgroups have chapters in New York City; Boston/Cambridge, Mass.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Champaign and Chicago, Ill.; Rochester, N.Y.; Norfolk, Va.; Wilmington, Del.; Baltimore, Md.; Houston; Milwaukee; Cleveland, Ohio; and other cities.

YOUTH AGAINST WAR AND FASCISM

Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF—is the principal agitational force of the Workers World Party, and indeed, because the majority of WWP members are under 35 years of age, the other WWP subgroups may also be considered subgroups of YAWF.

YAWF makes up for its overall lack of numbers by its vehemence and willingness to engage in physical confrontation with police, and by their attempts, often successful, to work in support of other, issue-oriented radical groups and individuals. For example, Tom Gardner of the Norfolk, Va., Center for United Labor Action/YAWF chapter, has been very active in other areas of the South with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, a former Communist Party, U.S.A., front taken over by a Maoist coalition late in 1973. Gardner remains on good terms with his old colleagues from the Southern Student Organizing Committee who now head the Institute for Southern Studies and the Georgia Power Project in Atlanta.

CENTER FOR UNITED LABOR ACTION

The Center for United Labor Action first appeared in New York City demonstrations with YAWF in June, 1971, as the Workers World Party's consumer interest organizing arm, protesting city tax increases, rent hikes, and utility rate increases.

An internal WWP directive from John Catalinotto, WWP director of national communications, dated October 9, 1971, ordered "Those branches which have not yet formed a CULA should do it if at all possible." This document, and the others quoted earlier, have been published together with other internal WWP documents in "The Workers World Party and Its Front Organizations," a Study Prepared by the Minority Staff of the House Committee on Internal Security, 1974.

Sam Marcy, founder, chairman, and theoretician of the WWP, described the rationale behind the creation of CULA in a report, "Political and Organizational Problems Facing Our Party":

We projected the Labor Center in anticipation of a working class resurgence. Why is the Labor Center necessary? Because we can't function in the labor movement in the name of the Party or YAWF as openly as we would like to. The trade union movement is bureaucratic and restricted, and it is necessary to have a type of functioning organization where workers from a variety of industries, organized and unorganized, can have a place to come with their problems, and where the Party can function more easily and take initiatives in the name of the Labor Center. Without it such activity would be more restricted or otherwise ineffective or even impossible.

The Party's program, insofar as it directly

affects the workers, and especially the trade unions, may first be initiated through the Labor Center and in that way the Party's program has a better way of getting a hearing.

The most important aspect of this work is the coordination of the local Labor Centers with the national Labor Center.

CULA operations have been organized in most areas where Youth Against War and Fascism is also active. In addition to a New York headquarters at 167 West 21st Street, CULA contacts include:

69 Clinton Ave., Albany, NY 12201 [518/465-7046].

595 Massachusetts Ave., Rm. 205, Cambridge, MA 02139 [617/661-0345].

454 Connecticut St., Buffalo, NY 14213 [716/882-3832].

920 N. Cicero, Chicago, IL 60651 [312/261-6474].

P.O. Box 2598, E. Cleveland, OH 44112.

P.O. Box 2439, Wilmington, DE 19801.

103 Alexandrine, Detroit, MI 48201 [313/832-4847].

3520 Moore, Houston, TX [713/277-4022].

P.O. Box 321, College Park, MD 20740.

2402 St. Paul St., Baltimore, MD 21218.

P.O. Box 91663, Federal Station, Milwaukee, WI 53202.

P.O. Box 7002, Norfold, VA 23509.

292 Andrews St., Rochester, NY 14604 [716/546-4759].

A check of CULA addresses indicates in many cases a sharing of post office box, street address, and/or telephone numbers with other Workers World Party subgroups such as YAWF, Women United for Action, or the Prisoners Solidarity Committee.

WOMEN UNITED FOR ACTION

Women United for Action—WUA—a group which appears identical with the YAWF Women's Caucus and the CULA Women's Caucus, has been involved with various consumer issues, protesting increases in rents, utility rates, food prices, transit fares, et cetera.

The Workers World Party revolutionaries, representing themselves as members of "grassroots" community organizations, namely CULA and WUA, have been granted the opportunity to testify before various regulatory bodies against various price increases, and thus have been given legitimacy for further organizing. In April 1974, WUA representatives testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee to protest compensation to chicken farmers for pesticide contaminated flocks.

PRISONERS SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE

The Prisoners Solidarity Committee—PSC—was formed as an outside support group for rioting prisoners in New York State's Auburn Prison in November 1970. Workers World has described the PSC as an "indispensable product of the spirit which lives on in rebellion." Its leaders have stated that its goals are "to free all the prisoners and tear down the walls."

The Prisoners Solidarity Committee has been active in demonstrations in North Carolina in support of accused murderer Joan Little. The PSC is also active in propagandizing on behalf of the inmates charged with offenses from the Attica riot in September 1971. States Tom Soto of WWP, the PSC leader, "All prisoners are political prisoners. Tear the prisons down."

AMERICAN SERVICEMEN'S UNION

The American Servicemen's Union—ASU—was founded and led by Andy Stapp of the WWP ostensibly for the purpose of organizing and unionizing Army enlisted men. Stapp explained its true purpose in these terms:

Just as the Bolshevik party organized through the soviets in 1917 against the Czar and the depression in Russia, the American Servicemen's Union is organizing soviets within the U.S. imperialist army.

The ASU, now virtually inactive, was not highly successful in its mission to subvert the U.S. Army. Its lack of success was possibly one of the contributing factors in moving ASU members at Camp McCoy, a Wisconsin Army Reserve training base, to terrorist actions.

In July 1970, water, power, and communications facilities at Camp McCoy were bombed. On January 16, 1973, after some 2 years of legal proceedings, Tom Chase, Danny Kreps, and Steve Geden, all organizers for the ASU, pleaded guilty to charges of attempted arson and the destruction of Federal property.

COMMITTEE TO SUPPORT MIDDLE EAST LIBERATION

The Committee To Support Middle East Liberation—CSMEL—is Workers World Party's subgroup operating in support of Arab terrorists in the Middle East. CSMEL and the WWP have expressed support for acts of international terrorism, including the Black September massacre of athletes at the Munich Olympics, charging that the slaughter was justified retaliation against "U.S. imperialism." Michael Rubin, a CSMEL activist from Seattle, has written:

And here to paraphrase Mao Tse-Tung that political power comes out of the barrel of a gun, only a protracted Peoples warfare against U.S. imperialism and the state of Israel will accomplish that, therefore all support for the Palestinian liberation struggle.

Certainly the Workers World Party and its front organizations, with their proven record of street fighting and physical confrontation with police, their support of international terrorist organizations, and their connections with the Communist regime in North Korea, are suitable subjects for continued monitoring by those concerned with the internal security of this country.

STUDYING CONGRESS IN A TIME OF CHANGE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, "interns" have become an institution on "the Hill," and intern programs have expanded greatly in the past few years. In fact, the Bipartisan Intern Committee lists 2,500 interns serving this summer alone.

My own intern program consists of a college student, a community college student, and 40 high school interns. While my college and community college interns work primarily in the office, the high school students attend a series of tours and seminars designed to acquaint them with the workings of the Federal Government on all levels and of all three branches. Dr. Martha J. Kumar, associate professor at Towson State College addressed all of my interns at an opening day luncheon. Dr. Kumar has long been involved with the legislative branch of Government, not only academically, but through her work as a research consultant for NBC on congressional elections, and also through her recent coauthorship of a book on the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

Dr. Kumar's remarks were so well atuned to the changing nature of the Congress, as well as being a brief and realistic overview of the roles of Members of Congress, that I am bringing them to the attention of the Members of the House as I think they might be of interest to all congressional interns.

The remarks follow:

STUDYING CONGRESS IN A TIME OF CHANGE

As you prepare to spend three intense weeks studying your government, you must be wondering what you can learn in that amount of time and how best to focus your energies. I suggest that you look for some of the major developments in what governmental institutions are doing, the kinds of activities they undertake, and get a sense of what changes are taking place in the relationships which parts of the government have with one another.

Government is of a dynamic character with the activities and relationships of the various institutions constantly changing. The structure and focus of institutions alter to meet the new demands which are made of them by the public and by those in other parts of the government. Alterations in the system also arise through changes in the environment within which the political system operates. Flexibility has served as a critical element in the ability of our political system to adapt to the enormous changes which have taken place in the world system in technological, social, and economic areas. The framers of the Constitution did not want to bind future generations into a rigid political structure; and they wanted the system they created to be a flexible one. And it has been. I would like to focus on the element of change in one governmental institution which you will be studying: the Congress. I choose the concept of change because an internship is particularly well suited to studying the dynamic elements of government.

You have come to study your government at an important point in its history; Congress is in a period of change. Change in its external and internal relationships. With the movement for change in the Congress has come both tumult and hope. The tumult arises in disagreements among the members over what the structure of the Congress should be and identifying its proper role as a governmental institution. And hope has risen with the interest of the Congress in revitalizing itself as an institution. While change has characterized what has been going on in many of the operations of the Congress, I would like to focus on change in three particular areas which heavily affect the vitality of Congress as a representative institution: a broadening of the concept of its legislative duties; change in the structure through which the Congress arrives at its decisions; change in its membership. These three areas are key elements in the ability of Congress to be a vital institution in our governmental system.

First let us look at how Congress is involved in broadening its concept of its legislative duties. The news media has hit hard at the Congress for the difficulty it has been

having in trying to initiate its own policy proposals, such as its failure in the energy area to come up with an alternative to President Ford's proposal. A recent political cartoon, borrowing on the cover drawing on the book, Jaws, has President Ford swimming unconcerned with a large shark entitled the Congress below him. The caption of the cartoon is "Gums". Is it realistic to expect that a Congress of 435 people in the House and 100 in the Senate can come together to present a unified alternative to presidential proposals? While we might wish that the Congress could initiate its own proposals, reality tells us that only rarely can it do so.

For reasons we will investigate shortly, the Congress has found it increasingly difficult in the twentieth century to write its own policies. Since World War II the Congress has been developing other legislative interests, ones very relevant to policy development, which have given us a new meaning to what legislative duties encompass. These new roles which the Congress has been performing are: legislative oversight of executive agencies; the investigation of governmental problems seeking definition and solution; the duty of informing and educating the public on particular issues; the role of ombudsman—the member as a problem solver for his constituents. We will investigate each of these roles in turn but I would first like to explore some of the reasons why Congress finds it so difficult to initiate legislation and why it has developed related interests. It certainly is not because the members fail to work hard or that they take their duties lightly. The impeachment hearings of the House Judiciary Committee showed us how serious and hard working our members really are.

Why is it then that Congress has trouble initiating policy as the framers of the Constitution intended for it to do? At least a part of the answer lies in the fact that the size and population of the country has changed and the nature of the problems has changed as well. The framers expected that the policy initiative was to come from the Congress. When there were only thirteen states, the public interest was not so hard to define. But our country has grown and our society changed radically since then. Industrialization has brought with it an increase in the functions which all levels and all branches of government perform. As the size of the country has grown, with it has grown a diversity of interests. Now it is almost impossible to determine what the public interest is; if indeed there is such a thing as the public interest.

Take the question of energy policy. Congress is confronted with many conflicting interests; the public says it wants less dependence on Arab oil but the people in New Jersey do not want any offshore oil rigs, the environmentalists complain of the ecological dangers posed by the Louisiana offshore rigs, and New Hampshire says no to having an oil refinery. People often express conflicting desires to their representatives: reduce the importation of foreign oil, but don't change my life style.

The inability to find energy solutions is a reflection of ambivalent constituent views. Congress is a representative institution and has come to reflect the diversity of interests which exist across the nation. Representatives do just what their name implies: they represent their constituents. Can we expect a body of representatives to achieve a policy when there is no consensus on the subject among the citizenry?

Congress has rejected this growing diversity and in the twentieth century has found it increasingly difficult to take the legislative initiative. Yet at the same time, the demands upon the federal government for action have increased sharply. States and localities find it difficult, and sometimes impossible, to resolve the problems with which they are confronted. We have seen the welfare problem move from being an area of private interests in the nineteenth century to becoming a local government problem. Then the localities were finding themselves bankrupted and the states had to take it over. But the states have been unable to deal with the problem since the difficulties sometimes relate to the variations between states in their regulations which results in people leaving one state to go to another.

Issues, such as welfare, have become federal problems because they have not been solved by private forces nor by state and local action. But Congress has the same difficulty which the states and localities have in answering conflicting demands.

In order to cope with the increasingly complex task of legislation, Congress in the twentieth century has gradually assigned responsibilities to the President. The President has become the beneficiary of many congressional responsibilities because of the several advantages he has in the policymaking process which the Congress can never have. First, he is a lone official and therefore does not have the problem of speaking with many voices. Because he is one person, he can act decisively when emergencies require quick responses. Second, the President and the Vice-President are the only nationally elected officials we have. Since the President is elected by the whole nation, he looks at problems in a broader manner which the Congress cannot do. Congress is a national institution but don't forget that it is made up of 435 local districts and 50 states. Third, the President has an advantage over the Congress in the information sources which he has. As of January 1, 1975, there were 2,812,217 civilian employees working for the executive branch while there were only 35,083 working for the Congress. The President has much larger information sources at his command than has the Congress when creating policy in areas such as intelligence.

Because of the nature of the presidency and the Congress as institutions as well as a result of social and economic changes in the country, Congress cannot be expected to be the prime initiator of policy for our country. The initiation of legislation is a process which now realistically requires the work of both the President and Congress. The President can propose and the Congress consider the merits of his judgments.

Congress is now trying to work out what the relationship between the President and the Congress should be in the legislative responsibility to the President, such as the budget area. One of the major alterations in the original balance between the President and Congress resulted from the assigning of the responsibility of the preparation of the annual budget to the President. In the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 the Congress gave to the President the responsibility of pulling together the estimates of executive agencies. Presidents then naturally used the budget as an instrument of their policy preferences. Congress, however, has sought to regain some of the budgetary initiative by creating committees which will make their own recommendations after reviewing both appropriation and revenue estimates coming from the President. The new budget committees went into operation this year for the first time and prepared themselves for their future work by doing a trial run with the fiscal 1977 budget. The desire to regain a lost initiative in the budget area is a hopeful sign of congressional willingness to assume what had become a presidential responsibility.

The effort by Congress to assign itself a larger role in the budget business received a strong impetus from the Watergate revelations. Watergate has shown us the functioning of three roles important to the development of policy which Congress has developed since World War II: legislative oversight; investigation; education. As the number of governmental programs and employees has multiplied enormously since World War II, Congress has developed a responsibility for examining the programs and discovering if they are being implemented as they were designed to be. This duty is called legislative oversight. The Congress oversees both the implementation of the program and the process by which the agency responds to the demands upon it. It has become an important part of the Congress's legislative duties because it tells us if the programs which have been created are achieving the results which they were designed to. Congress, particularly the Senate Judiciary Committee, was very successful in discovering how the FBI functioned in its Watergate investigation. The committee used its hearings relating to the appointment of L. Patrick Gray to be the permanent director of the FBI to discover how the agency was really being run. Sharp questioning brought out the abuses, such as the destruction of relevant files, involved in the agency's Watergate investigation. Congress is increasingly using its powers of oversight as a strong legislative tool.

The Watergate crisis also demonstrated the ability which Congress has—when it decides to use it—to investigate problems within the government. Congress has the power, as an adjunct to its legislative power, to investigate general problems which it finds need resolution. At the conclusion of the trial of the original Watergate burglars, Judge Sirica felt that he had failed to discover in his courtroom what had really gone on in the burglary of the Democratic National Committee and what efforts had been made to cover up information relevant to the case. The public too seemed dissatisfied. Early in 1973 the Senate appointed a special committee, called a select committee, to investigate the presidential campaign activities of 1972. That committee headed by Senator Sam Ervin brought together much of the information which was later to serve as a basis for many of the cases brought by the special prosecutor's office. Ervin's committee discovered: irregular corporate campaign donations; misuse of agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service and the FBI; attempts at the obstruction of justice in covering up the ties of the burglars to the White House and the Committee to Reelect the President. These same investigative skills can be used to probe other problems in government.

The impeachment debate which resulted from the trail of misdeeds first uncovered in the Ervin hearings, demonstrated the valuable role which the Congress can play by informing and educating the public. The House Judiciary Committee pulled together all of the evidence of presidential misconduct and presented it bit by bit to the nation. In a time when problems are viewed by constituents as being more and more complicated, the Congress has a very valuable role to play in educating people. They can help to define problems as well as to articulate them, as the members of the House Judiciary Committee did so masterfully in their impeachment inquiry.

The members can also help to identify for their constituents what the various solutions could be and what the alternatives involve. Woodrow Wilson long ago saw the importance of this role of the Congress. He said: "the informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

Another role which Congress has developed in the post war period is that of casework. The members act as an ombudsman—the name of a Swedish official who has as his job the ironing out of problems which individual citizens are having with their government. The ombudsman acts as a court of last resort for people who feel they have no place else to turn. In the United States Congressmen serve as intermediaries between their constituents and government by ironing out the problems which people cannot work out for themselves, such as tracing down lost Social Security and Veterans benefit checks.

Congressmen have been asked to perform an ombudsman role and can use the opportunity to discover additional information concerning the actual functioning of government. Problems in agencies, such as the Veterans Administration, have undoubtedly come to the attention of members first through casework and only later in oversight hearings.

Congress has developed these new roles: overseer; investigator; educator; ombudsman. But so far, except for the ombudsman one, it has been only on an episode basis; they have yet to perform them consistently. Committees, for example, rarely perform oversight hearings on a regular schedule. Rather, they tend to open them when the members get wind of a problem. As the Congress develops these roles into regular legislative tools, it will help to redefine what the role of Congress is. It is unrealistic to try to get the members of Congress to be legislators in the sense of being the sole initiators of policy. The creation of policy is now a process which should and does involve the President. Congress can create policy on its own without presidential initiative, as it did with the campaign financing reform bill, but we should expect that the initiative generally come from the President in areas of social and economic legislation.

While Congress has been revitalizing itself as an institution by creating new legislative tools, it has also given life to its institution by trying to alter the structure of the body. The second type of change in which the Congress has been involved is structural change. The House adopted a policy in 1973 and the Senate in 1975 of opening its meetings to the public. The policy was also extended this year to include the opening of the conference committees which iron out differences between House and Senate bills. Now you can attend meetings where bills are being rewritten after hearings have been held on them; these are called mark-up sessions and were once thought of as a private affair. Yet today you can attend these very sensitive proceedings except when committee members in a recorded vote decide to close them, and see what changes are being made and hear the reasons members give for making alterations.

The public has always been allowed to attend and listen to debate on the floors of the Congress, but it is only recently that citizens have gained easy access to their committees. Yet it is the committee which is the critical point in a bill's history. The amount of legislation considered by the Congress is enormous and getting larger. The committees are where the fate of legislation is decided. Woodrow Wilson observed in the late nineteenth century that Congress in committee is Congress at work. Since that time, the committees have gotten stronger. In the 92nd Congress, there were 25,354 bills and resolutions introduced in that two year period. Yet only 767, or 3%, became law. Most of those died in committee; only about 12% of those introduced were reported out of committee.

When we are talking about the visibility of the legislative process to the citizenry, it is therefore very important that committees be open to public view as well as floor activities. By allowing public entry into this very sensitive area, however, the Congress has brought into public view some of the dissension which had remained private in the past. This exposure has emphasized and exacerbated the divisions which do exist between members. Mark Twain once pointed out that while confession may be good for the soul, it is bad for the reputation. Public scrutiny of formerly private proceedings has done the same for the Congress.

The Congress has also tried to alter its structure by providing for the election of its chairmen. For the first time in January, the House of Representatives voted out as chairmen three men who held those jobs on the basis of seniority. When the revolt against the powerful Speaker took place in 1910, seniority became the critical point in the choosing of committee chairmen. Now the criteria have been expanded to include the opinions of the full membership of the majority party, By using means other than how long a person has served on a committee as a measure of who should serve as chairman, the members have added a dynamic element to their committees. This change leaves the committees the potential to provide for whatever leadership the majority feels is most capable to handling the committee business. In the short run, it means younger men as chairmen: the three deposed chairmen were an average age of 77 years old while the members taking their place as heads of those committees are an average age of 59.

The change in the committee chairmen as it relates to age brings us to our third type of change in the Congress: the membership. This year the House of Representatives has the lowest average age it has had since world War II. It is now 49.8 in the House. The youngest member, Thomas Downey (D-N.Y.), at 26 is probably less than ten years older than all of you. That is a change for Congress. Members are younger than they were in the last Congress to a large extent because of the unusually large turnover in membership. The average number of new members elected to the House since World War II is 65. This year, however, there were 86 new members sent to the House. Of course 1974 wasn't your regular election year but there is a possibility that a trend is starting to build which involves the shortening of the length of tenure.

While the image of the House of Representatives that we sometimes get from the media is one of an institution of men elected for several decades, statistics show a different picture. Actually two thirds of the membership of the House has been elected since 1964. While the chairmanships are now dominated by men who have been in the Congress for many years, that will not always be so. Members are taking an important role in Congress at a much earlier point in their careers. Today members do not want to hang around the Congress for a few years before they can be involved in the substantive aspects of congressional business; they demand that right upon election.

Congress is slowly bringing in as members persons from groups not heretofore well represented in the governmental structure, such as womeh and blacks. Both groups have more members in this Congress than they have had in this century. There are now 18 women and 16 blacks; low figures to be sure and ones which show us how far Congress has to go to be a truly representative institution. But there are significant changes taking place in both groups in the House. Prior to Shirley Chisholm's entry into the Congress in 1969 and Bella Abzug's in 1971, women in Congress, with a few exceptions, were generally seen and not heard. The usual way in which women had come into their seats in the House was through a husband who died in Congress. The local party found that the method of filling the seat which would generate the least amount of bitterness was to let the wife have it. This was the tradition of the "widow's mandate." With Shirley Chisholm we have the development of a new pattern: women elected to the Congress on the basis of their own careers in state politics. The women in your own congressional delegation, Congresswomen Spellman and Holt, are examples of this new pattern.

As the number of women has slowly increased so too has the number of black members. Ten years ago the black members came from Northern districts which were heavily black in their population. Today members come from Southern states as well as Northern ones and represent districts which have white majorities. The three black members who come from the South—Andrew Young of Georgia, Barbara Jordan of Texas and Harold Ford of Tennessee—all come from districts where over fifty percent of the population is white.

The Supreme Court in its 1964 decision of Wesberry vs. Sanders contributed to change in the Congress by providing that the Constitution requires that "as nearly as is practicable, one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." That means that congressional districts must be as nearly equal in size within a state as is possible. In the early 1960's you had a situation in Texas where you had 951,527 people in one district and 216,371 in another. Since the Court's decision there has been a redrawing of the district lines for all congressional districts with the inequities erased. Now the weight of the vote of a person in one congressional district is worth the same as that of voters in other districts in the same state. Most districts today have about 465,000 people in them. One of the effects of the Court's ruling was to reduce the influence of rural districts and to increase the number of suburban districts which we have. Your own district is an example of the benefits of the Westberry decision; it was after that decision that the 8th Congressional District was created.

All of these changes—in membership, structure, and in legislative work—are moving the Congress toward a more vital role in the governmental process than it has been playing in the past few years because all of the changes make it a more representative body than it was. And that was what the framers of the Constitution intended for Congress to be. Now it is true that these changes have had the effect of slowing down the legislative process. That is to be expected because there are so many diverse interests expressed in the body and because power is becoming decentralized now that more members are sharing it. We should not expect that the legislative process be a tidy one. Instead let us ask that it truly be representative.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW LIQUID METAL FAST BREEDER REACTOR

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in continuation of my practice of keeping this body informed of the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's Subcommittee to Review the National Breeder Reactor Program, I have the following report:

On July 17, the subcommittee in open session received testimony from Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Administrator of the Energy Research and Development Administration on the subject of ERDA's breeder reactor program. During this session, there was discussion of the comprehensive energy research and development plan which ERDA submitted to the Congress on June 30, the role of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR—in achieving the goals of that program, and the proposed final environment statement on the LMFBR program, on which findings have recently been reached by the Administrator, ERDA. I was pleased that Senators STUART SYMINGTON and JAMES L. BUCKLEY, and Con-

gressmen JOHN YOUNG, TENO RONCALIO, JOHN B. ANDERSON, MANUEL LUJAN, Jr., FRANK HORTON, and ANDREW J. HINSHAW were able to attend and participate in the questioning of the witness.

After welcoming Dr. Seamans at the start of the hearing, I reviewed briefly the sessions held to date by the subcommittee, as reported in previous issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also read into the record of the hearing of the impressions resulting from the subcommittee's recent trip to England, Scotland, France, and West Germany, for the purpose of reviewing the status and future plans of breeder reactor programs in those countries, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, July 17, 1975, at page 23454.

Dr. Seamans then proceeded with his testimony.

In his prepared statement, Dr. Seamans discussed the breeder reactor development program in the context of the energy R. & D. plan which he submitted to the President and the Congress on June 30 and his findings on the environmental statement on the breeder program which he also released on June 30. He cited the energy plan's conclusion that only simultaneous pursuit of all promising technological options can meet our future energy needs.

To meet near-term energy needs, the plan proposes early expansion of existing oil, gas, coal, and uranium energy systems and the application of conservation technologies that will reduce energy consumption. The plan proposes to develop technologies which utilize virtually inexhaustible resources, such as the breeder reactor, solar energy, and fusion, for meeting the long-term—beyond 2000—energy needs.

Particularly important for the breeder, Dr. Seamans pointed out that the plan reaffirms continuation of research, development, and demonstration of the breeder reactor as a priority matter.

Dr. Seamans said that his review of the proposed final environmental statement amply demonstrates the need to continue research, development, and demonstration of the LMFBR concept. He went on to point out that there is no presently available or prudent alternative to this course of action.

Dr. Seamans said there are several significant problems, including in particular those related to reactor safety, safeguards, and waste management, which remain unresolved. He said that although these problems must be resolved satisfactorily before the LMFBR can be commercialized, the record strongly suggests that the problems identified in the LMFBR concept are amenable to solution, wholly or partially, by a continuation of the breeder program.

Dr. Seamans anticipated that a final impact statement will be issued within about 3 months.

Dr. Seamans said that he has requested certain funding reductions in the LMFBR program, including the Clinch River breeder reactor project, because of delays in the breeder development program caused by licensing and environmental issues.

Dr. Seamans mentioned that there has been speculation that these funding changes indicate a lessening of resolve on ERDA's part to continue the breeder program. He said such speculation is erroneous and that the importance and priority of the LMFBR program remain unchanged.

Dr. Seamans also pointed out that the National Academy of Sciences will be conducting a study that will center on public concern about nuclear energy and the degree to which the Nation should rely on nuclear power.

In the questioning period following his testimony Dr. Seamans was asked what he thought were the chances that the safety, environmental, and safeguards problems relating to the breeder could be solved. He said there was a 90- to 95-percent chance of success.

In response to a question on whether he was downgrading the breeder, Dr. Seamans said he was not and that he intends to vigorously pursue the program.

In response to a question on why the Europeans are ahead of the United States in breeder development, Dr. Seamans said the breeder is a complicated and difficult project, the success of which depends on such factors as starting date, budget support, and clearly designated responsibility for the program. He said he is in the process of clearing up ambiguities which existed with the utilities' involvement and establishing clear project direction. He said that in about 1½ months he would have new budget requests reflecting the program changes he is making.

In response to questions relating to why the United States cannot just build a Phenix on the Clinch River site instead of continuing development of our own program, Dr. Seamans said it is not possible to just buy a foreign technology and expect it to work easily. Capabilities in manufacturing, licensing, and operating must be built up domestically and this requires the United States to build a demo plant. He said he would be reluctant to proceed into the next century relying on another country's breeder technology.

In response to a question as to how far we are behind the Europeans in our breeder program, Dr. Seamans said we are not far behind. We have a broad based program with many trained people to carry out designs and to test, manufacture, and construct our plants.

One member expressed his concern that we not study the breeder to death. Dr. Seamans said that progress is achieved by doing and that the Clinch River plant must be constructed to bring the whole program together.

Dr. Seamans was also asked whether ERDA had made any attempt to use foreign facilities to test breeder components. He said he plans to look into this on his upcoming trip to Europe.

It was pointed out to Dr. Seamans that in spite of a host of reports refuting the hot particle issue, the ERDA Internal Review Board which studied the PFEIS still considered this issue unresolved. Dr. Seamans said he would consider the body of scientific knowledge represented in those studies in making his final decisions.

In response to a question as to the reason for delays in the program, witnesses reported that the need for licensing approval was a primary factor. They stated that the current need for Nuclear Regulatory Commission to consider two designs for the CRBR, one with and one without a core catcher, was an important consideration in the start of construction—receipt of a limited work authorization—now being projected to occur not before August 1976, about 1 year later than had been previously anticipated.

SHOULD PUBLIC FINANCE PERPETUATING AN OUTRAGE?

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Goldsboro News-Argus of Goldsboro, N.C., an interesting article on how to succeed without a Government subsidy.

The story—a success story—relates how the Florida East Coast Railway Co. became a profitable, taxpaying business through the simple expedient of increased productivity.

The article is as follows:

SHOULD PUBLIC FINANCE PERPETUATING AN OUTRAGE?

Amid growing conviction that huge government subsidies or nationalization represent the only salvation of some of our railroads, comes a refreshing story from Florida.

Bill Kemp, Jr., president of Kemp Furniture Industries, brought it to the attention of the North Carolina congressional delegation when he and other Wayne County industrialists visited Washington recently.

The story itself is in a report by W. L. Thornton, president of the Florida East Coast Railway Company (FEC).

In 1960, the FEC found itself in essentially the same predicament facing the Penn Central before it folded.

Its operating income was less than its fixed expenses. It could not afford to maintain its tracks and modernize its equipment.

It was operating with a work force twice the size it needed.

Today the Florida East Coast Railway is a model of modern, well-maintained equipment and efficiency.

Since 1961, the FEC has installed 261 miles of centralized traffic control, 238 miles of welded rail, 134 miles of concrete crossties, replaced a third of its fleet with new Diesel locomotives, and purchased 700 new freight cars—56 per cent of its fleet.

And get this: It was all done from earnings.

Meanwhile, the railway was reducing its indebtedness from $50 million to $18 million.

In 1960 it didn't have enough income to meet fixed charges. Last year, the FEC had a net income of $6 million after paying $8.3 million in taxes. More than half of the tax bill went to the Federal Government.

Compare this to the $47.9 million lost by Penn Central in January, 1975—$13.7 million more than it lost in January, 1973.

How can this be?

FEC President Thornton insists that the success of his railway lies in its having eliminated antiquated operating work rules designed to meet conditions of 100 years ago.

For example, under union contracts, some train operating crews are paid for a day's

work on the basis of 100 miles travelled or eight hours—whichever comes first.

During the last century, it took eight hours to go 100 miles. Today's trains knock out 100 miles in two to three hours. As a result, three crews of four to five men each are required to move a train 300 miles. Each of the crew members works only two or three hours but is paid for a full day.

Two men, insists Thornton, could do the job by working a normal work day and increase efficiency 600 to 700 per cent.

"Multiply the inefficiency by the thousands of trains operated every day and it can readily be seen why the nation's railroads are so pitifully inefficient and why so many are in bankruptcy . . ." he observed.

In 1960, a freight operating from Jacksonville to Miami on the FEC line required 15 men—three five-man crews. Today, two men operate the train the same distance. In 1960, three through freights were operated in each direction per day. Today, eight through freights operate in each direction daily.

Thornton says that one of the major problems facing railroads is the debt being incurred from financing new freight cars.

Actually, he insists, there is no freight car shortage. The problem is the lack of utilization of the cars because of infrequency and inefficient service.

In 1973, the average freight car moved 57.7 miles per day. Thornton says increased efficiency could easily push that average to 85 miles per day. This would mean, he points out, a 50 per cent increase in the effective supply of rail cars without incurring any debt.

To purchase a 50 per cent increase in the nation's rail car supply would represent an investment of more than $16 billion.

Thornton suggests that so long as the bulk of today's railroads operate under antiquated requirements, no series of mergers and elimination of "unprofitable" lines will enable them to survive without massive infusions of taxpayers' money.

The FEC president argues that Congress should by resolution eliminate the archaic rules from working agreements negotiated by the railroad companies and the unions.

This would give the railroads not only a chance to survive but an opportunity to provide better transportation services—and at a profit rather than at the expense of a subsidy.

Operations of the Florida East Coast Railway document the soundness of the approach. The defunct and near defunct railroads of the northeast can do the same if given the chance.

The United States Congress, instead of bleeding the taxpayers to perpetuate an outrage, should put an end to it.

FAVORITE PASTIME

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from a sportsmen's organization which I believe should be brought before this House for consideration. The Sportsmen's Committee on Political Education was formed to insure that sportsmen be permitted to enjoy their favorite pastime. This organization provides its members with information regarding governmental actions which might affect their interests. And, I might add, the committee has been most helpful in informing elected representatives of the sportsman's view of pending legislation.

The sportsmen's committee has written concerning Department of Interior plans to file an environmental impact report prior to the setting of migratory bird hunting season dates for 1975–76. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Chamber who more thoroughly endorses the EIS concept as it relates to environmental protection than I. But I must agree with the committee that there seems little need for an EIS on this subject.

Control of the management and protection of migratory birds rests with the Bureau of Sports, Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior. Through the purchase of migratory birds stamps at the beginning of each season, hunters themselves have been the major supporters of the management activities of the Bureau. The hunter's concern for wildlife management and the protection of endangered species dates from long before the contemporary focus of the environment.

The proof of the concern of the Bureau, and its supporters in caring for migratory bird populations is the record that office has achieved. Since the late 1930's, when the migratory bird population was seriously endangered, the bird hunter and the Bureau have joined hands in a joint effort to protect these creatures and to provide them with safe and extensive nesting grounds.

As a result, there are more migratory birds today than there were 40 years ago. I applaud the accomplishments of this program, which have helped protect endangered birds and expand the bird population.

I think that a successful wildlife management and protection program deserves praise for its achievements. Certainly we ought to require comprehensive environmental evaluation where States or local areas fail to establish adequate standards. But California's deep concern with game management and protection has long been an example to the Nation, and sportsmen like those of the Committee on Political Education have been the strongest proponents of that conservation program.

To insist upon an EIS where the adequacies of the present conservation and management program are a matter of record seems to me to be a waste of valuable time and an affront to the dedication of many public and private citizens. I would hope that each Member of Congress will take a few moments to read the petition from the Sportsmen's Committee on Political Education:

RESOLUTION

Whereas; in the congestion and complexities, the tensions and frustrations of today's life, the need for outdoor recreation and the opportunity to get away from it all has become of crucial importance, and

Whereas; the Congress of the United States of America in 1969 passed the National Environmental Policy Act containing a provision that an environmental impact report must be made by any federal agency in which their activity has a significant impact on the human environment, and

Whereas; there are few pursuits providing a better chance for healthy exercise, peaceful solitude, and appreciation of the outdoors than the sport of hunting, and

Whereas; in 1974 several groups challenged the Department of Interior in United States Federal District Court for not filing an environmental impact statement with respect to their Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife usual practice of setting migratory bird hunting season dates and in order not to delay the hunting season, the Department of Interior agreed to file an environmental impact statement before setting the 1975–1976 migratory bird hunting season dates, and

Whereas; the spiritual, ethical, and consumptive environment of hundreds of thousands, of Americans benefit immensely from the sport hunting of migratory birds, the migratory birds flying in, over, and through the United States are the best managed wildlife species on earth, with more funds having been expended since 1937 to propagate and protect migratory birds than has been expended on any other species; more funds have been expended to rehabilitate the habitat necessary for migratory birds than for any other wildlife habitat reconstruction; more volunteer hours have been expended by truly concerned conservationists than have been expended on any other species, and

Whereas; the migratory bird hunter of the United States of America has provided the funds for management, propagation, and protection of our migratory birds and habitat, and demands from those delegated the responsibility for this management program; that all possible be done to maintain and increase the habitat necessary for the nesting and rearing of young migratory birds, and

Whereas; a most important by-product of this program financed by the migratory bird hunter has been the restoration, propagation, and protection of many vanishing species of wildlife, the creation of habitat for these species which no other group has seen fit to give even lip service until the present management system was proven a success, and

Whereas; without the funds derived from the volunteer contributions made by the hunter, the restored and reconstructed habitat could and possibly would be again lost, never to again be reclaimed so that our grandchildren might enjoy the wildlife as we have and the funds presently contributed by these hunters through their purchase of migratory bird stamps would no longer be available for the preservation and enhancement of wildlife and its habitat, or to finance the operation of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, and

Whereas; there can be no rational contradiction to the proven success of the migratory bird management program directed by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, although certain misguided people attempt to show that if left to themselves the migratory birds would fluorish in great abundance, but will not admit or recognize the fact that in the late nineteen thirties, the migratory bird species in America was almost an endangered species and because of this, the migratory bird hunter contributed the necessary funds to reclaim and rebuild the nesting habitat in the great plains of Canada, and that through these efforts, we have more migratory birds in America today than in the nineteen twenties:

Now therefore, be it resolved; by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, that proper steps be taken either by executive action or through legislation to assure that the United States Department of Interior be exempt from now or in the future, the necessity of filing any environmental impact report prior to or thereafter setting of dates for hunting migratory birds.

Respectfully submitted.

BENNIE F. WRIGHT,
President, for the Board of Directors.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD INVESTIGATE CANNING LID SHORTAGES

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a resolution calling upon the Attorney General to investigate possible antitrust violations in the manufacture, marketing, and sale of replacement home canning lids. It is my fervent hope that a comprehensive investigation by the Department of Justice can help to get to the bottom of this puzzling lid shortage and give the Congress the answers that so many of our constituents are demanding.

Twenty-two million home canners in this country are facing the potential loss of their homegrown fruits and vegetables, because they cannot find replacement lids for their jars. At the same time, there seem to be plentiful supplies of canning jar-and-lid combinations available—at much higher prices. In addition, it seems that canners can get lids if they are willing to buy a certain brand of instant coffee. The availability of lids in these combination units, and the special promotion of lids with coffee, as well as rumors about blackmarket sales, hoarding by distributors, and other questionable practices, raise enough serious questions about this crisis to call for a full and complete investigation by the Federal Government.

It has been reported that the Bureau of Competition in the Federal Trade Commission will soon announce a new investigation into this area. I am pleased that the FTC has finally agreed to look into this crisis in some depth, but I am concerned that the FTC has been unwilling to conduct such an investigation for some 18 months. The critical shortage of canning lids has been apparent to most home canners for some time, but the FTC was apparently blind to this crisis and refused to do anything even though many consumers, as well as many Members of Congress, requested them to look into the matter. Past failure to act gives one little confidence in the degree of interest the FTC will show in this area.

Furthermore, my resolution, which requests the Justice Department to investigate, would set a time limit of 60 days for the Department to give the Congress a preliminary report. The FTC has not promised to report within any specific period. I believe this Congress should request, through passage of my resolution, a thorough investigation and a speedy report. America's home canners expect nothing less.

The resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

To require the Attorney General of the United States to conduct an investigation to determine whether antitrust violations are occurring in the manufacture or marketing of replacement home canning lids, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General of the United States (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Attorney General") shall investigate the manufacture, marketing, and sale of replacement home canning lids to determine whether practices in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1–7), the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12–27, 44), or any other antitrust law of the United States are occurring in such manufacture and marketing. The Attorney General shall, in conducting such investigation, give particular attention to practices in which replacement home canning lids are marketed only to purchasers who agree to buy additional products or services.

SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General shall submit an interim report to the Congress not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution. Such report shall include detailed statements of—

(1) the findings of the Attorney General concerning any occurrence of practices described in the first section of this joint resolution;

(2) any action which the Attorney General has taken or intends to take against any person engaged in any such practice; and

(3) any recommendations of the Attorney General concerning the necessity or desirability of any legislative or other action to assure that any existing or future shortage of replacement home canning lids is not caused by anticompetitive practices in the manufacture and marketing of such lids.

(b) The Attorney General shall submit a final report to the Congress not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution. Such report shall include a detailed statement of any action which the Attorney General has taken after the submission of the interim report required by subsection (a), or any action which the Attorney General intends to take, against any person engaged in any practice described in the first section of this joint resolution.

AUTHORITY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM—IEP—H.R. 7014, ENERGY CONSERVATION AND OIL POLICY ACT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House this week is considering H.R. 7014, a major portion of the President's energy package. Part of H.R. 7014, sections 210, 211, and 212, provide the authority necessary for the United States to carry out its responsibilities under the agreement on an international energy program—IEP—signed on November 18, 1974.

The primary goals of the international energy program are to serve as a deterrent against future interruptions in petroleum supplies, to improve our ability to withstand the economic impact of an oil embargo, and to assure that all members of the IEP will assist any other member which might be the target of a selective embargo.

These goals are to be achieved principally through: First, coordinated energy conservation policies; second, coordination of expanded energy research and development program; third, exchange of information; and fourth, burden-sharing of petroleum shortfalls in emergency situations.

Last December my Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held hearings on the purposes and operations of the international energy agency. As the international authorities in the President's energy package impinge on the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations, three of our subcommittees—the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Subcommittee on International Resources, Food and Energy, and Subcommittee on International Trade and Commerce—held oversight hearings earlier this year on the proposed legislation. These hearings were followed by correspondence from the interested subcommittee members to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That correspondence detailed our position on the proposed international authorities. I am pleased to say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was receptive to our views and that sections 210–212 closely correspond to our position.

While the international energy program, at least on paper, serves the critical purpose of furthering cooperation among the industrial nations on energy policy and problems, this is only one portion of the problem, and U.S. policy has ignored the other part—cooperation with energy-importing developing nations.

There are two principal reasons why the United States should devote more of its international efforts toward the energy problems of the underdeveloped nations. One is that a number of them, particularly the MSA's—those "most severely affected" by the increase in oil prices—but also such advanced developing nations as Brazil, are facing serious problems due to the five-fold increase in petroleum prices, including major setbacks in development. The United States has valuable technical and financial resources that can assist nations in easing these bottlenecks. The United States has a humanitarian responsibility to devote more of its resources toward such efforts. It is with this in mind that several members of the Committee on International Relations are amending the Foreign Assistance Act to specifically direct AID to enter the energy field and to promote and disseminate intermediate energy technology.

Second, the United States has a political interest in assisting the developing nations with their energy problems. To date, most underdeveloped nations have maintained solidarity with the OPEC nations and supported their right to arbitrarily increase petroleum prices. The oil-importing developing nations have maintained this solidarity because of the psychic pleasure they understandably receive from seeing a group of their fellow underdeveloped nations stand up to the industrial world and successfully blackmail their economies. Furthermore, these oil-importers see a better chance of receiving additional financial assistance from the rich OPEC nations than from the traditional international donors who are strapped with serious economic problems.

However, this would seem to be a short-term and short-sighted position.

While the OPEC nations may have been "fellow have-not" nations yesterday, they are quickly becoming "have" nations. The United States should attempt to convince these importer nations of where their long-term interests lie—as consumers—and to terminate their irrational support for OPEC price policies. It must be understood that while certain aspects of the new international economic order will work to the general good of all developed nations and to the construction of a more equitable international economic system, other aspects, such as producer associations and indexation, will serve the benefit of only a few nations—the OPEC, a few other LDC commodity exporters, and advanced commodity exporters such as Canada, Australia, and even the United States.

Cooperation among all petroleum-importing nations is essential if their mutual problems are to be solved and if reason and fairness are to return to international economic decisions.

THE FUTURE AND HISPANIC AMERICANS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of other Members of Congress to the following adaptation of a speech given at a Pan-American dinner in Chicago by Marcelino Miyares. This adaptation appeared in the New York Times on Monday, July 21, 1975.

Marcelino Miyares is a Cuban-born author. He was formerly chairman of the political science department at Illinois Benedictine College, and now heads a Chicago market-research and advertising concern.

The speech follows:

HISPANIC-AMERICANS' STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE

(By Marcelino Miyares)

There are more than 11 million Hispanic-Americans in this country, by 1985 there will be 15 million, and by the year 2000 it will be difficult to enjoy the privilege of being a minority group, since there will be 20 million—or 8 per cent of the total population.

Hispanic-Americans in the United States are concentrated in few areas or markets; thus, our social, political and economic impact is likely to be stronger in those areas of concentration, and by virtue of the visibility for being different, in this electronic media-oriented system, our impact in the nation is likely to be greater than our numbers.

We are in a developing stage within a highly developed and changing society. Our success as a group is likely to be determined by our ability to see our present reality, to establish practical and realistic objectives, and to design and implement sound strategies of development. In two words, thinking and working: Thinking theoretically, thinking strategically, thinking practically . . . and working very hard.

As a developing group our tasks are these: first, to increase group awareness, in terms of our common interests; second, to identify the real needs of the group in terms of education, communications and political and economic participation in the system, and finally to work very hard at the individual, family and organizational levels to satisfy those needs.

In the mid-seventies the facts are, however, that our educational level is low, our access to local and national media is nonexistent, our income is far below average and, in consequence, our degree of political participation is very low.

While the educational process is slow by nature, the increased acceptance by the nation of the need for bilingual education is likely to speed up the process. Thus, we should concentrate efforts in the establishment of bilingual programs. In business, Federal and local minority programs have increased our opportunities; thus, our main task is to identify them and the people capable of developing viable business enterprises.

In political participation, however, our capabilities have not been properly used and the closed nature of our political parties has not provided the opportunities available in the educational and business areas.

Thus, while the grand strategy of development is biculturalism, business development and real political participation for the next 25 years, the most pressing area of development is political participation.

For this reason I consider it essential to think about strategies and tactics aiming at the development of a greater and more realistic political participation of Hispanics for 1976 and thereafter.

The strategy that I consider workable is the organization of a Hispanic congress structured by committees in charge of studying the problems affecting our community, each committee to be led by people capable of identifying needs and defining problems.

Economic reasources would be invested in seeking professional guidance in the development of conceptual alternative solutions, and tactics to make them operational within the system. As progress is made, the executive committee would be continuously communicating to the community with the objective of giving the community the opportunity to think about issues and problems. The first step is the political participation process.

In this fashion, parties and candidates would find themselves in a position of having to "sell" their product, and in order to do it will have to seriously consider whether or not our definition of problems and our vision of what is good for this society are in agreement with theirs.

Thus, I am recommending a strategy of study, work, respect and healthy politics. This strategy would give us what we do not have—namely, resources, organization, image and respect.

Individuals in the more than 2,000 volunteer organizations of Hispanics in the nation can transform into reality what might now sound like an impossible dream. But it is part of our Hispanic character to dream the impossible and it is America's tradition to reach the unreachable. Thus as Hispanic-Americans we have to dream and to reach. I invite all to dream and to participate in the life of this great country in order to make it even greater for future generations.

THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the high price of energy is of great concern to the American people as we all know. However, the Congress has neglected the only real solution—expansion of supply—and instead attempts to use the collectivist approach to control the marketplace. Holding the price of energy below the natural level is deceivingly enticing to those demagogues who would tell their constituents that government fiat is the answer. I wish to emphasize that a ceiling on the price of a valuable commodity forces it off the market. The price of energy will fall when new sources are developed and made available to consumers.

Unfortunately, government has thwarted attempts at new energy development. Particularly in the field of nuclear energy, fanatics like Ralph Nader have promoted reactionary steps to be taken against the growth of energy sources. Nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller countered this Nader nonsense in a speech delivered at Hillsdale College in Michigan. Taken from Imprimis, the monthly publication of the College's Center for Constructive Alternatives, the text of the speech follows:

THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

(By Edward Teller)

Right now I am working on the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans under the chairmanship of Nelson Rockefeller. And furthermore, the topic of my work is energy. Some of us have seen the energy shortage coming. Had we done the right thing about it, there would not be an energy shortage now. The oil embargo came just a little less than a year ago. This year we have wasted. We have made practically no progress toward solving the energy shortage. And the energy shortage must be solved.

You have heard this from others: each year a hundred billion dollars are paid to the oil producing countries who can use only 40 percent of that money. The rest remains floating capital. The accumulation of this capital will transfer an amount of wealth to these countries which in ten years will amount to the value of everything that you can buy on the New York Stock Exchange. And it will be six times the value of the world's gold reserves. If this is not unstabilizing, I don't know what is. I don't know what will happen, and in this respect I'm just as good as the economists. They don't know either. But disorder that may come could be bigger than that connected with the great depression. The great depression led to Hitler, and Hitler made the Second World War.

We have in the United States an oil shortage which we can live with, although it might be disagreeable. The Europeans, the Japanese, many of the developing countries including India, cannot. The problem is a global one. And our main concern should not be ourselves. Our main concern should be how the effect of unemployment, hunger, other disasters occurring around the world will react back on us. That may drag us down. There is no *one* solution, and whoever claims that there is one solution, I am sure that he is either a liar or a fool.

One of the things that can be done fastest and should be emphasized most, is conservation: to use less energy in every possible way. There are many other approaches, and you have heard some of them. I will concentrate on nuclear energy, not because it is *the* solution, but because it is a very big part of the solution, and because I happen to know about it more than I know about the other problems. So I talk about what I know.

For us in the United States nuclear reactors are important. In ten years they could deliver more than one-third of our electric power. In 20 years if we go about it the right

way they could deliver well over one-half, maybe three-quarters of our electric power. And that is what we should be aiming for. If we abstain from building nuclear reactors it will be harder, but we shall not be faced with insoluble problems.

There are many places in the world where nuclear reactors are a must. For instance, this holds for Japan, which has no oil, which has very little coal, and which probably has geothermal energy that is still to be developed.

Nuclear energy has one peculiar property in common with oil and one property different from oil. Both are favorable for nuclear energy. The common property is that nuclear fuel can be transported even more cheaply than oil, although oil can be transported very cheaply. Coal and liquid natural gas are much harder to transport. Nuclear fuel is available in very many places around the world in abundance. We are not going to run short of nuclear fuel, and this is the second point where I say nuclear fuel is different from oil. An oil shortage, if it is not here yet, is coming. The Arabs, the Iranians, could pump out oil more rapidly. Probably they should—perhaps we can persuade them to do so. But in 20 years or 40 years these supplies are apt to run short. Nuclear fuels are going to last at least for 100 years, and I believe much longer.

Now here I come to a somewhat controversial point. It is not a point about which the broad public is getting excited. But in the technical public it is controversial and it should be understood. It has been claimed that the kind of nuclear fuel that we are now using will be short, certainly in 20 years, perhaps a little sooner. And, therefore, we have to develop a new type of reactor, a breeder reactor. Now the breeder reactor has this advantage; instead of using only approximately one percent of the energy in the uranium, it can use close to 100 percent of the energy. And you can gain in principle a factor 100. This was known in 1945. No new idea has been added. The engineers have been busy all around the world. A couple of billion dollars have been spent, the best talent has worked on it, we still have no breeder. It happens to be a really difficult problem and nobody believes that we are going to have a fast breeder before 1990, at least none that can make a real difference. And we need the energy now.

There is a solution: uranium is not the only fuel. There is another element in the close neighborhood of uranium, called thorium. Thorium can be used as a supplementary fuel. It can take over at least 80 percent of the energy production in reactors similar to those we have today. These reactors don't need the long research that the breeder needs, and if we utilize this possibility then we are going to have enough fuel for everybody in the whole world for at least 100 years. I guess that it might turn out in the end to be closer to 500 years. In the meanwhile, all kinds of other things will be developed. So that point needs not worry anybody.

There is another point about which people are very worried: the nuclear accident. Now this is very peculiar. I have a little personal involvement with this point. Around 1950 I was chairing the world's first Reactor Safeguard Committee. And at that time, among my colleagues who wanted to build nuclear reactors very fast, I was known as something like a "Mini-Nader" (although that expression at that time didn't exist yet. I will gladly concede that Nader is bigger, but I will not concede that he is necessarily better). We tried and succeeded in making reactors exceedingly safe.

A nuclear reactor can go wrong in many ways, although none has ever gone wrong yet. All these accidents are imaginery. And by imagining them we are avoiding them. We have no precedents. We build cars, let them collide, get into trouble and then find the safety measures. With the reactors you better not do this, and we haven't.

I want to give you an example from the early days, a very simple one. A reactor came up for consideration on Long Island, to be built in a place to be called Brookhaven. Now this reactor consisted of two big pieces, and between them there was an open slab in which the cooling air was to come out. I started to get nightmares. What if Long Island had a very big earthquake, and the two pieces slid together? Then the darned thing would be more than critical, it would blow up. Now I didn't quite say that. I didn't quite imagine that, because that couldn't happen. They could slide together, the reactor could develop too much energy and ruin itself. But it would not blow up, even under the most extreme conditions. It cannot blow up, because it is not constructed that way. You have to be very careful to construct a nuclear device in such a way so that it should blow up. We had a hard time in persuading nuclear devices to blow up in Los Alamos. A reactor won't even do it for us. But the reactor could ruin itself and a lot of radioactivity could get loose, and that's what I was worrying about.

So our committee asked an earthquake expert to come and talk to us. You may know that the best earthquake experts in the United States are the Jesuit fathers. Their missionaries in China used seismology to tell the Chinese emperor where the earthquake would occur, before he could have any message, which was, of course, miraculous, or divine. And the Jesuits made much of it. So a small Jesuit father, who incidentally could not be cleared for the secrets of the reactors (because in those days the reactors were secret) came to us under guard in the AEC. They sat him down at the head of the table in a big armchair, the little father, and he kept answering questions for half an hour. In that period we ran out of questions, but he did not run out of answers. When it was clear that no more answers were coming he pulled himself up in the chair, growing in stature, and looked us in the eye one by one. He looked at me last and said, "Dr. Teller, I can assure you on the highest authority that no major earthquake will occur in Long Island in the next 50 years." He got up and marched out of the room. That was the most difficult moment of our committee, but we behaved grandly. There was not a single smile until the door closed after the Jesuit father. And he had it on the highest authority, just like the Jesuits in Chinese imperial days.

I tried to tell this to you because there is this mixture of the unreal and the very real, the very practical, which we run into. More and new difficulties can be imagined. We don't want a nuclear accident and we should never have one. I have advocated, and I am still advocating, that nuclear reactors should be built underground. They are exceedingly safe, but they should be even safer; this should not mislead you into believing that the reactors are not safe as they are. The urgency of the present situation is so great that we should build them.

Let me try to tell you of two little points. No industrial nuclear reactor has killed anyone yet. The critics of nuclear reactors have the highest of praise for hydro electricity—for dams. The collapses of dams have killed hundreds of people and have made many more thousands homeless.

As another example, we are running short of natural gas. We begin to practice the importation of gas in the form of liquefied natural gas (LNG) in big ships. It is conceivable that such a ship may blow up. Not long ago two railroad cars carrying butadiene blew up in Houston with the force of many tons of TNT. Many people were hurt, and windows miles away were broken. Liquefied natural gas, because it has a lower boiling point, is more dangerous than butadiene, and a big ship is very much bigger than the two railroad cars. You have right there enough energy to supply five Hiroshimas. I don't know whether it can happen, but it can happen much more easily than a malfunction of a nuclear reactor. Do not believe that anything we are doing is safe.

In the special case of nuclear reactors there is an aura of danger which quite possibly comes from the fact that we are uneasy about what happened in Hiroshima, which probably shouldn't have happened. We probably should have tried to end the war with a demonstration, rather than with killing people. That nuclear energy first was used in war has colored our thinking on the subject.

Nuclear reactors are safe. Nuclear reactors are generally available. Unfortunately, they cannot be built quickly. Today it generally takes ten years to build a nuclear reactor, although we could speed up the building of nuclear reactors to five years. In the meantime there will be serious shortages.

Now let me talk about these reactors a little more. Even if I do that I will not manage to exhaust the criticisms of nuclear reactors. One of the criticisms is that nuclear reactors emit radiation even in their normal operation, and that this radiation may endanger people. I have a colleague, Dr. Tamplin, who appeared at a hearing of the Dresden III reactor and objected to the Dresden III reactor because it emits radioactivity in normal operation. A young employee of the AEC who was present at the hearing asked Dr. Tamplin, "From what do you get more radiation, from leaning up against the outside of this recator, as close as you can get, for a full year, or from your habit of sleeping each night with your wife?" Dr. Tamplin did not seem to understand. So the AEC man explained. "I am not trying to imply that your wife is particularly dangerous. But all of us have radioactive potassium in our blood. And you get more radiation from your own potassium than you get from the gamma rays that your wife's potassium emits. But you get some from her. Now then, potassium is well shielded; so is the radioactivity of this reactor. Just for comparison, from which do you get more radiation?"

Dr. Tamplin still couldn't answer, so this AEC man went back to Washington and wrote a memorandum, and forgot to classify it, and I got a copy. This memorandum said, "I have made the calculation, and you get more radiation from the Dresden III reactor than you get from your wife. Therefore, I am not going to suggest to the AEC that twin beds should become obligatory for all married couples. But from the point of view of radiation hazard, I must warn you against the habit of sleeping each night with two girls, because then you get a little more radiation than from the Dresden III."

Probably I should not talk this way because we are speaking of extremely serious problems. But you should realize that at a time when more energy, including more energy from reactors, has become practically a matter of life and death, objections as trivial as the one I have just mentioned are being raised and are believed. I think reactors can be built, must be built, and I am confident will be built. I hope they will be built safely.

It has been proposed to produce energy not from nuclear reactors, which derive their energy from the splitting of heavy atoms, but from controlled fusion, with the energy from the union of the lightest atoms—that is, on fusion of hydrogen. Fusion was used in an explosive form in the hydrogen bomb. The question is whether we can use it in a controlled form to produce energy.

I have been arguing that all research on fusion should be open. After many years of argument I got permission to go to the second Atoms for Peace conference and talk about it publicly. The Russians came and

talked about it too. It is now a subject of internal cooperation which is a complete success. We have good reason to be convinced that even the Russians don't hold back. They are working on it more diligently than we are.

Unfortunately, the problem is difficult and we will not succeed in my opinion before the year 2000. It may succeed in the next few years in the sense of building a demonstration plant which gives an electric profit, meaning more electricity would be produced than consumed. An electrical profit, however, is not a dollar profit. It will be a big engineering job to make fusion economically usable. It cannot be done before the year 2000. The same holds for the much more ingenious and much more difficult idea of laser fusion.

We started to talk about fusion at an international conference in 1958. And while I was at it I also got permission to talk about a proposal we had in our laboratory, the Livermore Laboratory—a proposal to use nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, which I briefly did in Geneva in 1958. No sooner did I finish than Professor Emilianov, the leader of the Russian delegation, got to his feet and denounced our proposal on Plowshare (the peaceful use of nuclear explosives) as an imperialistic plot designed to legitimize more nuclear explosive experimentation. With an enormous exercise of self-control I refrained from answering him. But a few hours later in the press conference, a reporter from New York asked him, "Isn't it true, Professor Emilianov, that at the time of the first Russian nuclear explosion in 1959, a member of the Politboro claimed that this explosion was not for war, but for peaceful purposes? Now you say that nuclear explosives cannot be used for peaceful purposes." The professor said, "That was a politician speaking, and we Russian scientists never listen to what the politicians say."

I have to tell you that in the meantime the Russian scientists seem to have listened. We are not progressing on Plowshare because some people who believe they are environmentalists are objecting. The Russians are going full speed ahead. They have used nuclear explosives to put out fires in gas wells. They drill a hole next to the gas well, explode the nuclear device and shove the earth over in a massive explosion, and that shuts off the burning. They have made a big hole in the desert as a water catchment area. They are planning to connect two rivers, the Pechora and the Kama, which flow westward from the Ural mountains. One, the Pechora, flows into the Arctic Ocean, which has enough water. The Kama flows southward into the Volga and eventually into the Caspian. The Caspian is drying up—it's too salty. Fish don't thrive so well and the Rusians are getting a little short of proletarian caviar. They are planning in a very reasonable environmental fashion to deflect the Pechora into the Kama, which means digging a long canal over elevated terrain, which you can do by nuclear explosions—a very admirable project.

Now all this has a recent sequel. You know that the Hindus have exploded a nuclear device. They claim they are doing it for peaceful purposes. They furthermore claim that they have done it in shale because they want to squeeze oil out of oil shale. They say that nobody should object. In principle they may be right, but in practice, who knows?

But what about this question of squeezing oil out of oil shale? Nuclear reactors will solve a part of the energy problem. But as we now know the subject, nuclear reactors will mainly produce electricity. They will not produce a fluid that can be used to drive automobiles. Shale (peculiarly enough) does not contain any oil, but it has organic substances which if cooked make a fluid which looks like oil. You can think of oil attached to rock: that is oil shale. The cooking tears the oil loose from the rock. The approved method is to dig up the oil shale, put it into a retort, ignite at the top, and it will start to burn down if you supply oxygen or air. As the burning progresses downward, layer after layer is heated. As the layer gets sufficiently heated, the oil is liberated and vaporizes. The vapor then condenses in the layer even lower down. And this oil can be pumped out. That is how oil shale gets retorted today. But first you must dig it up, and then you must retort it—very expensive. Furthermore, it takes a lot of steel, a lot of capital investment. And in order to do that we have to get hundreds of thousands of people to Colorado, Wyoming and Utah, into desert places—a big displacement of population. And we must use lots of water to cool the retorts, and then you are left each day with millions of tons of unused shale, which is a real environmental nuisance.

Now one of my acquaintances, Don Garrett, has proposed a way around these troubles. He excavates a room below the oil shale, then puts high explosives into the ceiling, collapses the ceiling, and produces a rubble chimney in the oil shale. Then he uses this chimney as a natural retort. He does the whole thing underground. It is cheaper, it is better, and it should be done.

I don't think it's good enough. It should be done, but the development in the end will go even farther. In Colorado, in one place in the Piceance Basin, we have approximately two A units of hydrocarbon. An A unit is the amount of oil that the Arabs are known to have underground. And Colorado has at least 2 A units, probably more. And some of it is 2,000 feet thick. What you can do here is to drill down under the shale, blow up a nuclear explosive, maybe 50 kt., maybe 100 kt. There would be an earthquake on the surface, so you better move the people out. But it is a desert area where for one shot you have to move out maybe 50 people. And the damage found afterwards in the few buildings is quite small. It's a moderate earthquake, not a very big one. Then you are left with an enormous rubble chimney. You have saved the whole mining operation, you have brought out no shale, everything is underground. You might get oil as cheaply as $3 to $5 a barrel in great quantities, enough for us for the next 100 years. Furthermore, oil shale in one form or another is widely distributed throughout the world. The Plowshare method is only one way—it may be the best.

Yes, but some people have proposed an amendment to the Colorado constitution: no nuclear explosives in Colorado. I am told the amendment will pass.* I am told I better not go to Colorado and speak there, because I am a carpetbagger with an accent, and it will only make matters worse. But I'm going just for the fun of it.

I have told you the story about oil shale, about the Hindus, about the Russians, and about our own efforts to try to give you an idea how many ways there are in which the energy problem can be handled. And I can assure you that there are a dozen other possibilities which I haven't mentioned.

I am firmly convinced that we must try to work on many fronts. On those that will pay off later, we still should work a little.

Furthermore, I am convinced that we must not go into this research and development by ourselves. It is a worldwide problem. It should be attacked on an international basis, which indeed is already done in connection with controlled fusion. We have not done it in connection with the breeder reactor. The job should be performed jointly. Plowshare should be jointly pursued. It should be open. The Hindus may learn a little from us, and I would be very happy to learn, in turn, from the Hindus and the Russians. It is a problem as important for them as it is for us.

* It has passed.

AID TO TURKEY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my supplemental views to the International Relations Committee report on S. 846, a bill to authorize the further suspension of prohibitions against military assistance to Turkey.

The supplemental views follow:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

The vote of the House of Representatives on S. 846 may be the most important single vote for Congress on a foreign policy issue this year, and I hope Members will support this bill.

The vote is important because it touches on several key foreign policy interests, including: the future of the southern flank of NATO, U.S. bilateral relations with Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, the ability of the United States to deal effectively with future mediterranean and Middle East crises, the ability of the United States to promote successful negotiations for a just and lasting resolution of the Cyprus problem and an end to the suffering of the Cypriot people, and the ability of the United States to continue to gather information vital to our national security.

The crucial question here concerns the means that the United States Government has to influence the Governments of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus to deal with an unacceptable and deteriorating situation in the Eastern Mediterranean. More precisely, the question is whether the several U.S. foreign policy interests in the area will be better served by continuation or modification of the arms embargo against Turkey.

In my view the arms embargo has been detrimental to the maintenance of a strong southern flank of NATO, to United States efforts to play a constructive role in the region, and to the preservation of important, if not irreplaceable, U.S. intelligence gathering facilities.

In short, the nearly six month ban has simply not worked and it is time to take a new approach. If the ban is removed, the United States will be in a better position to promote favorably its several interests in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Several arguments are being used against S. 846 and in support of the arms embargo, and I would like to comment on them:

Argument: Turkey violated provisions of American law when it used U.S. equipment in invading Cyprus.

Counter:

Unfortunately, the issue is not so simple. As a guarantor of the independence of Cyprus under the 1960 accords, Turkey felt its duty was to protect the independence of Cyprus when the Greek Government helped engineer the overthrow of Archbishop Makarios in July 1974.

Turkey was, then, caught between conflicting legal responsibilities. If Turkey did not act to protect Cypriot independence and the Turkish-Cypriot minority, which it felt were threatened by the July 1974 coup. Turkey would be ignoring its international legal obligations under the 1960 agreements on Cyprus; on the other hand, if Turkey did act, its actions could be construed to be in violation of American law.

Whatever its position with respect to American law, Turkey felt it was acting according to international law and the 1960 accords to which Turkey was a party.

Moreover, Turkey has been punished for nearly a half year for its invasion of Cyprus.

The effect of the law has been felt and the principle honored. The law was not intended to punish Turkey, or anyone else, indefinitely, especially when the cause of peace and promotion of the national interest argue strongly for a modification of the embargo.

In addition, the United States law should not be selectively enforced. Several other similar military agreements that have been violated by friendly states around the world have not led to denials of aid and the United States has furnished arms to countries which were in possession of territory of other states.

There is, for example, uncontradicted evidence that Greece has transferred U.S. military equipment to Cyprus since the mid-1960s in violation of law.

Argument: If the United States resumed aid, we will set a precedent encouraging other states to use U.S.-supplied arms as they please.

Counter:

The law has been punitive to Turkey. Nations are on notice that if they misuse American arms, they risk losing access to those arms. The only reason for suspending the provisions of the law with respect to Turkey is because of a new situation.

This action will have no impact on Persian Gulf states or other states in the Middle East—the only way we can persuade other states not to use arms for purposes other than those prescribed in the law is through bilateral presentations and we do that. The particular facts of each situation will determine the use of American arms, not this or any other precedent.

We have upheld the principle that violators of U.S. laws and regulations relating to military equipment provided to foreign nations will be penalized.

Argument: The Turkish military is hurting now and Turkey will eventually make concessions.

Counter:

Turkey can buy arms elsewhere. The British are willing to sell them equipment. Others in Europe, including the Soviet Union, could supply arms.

Pressure on Turkey in the last several months has only hardened its position. Given the Turkish national character and their unanimity of view in opposition to the embargo, Turkey is not likely to make concessions under duress and this means that suffering on Cyprus only continues.

The Turkish military may be hurting, but not that much. Over the years it has been able to cannibalize equipment and it can do so now. The ban is simply forcing the Turks to turn for help to other nations whose interests may not be harmonious with ours.

Argument: The embargo did not work because the President and Secretary of State did not want it to work. Rather than pressing for Turkish concessions, the U.S. told Turkey "wait, we will bring Congress around on the aid issue."

Counter:

Under Secretary of State Sisco denied this charge. He said that we have made vigorous efforts to try to obtain concessions and meaningful negotiations. I would not try to defend every move of the Administration in dealing with Cyprus. The fact is, however, that with the embargo, our ability to work with, and to influence Turkey has diminished, and Turkish cooperation is essential if progress is to be made on Cyprus, as well as on other crises in the area.

Argument: We are only acting now because Turkey gave the U.S. an ultimatum that bases may be closed after July 17. If we give in to extortion, now we will only up the ante and face future Turkish demands.

Counter:

We are acting now, not because of any ultimatum, but because it is in our national interest to act.

Most Turkish political parties have been calling for a review of base and facility arrangements for some time. This is not a new issue.

There is neither extortion nor ultimatum here. Our security arrangement with Turkey is for the mutual benefit of Turkey and the United States. Because of the embargo, it is only natural that Turkey is reviewing its security ties.

We are not upping the ante: our security relationship with Turkey has always been at the core of our ties.

Argument: Turkey will not make concessions and compromise on this issue or other issues like the opium poppy growing issue.

Counter:

While Turkey has resumed production of opium poppies, the harvest is only now beginning and we do not know whether its substantial efforts to keep opium out of illicit markets will work. We will have to judge these efforts later.

We have had a 30-year relationship with Turkey and our mutual interests in preserving that relationship are great. In the past, they have shown a willingness to cooperate and to compromise, and there is no reason to think they will not in the future, provided that we treat them as a partner in a mature relationship.

We need good relations with the Turks if we are to be able to work with them on some issues that matter to us, like the opium issue and the Cyprus problem.

The embargo only reduces our ability to work with and influence Turkey on these and other issues.

Argument: Resuming aid will seriously jeopardize United States-Greek relations.

Counter:

The basis of our dealings with one ally—Greece—should not hinge on what we do with another ally—Turkey. Greece cannot complain if she and Turkey are treated equally, which would be the effect of a lifting of the ban.

The best judgment of our diplomats is that a modification of the ban will not produce a major reaction in Greece. Many Greeks recognize that the ban has introduced a complexity into the negotiations which is, at least, delaying a solution.

There is only one way to improve and preserve the close relations we want with Greece and that is directly with Greece in our bilateral ties. These bilateral dealings continue to need urgent, direct attention.

We are working with Greece now on further military assistance and there is a likelihood of economic help in the future. The bill before the House encourages assistance to Greece. Greece intends to buy considerable military equipment from the United States, and Greece's relationship with the United States is more important to Greece than what we sell to Turkey.

Argument: S. 846 is no compromise. It gives Turkey everything it wants.

Counter:

This bill continues to put restrictions on what we give Turkey. Upon enactment of this bill, Turkey will not have everything it wants. This bill releases to Turkey equipment it has already purchased. Only when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1975 is enacted will Turkey be able to buy equipment directly or on credit. The denial of grant aid to Turkey continues.

This bill, with a partial lifting of the arms embargo, is a compromise between the President and Secretary of State who wanted a total and immediate removal of the arms embargo, and the proponents of the arms embargo in Congress who wanted no removal without prior Turkish concessions or assurances of them.

If Turkey fails to respond to this effort and if no meaningful negotiations result, the partial lifting of the ban can be removed and the full ban reimposed.

LEE H. HAMILTON.

SAVING OUR CITIES BY MAKING THEM SAFE

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials—NAHRO—an outstanding organization of professional men and women in the field of urban planning and housing improvement, recently held a national conference in my city of St. Louis to discuss the social goals and social impact of housing and community development. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing, and a member of that subcommittee since it was established 20 years ago, I was pleased to accept NAHRO's invitation to deliver the keynote address at the opening of the conference.

The picture I painted of the outlook for our cities, unless fundamental changes are achieved in the safety and well-being of the fearful people who reside in our cities, was rather grim. The acute housing problems cannot be solved by professionals in the housing field alone, or by unlimited appropriation of funds for them to administer. It is going to take the combined and coordinated efforts of many professional groups—the sociologists, the clergy, the educators, the political leaders, the police, the prosecutors, the judges, and the probation officers, among others—to save our cities by making them once again safe and satisfying places in which to live. We must find a way to meld all of these professionals into a strike force for human safety and dignity, and enlist the people of the community into the same war.

That was supposed to be the concept of model cities, until model cities was transformed from a concentrated demonstration approach in a limited number of areas into yet another broad program for channeling some additional Federal funds into every city. So we ended up with no truly "model" cities.

Mr. Speaker, I now hope that many of our cities will use substantial amounts of their fund allocations under the new community development block grant program, which supersedes the old categorical assistance programs, to coordinate their attack on housing problems with an attack also on all of the other problems in the community which contribute to neighborhood decay and urban blight. And first and foremost is the necessity to make the city a safe place to walk, in which householders are secure in their

homes, mass transit safe to ride, and in which the average income family which pays its own way and pays the taxes for the subsidies for others feels that its needs are also being fully and seriously taken into account.

TEXT OF ADDRESS TO NAHRO

I submit as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the keynote address I delivered on July 8 at the national conference at the Chase-Park Plaza Hotel in St. Louis of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

During twenty years of service on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House of Representatives—ever since the Subcommittee was established in 1955—I have probably learned all there is to know about the *needs* of our cities in solving the problems of bad housing, urban blight, neighborhood deterioration, insurance red-lining, spreading slums, congestion, traffic strangulation, air pollution, overtaxed waste disposal, inadequate community facilities, and crime. I am a walking encyclopedia of problems recognized and conceded.

I only wish I were as knowledgeable about how to solve them.

We have tried—oh, how we have tried!—in those 20 years to devise programs to meet these needs. Each new program was launched with widespread hope and even enthusiasm. Billions of dollars of Federal funds in outright grants, in matching funds, and in loans, poured out of the United States Treasury in a belief that, while money couldn't solve everything, nothing could really be solved without Federal financial help and technical assistance.

Sometimes we might wonder whether, if we had done less, the results might have been at least the same, if not better. I am sure that would not have been the case. There is overwhelming evidence throughout the country that urban redevelopment programs have accomplished tremendous improvements in the physical appearance of every major city and of hundreds of smaller ones. The costs have been high—in dollars and in dislocation of families and businesses forced to move to different locations to make room for the dramatic new projects—but the results in many instances are impressive and often thrilling.

SOLUTIONS DIFFER—PROBLEMS PERSIST

Public housing, with all of its publicized failures, has nevertheless provided decent, sanitary, solidly-built, brightly promising new homes for many thousands of families which would otherwise have lived in misery—except that many of the public housing projects themselves turned into islands of misery where problem families were thrown together to stew in environments of despair. The public housing high hopes of the Thirties turned into high-rise warehouses of crime, vandalism, and decay.

Not all public housing projects deteriorated into horrors, by any means. But the public image of public housing became so tarnished that we are now running pell-mell away from the concept, abandoning it while more and more of our population is being priced out of the private housing market by inflation.

We tried subsidized home ownership for the poor, only to have greed and avarice and scandal virtually destroy public support for this approach.

Now we are putting most of our eggs in the basket of subsidized rents in private housing. The program was authorized last year on a comprehensive scale with promises that by the end of calendar 1975—within six months from now—we would have 400,000 new Section 8 units in place. Instead, only about 20,000 units are actually in construction.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, which so confidently gave us the 400,000 figure last year when the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 was being pushed through the Congress under Administration support and pressure, now informs us that the problems of setting up the Section 8 program were for more complex than had been anticipated, but that things should pick up quickly now that the difficult preliminary work has been accomplished. Let us hope so, for the needs are so urgent they scream for solution.

THE BLOCK GRANT APPROACH

Unlike the housing assistance program under Section 8, the Community Development Block Grant program has been moving more quickly with more than 1300 applications flooding in, and with strong evidence that the communities applying for funds are planning to use them in support of the major objectives of the Act, as measured by *locally identified* priority needs, and that these needs generally coincide with national objectives.

All well and good—and hopeful.

But it is certain that whatever funds are provided are not going to be enough to satisfy local planners, and you are all going to have to redefine and redefine and sharpen your plans. But instead of arguing each dollar's assignment with HUD bureaucrats in Washington and in the field, you are going to have to argue them out with your own city governments and with the voters of your own constituencies. I do not look for instant unanimity there, any more than you found it in the HUD bureaucracy.

I hope the idea of local autonomy in setting priorities on housing and community development programs works as effectively as its proponents argued it would when the legislation was being considered over the past four years. Certainly the idea makes great sense. But then we must remember that every idea and plan we adopted in the past forty years in solving the housing and urban development needs of our communities made great sense at the time. Each was adopted with a sense of expectation and enthusiasm. If a plan worked satisfactorily on a small pilot basis, it was automatically expanded into a program of incredibly large proportions with its own cheering section and bureaucracy in every locality, only to lead to the inevitable squabbles and disillusionment over results and costs.

So if some of us are skeptical about the eventual superiority of Section 8 over public housing, or of Community Development Block Grants over Model Cities, Urban Renewal, Open Spaces, Slum Clearance, and all of the other categorical programs of the past now superseded by and merged into CDBG, it is certainly not because we don't *hope* the new plan will succeed but merely that we've been through a lot of disappointments together in this field of urban revitalization.

INSTILLING RESPECT FOR RIGHTS OF OTHERS

Some of us have preached—and I'm afraid that is the only appropriate word—we have preached the need for far greater attention to the *perversity of the human beings* who are at the heart of our housing and urban problems.

Back in the earliest days of Federal programs in the housing field, it was felt by most of the experts that all you had to do to assure a decent environment for poor families was to provide new and clean and dry and vermin-free housing for those living in slums, clean out the slums, and our urban living problems would be solved. A similar panacea today is that if poor families had more money to spend as they see fit, they would opt for all of the proper things for a satisfying life—and our social problems would be solved.

As a New Dealer, Fair Dealer, New Frontierswoman and Great Society partisan through all of those years of exciting economic and social development, I have nevertheless clung to the rather old-fashioned idea that helping people helps them in the long run only to the extent that you help them help themselves—to make themselves self-reliant, self-respecting and self-improving.

Being poor does not make one either noble or community minded, any more than wealth automatically brings such individual virtues to the fore. We have all had to be taught decency, morality, good manners, honesty—and we learned these things at home, in church, in school, somewhere. Even the most advantaged of Americans not always learned these lessons effectively, so it is not entirely a case of income.

But in the jungles of our city slums, the temptations are infinitely greater and the difficulties of achieving so-called middle class values are infinitely more rigorous. We fight alcoholism, drug addiction, crime, delinquency and violence in a variety of ways, some more successfully than others, but until we find ways to instill a respect for the rights of our neighbors and the *stranger* on the street, we are fighting a losing battle in urban rehabilitation.

A STRIKE FORCE FOR HUMAN SAFETY AND DIGNITY

Is this a professional concern of the housing and redevelopment experts? I think so. For you are never going to succeed in your objectives—which are, of course, the objectives of the whole community—until you join with the sociologists, the clergy, the educators, the prosecutors, the courts, and the politicians in an all-out combined war on the anarchy and lack of self-discipline which pervade much of our cities.

People must once again be free to walk in our cities—in any part of our cities—in safety. Householders in every part of our cities must be secure in their homes. Children must want to go to school and learn and must be enabled to do so without fear of bodily harm and mugging to and from school, or paying ransom for safe passage. People who work for a living must be protected in their passage, too.

Is this asking for Utopia? In many of our cities today, I am afraid it sounds like an impossible dream. But life for millions of residents of those cities—whether in public housing or in middle class neighborhoods—is a nightmare of physical and emotional fear. And such fears are now widespread in the suburbs, too.

Instead of the police holding seminars for policemen and policewomen on how to handle their part of the job, and housing and redevelopment experts like you men and women holding conferences on your part of the job, and the clergy doing the same, and the sociologists, and the educators, and the prosecutors, and the judges and the probation officers and the all of the other professional segments of the community and of the nation sitting down to commiserate among themselves over the problems they face in coping with *their* assignments, we must find a way to meld all of these professionals into a strike force for human safety and dignity, and enlist the people of the community into the same war.

This was the concept behind Model Cities. What happened to that *idea?*

We are spending billions of the taxpayers dollars these days on urban mass transit, but as long as a comparatively few hoodlums can make riding on these facilities a joust with physical danger, people will continue to drive

their own cars to wherever they are going, with the resultant pollution, congestion, and waste of energy.

We have devoted endless amounts of money to rehabilitation of deteriorating neighborhoods, only to have newly remodeled homes vandalized and torn apart before they are even occupied; only to have boarded up windows giving an atmosphere of desolation and devastation to an entire area of well-built, solid, good housing occupied by people afraid for their lives in the night.

MEETING NEEDS OF AVERAGE INCOME FAMILIES, TOO

As I told you at the start of my talk, I am a walking encyclopedia of the problems of our cities. But when do we in the Congress begin getting some feedback from you and other urban professionals on successful solutions?

In recent hearings, one theme seemed to be dominant—people need more money. Certainly they do. They need jobs. That is basic—as basic as fighting crime. How President Ford could have vetoed a bill to provide hundreds of thousands of public service jobs at a time when all of our cities and towns are finding it almost impossible to cope with the most fundamental of their responsibilities in serving the public is incredible; how he could get away with it is incomprehensible.

The housing bill he vetoed with similar success was not, in my opinion, a satisfactory measure. But it was something—it was an important step forward in meeting the needs of middle income families for housing such families could afford. My complaint was that it subsidized the upper levels of the so-called middle income group—those whose incomes are 120% of median—to buy houses costing from $38,000 to $42,000. Like many of our programs, this would have had the average-income families paying taxes to subsidize families more affluent than they are, while being denied any measure of support themselves.

I have been struggling for six years to enact a program of home ownership assistance for the average working family—without subsidies—through a direct Federal loan program, the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation, at interest levels no higher than 6½%. This idea will eventually win, because it is the average income working family—now making from $12,000 to $17,000—that is paying the subsidies for lower-income families' assistance and the tax breaks for the upper income people as well.

MIDDLE-CLASS FEELS IGNORED

The middle income families are left out. And they are angry. They see families on welfare living, in many instances, better than they can, and eating better, too. As the Member of Congress most responsible for the existence of the Food Stamp program, and as one who has voted for many, many other assistance programs for the poor, I can acknowledge the legitimacy of these complaints. The answer is not to deny help to the poor; it is to make sure the middle income families which pay their own way can make their way in these topsy-turvy days of inflation and bitter recession. Unless we do that—unless we can reassure the average income family that its contributions to this society of ours are recognized, appreciated, and fairly rewarded, all of our social programs are going to collapse in the heap of popular repudiation.

When I was invited to speak to this gathering today, I was asked to keynote the meeting by discussing the social goals and social impact of housing and community development programs. I realize I have painted a rather grim picture. Many of you may disagree with it. But if I thought the situation were hopeless—that we aren't smart enough as a nation to solve these problems—I certainly would not have accepted your invitation. But I don't think your profession can solve the problems of our cities by yourselves, nor can we as politicians, nor can any one group in the community or in the nation.

When George Washington took command of the "Colonials" in Cambridge, Mass. 199 years ago, they had already lost some major battles and knew they faced many bitter trials ahead. But we're all mighty glad that the founders of this Nation kept up that fight, and we've got to do the same thing to redeem the heavy losses of our urban society. We are not going to abandon our cities, come what may.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR JAPANESE-AMERICAN WORLD WAR II INTERNEES

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I today join several of my distinguished House colleagues from California through my introduction of a measure aimed at redressing a serious transgression from the principles of equality and justice upon which this Nation was founded. My reference here to bills offered by Members of the House of Representatives is to H.R. 4787, introduced by the Honorable ROBERT L. LEGGETT; H.R. 5560, introduced by the Honorable PHILLIP BURTON; and H.R. 5954, introduced by the Honorable WILLIAM M. KETCHUM. A similar measure has been introduced as S. 1424 by Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE of Hawaii.

The transgression from equality and justice which I refer to is the mass relocation of 110,000 Japanese-Americans during World War II.

Although the internment and detention of persons of Japanese ancestry occurred more than 30 years ago, I do not believe that we should allow ourselves to wipe those dark events from our individual or collective memories. To do so is to bring further injustice to those denied their human and constitutional rights in the past and to deny the painful but vitally important lessons to be taken from those times—in the words of Tom C. Clark, past Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

First, that the mere existence of a legal right is no more protection to individual liberty than the parchment upon which it is written, and second, that mutual love, respect, and understanding of one another are stronger bonds than constitutions.

Among those Japanese Americans who suffered the stress of confinement, lost property, and the humiliation of being regarded as traitors by their own government were many individuals who had, prior to the issuance of Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, contributed directly to the well-being of this country as Federal employees. Still others of the 110,000 Japanese American internees joined the U.S. Civil Service subsequent to their release from the detention and internment camps. Many of those evacuated from their homes under Government order went on to serve and defend the United States in the Armed Forces.

Although the detention and internment of Japanese Americans occurred more than 30 years ago, it is not too late to provide some measure of acknowledgment for the suffering and anguish caused Americans of Japanese ancestry during World War II. Following the precedent actions of the 92d Congress in its enactment of Public Law 92–603, which provided credit under the Social Security Act for the time spent by persons of Japanese ancestry in internment camps, the bill I am introducing today would allow for the crediting of time spent by Japanese Americans in World War II internment and detention camps under the Federal Civil Service Retirement System.

Through the adoption of such a measure, we can achieve and further equity on two bases. In the narrower sense, we can provide to Federal employees the same treatment afforded to present and future social security recipients interned during World War II. Toward the principle of equity in the broader sense, we can provide some redress for the wrongful and deplorable actions of some 30 years ago—taken in the name of "the national security"—which deprived 110,000 individuals of their civil and human rights.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in accord with Public Law 86–90, the third week in July has been set aside as Captive Nations Week, dedicated to the commemoration of the fate of the millions of people denied basic human rights by Communist oppression.

It is important that we in the Congress take time to reaffirm our basic belief in the right to freedom for all men, and also reaffirm our commitment to those living in captive nations who, because of the support of the United States, have not lost hope for freedom. Because of the tragedy of Southeast Asia there are some who may question our commitment to those who have been denied their freedom. For this reason, it is particularly fitting that we reaffirm this commitment to the millions of people all over the world living in closed societies, who are unable to hear the facts, speak the truth, and fully determine their own form of government.

In this era of détente we must not be allowed to lose our perspective toward the captive nations of Eastern and Cen-

tral Europe. The U.S.S.R. has sought our acquiescence of its control over these countries, a control that precludes free exchange of ideas, personal mobility, and the exchange of information. This area of Europe has long endured as the traditional power fulcrum in maintaining a balance of power. It should not be abandoned to provide the Soviet Union with sufficient leverage to penetrate further into the European Continent. The United States must declare, therefore, that it will not accept any permanent Russian hegemony over this part of Europe.

In keeping with this position I have cosponsored House Congressional Resolution 262, expressing the sense of the Congress that the U.S. delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

The Department of State agrees with the stipulation of the resolution that the U.S. delegation to the conference should not agree to the recognition by the conference of the Soviet Union's forcible annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Although the conference may consider a declaration of principles which will include respect for "frontier inviolability" this must not be interpreted as recognition or condoning of the forcible annexation of the Baltic States. The Western delegations to the conference must insist that any declaration of principles include specific reference to peaceful border changes, to self-determination, and to respect for human rights.

Détente, to be effective, has to consider human and moral as well as political realities. Any future agreements between the Soviet Union, the United States, and the Free World should be made contingent on the Soviets adhering to a policy which respects the fundamental rights of all people. Without this insistence the citizens living in captive nations will be forced to endure only more oppression. Our priorities should be clear, and it is my hope that soon freedom and liberty will again return to those living in captive nations of the world.

ENERGY BILL POSES DANGER TO OUR OWN COUNTRY

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has hardly won great praise, nor has it deserved it, for its handling of our energy problems. We have yet to come up with a real program and much of what we have done can best be described as "cosmetic."

While initially the public and the media seemed to accept the timid and halting approach to making tough decisions necessary to achieve our goal of energy security, accepting the claim that the Congress could come up with a better solution, that time has passed. What has happened is that a new awareness of the magnitude of the problem and the tough steps necessary to meet it is appearing in the press and in the mail from constituents.

We are presently debating proposed energy legislation that does have some teeth, H.R. 7014 as reported out by the Commerce Committee. The trouble is that these teeth are so designed that they can only take bites out of our own domestic petroleum supply, leaving us even more at the mercy of foreign oil producers. There are some good provisions in this bill, and we could, through amendments, transform it into a solid start toward an energy program.

Unfortunately, the House has so far not exhibited the will to do this. If the Congress adopts this bill in its present form, we will deserve the criticism we shall receive. At this point I wish to include in the RECORD two editorials from the Hartford Times of Wednesday, July 16, concerning the question before us:

ENERGY BILL WILL TAKE OVER U.S. PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

The House Commerce Committee's energy legislation, known as the Dingell bill, will do more to threaten any hope the United States may have of achieving energy independence than any single measure ever considered by the Congress.

The bill, in fact, represents a virtual takeover of the nation's petroleum industry, and it is being presented as a "constructive alternative to President Ford's massively inflationary and recessionary" program, which would insure that this nation has the energy it needs.

Already there is very little "free enterprise" remaining in the petroleum industry and, as a result of that fact, the nation continues to suffer petroleum, petroleum product and natural gas shortages even though there are identifiable deposits of those materials within the reach of the continental United States.

Under the so-called Dingell bill, the inequitable allocation program now in effect would be extended, allegedly to "protect independent refiners and marketers from monopolistic practices." What is not explained is what "monopolistic practices" actually exist in the petroleum industry, which is one of the most competitive industries remaining in the United States today. No single petroleum company controls a truly significant share of the market, and independents and smaller petroleum companies have been growing at a rate far faster than the majors.

The legislation would also "stabilize" the price of new oil discovered in the United States at an average of $7.50 per barrel—apparently regardless of the fact that discovery and production of that new oil might cost $10 or $15 per barrel. How much "new" oil does the Congress truly believe that proposal will generate?

In addition to tampering with the domestic pricing market, the legislation would put the federal government in the petroleum business, and most Americans can guess what the consequences of that would be. The federal government would be in the position of purchasing foreign oil by sealed, competitive bidding, thus replacing the private companies in that operation and requiring establishment of a costly new federal bureaucracy.

The legislation also would establish a nationwide monthly ceiling on gasoline consumption; would tamper with the automobile industry by establishing automobile fuel efficiency standards; would tamper with industry by establishing industry conservation standards, energy efficiency labeling of appliances, and appliance energy efficiency standards; and would tamper with the transportation industry by establishing requirements on energy conservation in transportation.

In short, those provisions alone should be sufficient to sound the death knell for free enterprise in the industry—and perhaps in many related industries as well.

As if those things are not bad enough, the legislation also gives the President the power and authority to decide how much petroleum producers should extract from their sources and when. The legislation states that the President "may require producers to produce oil at the maximum efficient rate" when he chooses, regardless of what that decision might cost the nation's private petroleum industry, which, for the record, is not owned by the government in the first place.

Also, it gives the President absolute authority over related industries which manufacture petroleum production equipment and materials.

And, to top it all off, the legislation authorizes the federal General Accounting Office to perform an annual audit of the finances and records of the nation's major oil companies.

The Dingell bill is unquestionably one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever introduced and considered by the Congress. It would in effect nationalize an American industry without compensating those who actually own the industry and without informing the American people of the fact that that is exactly what is happening.

There is absolutely no grounds upon which the legislation can be justified and the only insurance against its implementation should it pass the Congress as expected is the certainty of a presidential veto.

Free enterprise must not be allowed to die by congressional fiat in the petroleum industry. The Dingell bill must not be allowed to become the law of the land.

AND FORD'S ALTERNATIVE

President Ford has submitted both a sane and a viable alternative to the Dingell bill to the American people for their consideration: His plan to decontrol petroleum prices in order to provide the nation's oil and natural gas producers with the incentive essential to the stimulation of exploration and development of new sources.

The President's approach is the only rational one. It recognizes that new energy sources will not be sought and developed unless American industry is assured that it can expect decent profit in return for its efforts.

The President also has insured in his proposal that the American public will be protected: It includes a tough windfall profits provision that guarantees that unless income resulting from higher prices is used for exploration and development of new energy sources the profits will wind up in the federal treasury.

The price increases resulting from the President's program could be phased in gradually over a nearly three-year period and would average about 3.3 per cent per month during that time. It is of course true that the final increase would be substantial in terms of burden on the nation's consumers, but the alternative, insufficient energy sup-

plies and probably an even more severe energy crisis in the future, as well as continued Arab blackmail, is far less palatable.

At present, the federal government controls approximately 60 per cent of all domestic petroleum production, production which accounts for about 40 per cent of the nation's total consumption. Prices on that 40 per cent of consumption are held artificially and unrealistically low by the federal government's price controls.

There are extremely important conservation aspects of the President's proposal as well. He estimates that the higher prices resulting from his program will curb petroleum consumption by 300,000 barrels a day, and when added to his other conservation measures, that consumption will have been curbed by as much as 900,000 to one million barrels per day.

There is no question that energy consumption must be curbed. The only question concerns the manner by which to curb consumption, one which seeks to insure the exploration for and development of new energy sources, or one that would insure the nation's continued reliance on foreign imports.

The President's proposal would do the former, while the Dingell bill would do the latter. Clearly, the President's proposal is infinitely more preferable and less dangerous.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLAIR W. BURGENER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 22, 1975

Mr. BURGENER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on the floor today when the vote was taken on House Resolution 605, the Disapproval of the President's Order on Oil Decontrol.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay".

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 23, 1975*

(Legislative day of Monday, July 21, 1975)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name.

Keep our values high, our vision clear, our motives pure that with patience and power we may serve this Nation to the honor of Thy name and for the good of all mankind.

We pray in the name of the great Redeemer. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1975.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 22, 1975, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today, except during debate on the Durkin-Wyman issue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter J. P. Curley, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland; and the nomination of Herbert J. Spiro, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Cameroon and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Denis M. Neill, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CHURCH TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders have been recognized under the customary procedure and courtesy that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be recognized tomorrow for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the minority leader yield back time?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

AMENDMENT OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on H.R. 6219, which the clerk will state for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6219) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to extend certain provisions for an additional 10 years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time before the vote be allocated evenly between the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), or his designee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.