

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MY COUNTRY AND THE WORLD

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt from Andrei Sakharov's book "My Country and the World" appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, October 19, 1975.

It describes a situation which plays a major role in splitting American liberals and thus makes it more difficult to put together the moderate-liberal coalition which must be assembled if anyone except a conservative is to be elected President of the United States.

The article follows:

SAKHAROV WARNS THE WEST: LEFTIST FADS ASIDE, THE THREAT IS REAL

(By Andrei Sakharov)

(NOTE.—Selection of Andrei D. Sakharov as winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize was announced this month. Sakharov, a physicist who helped the Soviet Union develop the H-bomb, began to speak out independently to his nation and the world in 1957 with pleas for a halt to nuclear testing because of radioactive fallout.

(After nearly a decade he shifted from scientific topics to political and social matters, especially criticizing repression in the Soviet Union and pleading for rapprochement between East and West. Despite the boldness of his internationally publicized views, his fame and honors helped him remain immune from official Soviet criticism until 1973. Since then he, his family and friends have been under constant harassment.

(This article is excerpted from his latest book, *My Country and the World*, published last week by Alfred A. Knopf. Translation by Guy V. Daniels. 1975 by Alfred A. Knopf Inc.)

In recent years I have had occasion, for the first time, to meet people from the West—to verify and supplement my vicarious impressions of that world, which in so many respects forms a contrast with ours but which, in what is deepest and most important, is humanly understandable.

My attitude toward the foreign intelligentsia—toward the people I have come to know personally—is compounded of a deep liking, hope, and a respect bordering almost upon envy. In the best people from the West I see—and value very highly—an inner freedom, a readiness to debate combined with complete respect for the opinions of others, an absence of national prejudices, a realistic and practical cast of mind, and a readiness to undertake good works.

And yet in my opinion there is one characteristic common to many Western intellectuals that is somewhat disturbing. I refer to what I have called, in my own mind, "leftist-liberal faddishness." In a naive form it is partially illustrated by a reply made by one American in a conversation with an emigrant from the USSR: "Well, all right. There are lots of things in Russia that you don't like. You were mistreated there. I can understand that. But I imagine you don't have any prejudices against China. Aren't you happy with what's going on there now?"

If my analysis and opinions are mistaken, I hope my friends in the West will forgive my lack of information. But if I have hit the mark even partially, then I believe they should take serious note.

I have no doubts as to the altruism and humanity of most of the Western liberal intellectuals—as to their hopes for the welfare of all people, for equal justice for all. But I fear that such things as a lack of information or the opportunity to analyze it critically, faddishness (which is all-powerful in the West), the fear of seeming old-fashioned (especially to one's own children, as many frankly admit), a lack of imagination where the factor of distance is involved, and an inadequate notion of the tragic complexity of real life (in particular, life in the socialist countries)—that these things may lead, and are already leading, to dangerous mistakes both in the intra-political life of the Western countries and in evaluating the difficult questions of international relations. Distance can cause one to have doubts about the strange and frightful things that one has learned only from books and stories.

(My wife's mother, who spent many years in Stalin's labor camps as a ChSIR (member of a traitor's family), has a close relative who lives in France (and who, incidentally, is a member of the French Communist party). He once tried to find out from her whether there was a particle of truth in what Solzhenitsyn had written. She could only laugh bitterly.)

The liberal intellectuals of the West undoubtedly have good reasons for being dissatisfied with many aspects of their society. In hundreds of newspapers they read of acts of violence and cruelty, of social and racial discrimination, of the horrors of famine in the under-developed countries, and the terrors of war. They not only read these reports but see them with their own eyes, since there is no problem about traveling through their own country, or obtaining visas for Africa or Latin America.

People in the West enjoy a plethora of accessible information, an abundance of different ideas, and the coexistence of competing political groups. Some of these groups pursue very private interests, but all of them profess some brand of politics. In the West, political activity—the circulation and promotion of social ideas—becomes a profession just as easily as any other kind of activity, and is associated with the material interests of groups and individuals.

As is the case with us, many Westerners find themselves unable on their own to evaluate critically the flood of facts, opinions and ideas that pours down upon them; and faddishness with all its irrational laws comes to the fore. Often it is not the more logical ideas that take precedence but ephemeral notions that are more extravagant and easier to grasp.

"Left-wing faddishness," it seems to me, is now dominant in the West and has achieved that position through the complex interplay of various factors. Two of these are the eternal hankering of youth after the most radical changes and the fear of the more experienced and cautious representatives of the older generation that they may lag behind their own children. In the West, as everywhere else, there exist complex social problems that cannot be solved immediately, within the framework of the existing system. But radical solutions, with their persuasive, surface simplicity, create the illusion that those problems can be quickly solved.

Another important factor in the dominance of leftist faddishness is the fact that over a period of decades the Western world of free competition among ideas has constantly been fed by a small stream of pro-Soviet or pro-Chinese propaganda in which various, basically sound socialist ideas are tentatively mixed with half-truths and out-and-out lies. This factor is perhaps not terribly important. But it, too, exerts a

force; and in many ways it is rather effectively strengthened by the direct and indirect support of certain writers and politicians.

Such, it seems to me, is the soil that has given rise to the dominant stereotype of the leftist liberal intellectual of the West, with all his illusions and mistakes. Basically, however, the majority of such people have an outlook that is high-minded and humane, have real grounds for dissatisfaction with their society and feel good will and an aspiration toward justice and the common weal. And this permits me to hope that in the final analysis the Western intellectual won't let the rest of us down. Totalitarianism, fascism of whatever brand, demagogues, and intriguing politicians—these things are not, I trust, for the likes of him.

With respect to his own country, the Western liberal intellectual supports the full measure of civil liberties and economic and social reforms of the socialist type. These aspirations are in fact in the spirit of the times; and if they are realized cautiously, they will probably promote justice, happiness and the flourishing of society, and help to eliminate rough spots and societal defects.

It is not by chance that I emphasize caution. I am deeply convinced that the thoughtless, frivolous pursuit of leftist-liberal faddishness is fraught with great dangers. On the international level, one danger is the loss of Western unity and of a clear understanding of the ever-constant global threat posed by the totalitarian nations. The West must not under any circumstances allow the weakening of its stand against totalitarianism. There is an internal danger for each country of slipping into state-capitalist totalitarianism. These two threats are of course closely related. And the growth of leftist ideas must not lead to a weakening of the international defense of human rights throughout the world, with the same standards for the Englishman, the Frenchman, the black from the Republic of South Africa, the Crimean Tatar, the Russian, the Ukrainian, the Italian, and the Vietnamese.

In comparison with these problems, many of the day-to-day matters that are disturbing the ordinary man in the West are of slight significance. If he, his children, or his grandchildren ever live under a system even remotely resembling ours or the Chinese, they will understand—it isn't too late.

The late Arkady Belinkov, [a Soviet literary critic and former political prisoner who defected to the U.S. and has since died] who was received with so much coolness and distrust in the West, once wrote: "Socialism is the kind of thing it's easy to sample but hard to spit out." And indeed, by virtue of its inherent qualities of immanent stability, and the inertia of fear and passivity, totalitarian socialism (which may be called "pseudosocialism") is a kind of historical dead end from which it is troublesome to escape.

Certain Westerners have expressed the opinion that the failures and calamities in the USSR and the other Eastern socialist nations are due to the fact that these are "benighted Asian countries" without democratic traditions and without any history of respect for the rights of the individual. For these nations—for the Russians, the Chinese, the Vietnamese—everything that takes place (terrorism, muddling, dirt in the maternity home, violations of freedoms—I am intentionally citing disparate things) is allegedly customary and even "progressive," since those people have such a strange way of taking a step forward. But, it is alleged, the West, with its democratic traditions, will rise in one upward swoop to the higher level of "socialism with a human face"—humane and

effective. In particular, such arguments are, I gather, widespread among the Western Communists—especially among the intellectuals and leaders. But for the rank-and-file Communists they employ the simpler methods of distorting and concealing the truth about the lands of victorious socialism.

These typically leftist-liberal arguments (I call them "inverted Slavophilism") are in no way justified by historical experience. To me they represent a dangerous illusion and an immoral use, perhaps in order to appease consciences, of different yardsticks for "our people" and "other people."

Heretofore socialism has always meant a one-party system, power in the hands of a grasping and incompetent bureaucracy, the expropriation of all private property, terrorism on the part of the Cheka or its counterparts, the destruction of productive forces, with their subsequent restoration and expansion at the cost of countless sacrifices by the people, and violence done to free consciences and convictions. So it has been in the USSR, in the people's democracies, in the People's Republic of China, and in Cuba. (The example of Yugoslavia, the nation most independent of Soviet guardianship and the freest and most open of the socialist countries, is especially significant.)

Is all this inevitable? I believe that in principle "socialism with a human face" is possible, and represents a high form of social organization. But it is possible only as a result of extraordinary collective efforts, plus wisdom and selflessness exercised by a great part of the people—something uniformly difficult to achieve for any country, requiring especially favorable domestic and foreign conditions. The total nationalization of all means of production, the one-party system, and the repression of honest convictions—all must be avoided or totalitarianism will prevail.

I would also assume that the totalitarian states stand at an especially great distance from this ideal, that they are farther from it than capitalist states of the West. In 1968, the world witnessed an attempt by the Czechoslovak Communists, supported by the Czech people—especially the intelligentsia and the working class—to purge totalitarian socialism of its monstrosities (it was there that the phrase "socialism with a human face" came into use) and, at the same time, to rid the country of the USSR's humiliating and dangerous guardianship. This attempt achieved certain successes, and elicited admiration throughout the world. But it was precisely the successes that made the USSR, East Germany and Poland fear them as dangerous examples, and that served as the reason for the shameful intervention. Totalitarianism defended itself with tanks, but in so doing it compromised socialist ideas in the eyes of millions of people for a long time.

The dangers of totalitarianism associated with the socialist, so-called progressive path of development—especially in the specifically modern setting of a divided world—have been repeatedly and glaringly evident in recent times.

As I write, [in the summer of 1975] the world is watching Portugal, where the mechanics of falling into totalitarianism are in operation.

The manifestations of the leftist position in international relations are no less serious. The illusions commonly entertained by the leftist-liberal intelligentsia as to the nature of society in the USSR and the other socialist countries, as to real domestic and geopolitical aims of the ruling circles in those countries, make it difficult to evaluate the true significance of detente. And sometimes governments of the Western countries are prompted to take false and dangerous positions—to grant unilateral concessions and "gifts" in the course of detente. In the Western nations, the majority opinion has a direct in-

fluence on the practical actions of political leaders, who (so it seems to me, looking at them from here) usually pay heed to their constituents, the press and public opinion.

In particular, the leftist intellectuals are urging their governments toward unilateral disarmament. But such disarmament could lead to a disturbance of the international equilibrium—to weakening the Western position vis-a-vis the totalitarian threat—and could induce stepped-up expansion by the socialist nations, especially in the strategically important focal points of the Third World; e.g., the Indian Ocean.

The domestic socioeconomic problems of the Western countries should be solved by mobilizing resources and by means of temporary economic belt-tightening—not at the cost of weakening their stand toward the threat. Balanced disarmament is extremely important; but this result cannot be achieved from a position of weakness.

Also important is the political and economic unification of the Western countries, as in the Common Market (of course not by opposing the United States, the leader of the Western world, but in close cooperation with it). I experienced a feeling of relief at the outcome of the 1975 Common Market referendum in Britain, and of Greece's impending adherence to the Council of Europe. In these situations, the immediate economic aspect of the problem must be relegated to a secondary status. It is most important to oppose expansion by the totalitarian countries. So far, the leftist, "progressive" forces have not taken a clear-cut position in all these matters.

The "leftist" mistakes in Vietnam have been repeated in other cases as well. The leftist-liberal intellectuals are often ready to support and defend extremist and even terrorist groups in their own countries and throughout the world, if these groups are using a leftist mask, while at the same time the intellectuals are ready to condemn harshly those who do not make common cause with them for being conservative and reactionary. This viewpoint is a tremendous danger for mankind.

The leftists usually accept too trustingly the dogma of the advantages of the socialist system, and avoid listening to anything that contradicts it. Reports of current social and economic difficulties and the political, ethnic and religious persecutions that are taking place today are often regarded by such intellectuals as exaggerated and artificially selective.

But even in the most hideous years of Stalin's terrorism, when the fog of misinformation and pro-Soviet propaganda was especially thick, there were honest and brave individuals in the West who realized the truth and managed to speak it. Today the situation has changed in many respects; the fog has begun to lift.

Individual actions taken in socialist countries have played a special role in leading to important psychological shifts. Each deed of this kind is pursued at a high price. In some cases a person involved may suffer repression; in other situations there may be long-term consequences for the cause he has espoused, for his friends, his children, or his close relatives.

I would hope that my book will be heeded. I am hoping, in particular, that members of the Western intelligentsia will more vigorously defend human rights in our nation and the other socialist nations.

In 1974 international support saved the Panovs. Unquestionably, the public statement by Prime Minister Harold Wilson played a decisive role, bringing the protests up into those high quarters not usually reached by noise from the street. The same thing is possible in other cases. The story of the Panovs confirms that only the strongest pressure—the kind to which the Soviet au-

thorities are most vulnerable—has any chance of success. Only pressure can compel those officials who are not entitled to deviate from their instructions to request further instructions from the higher leadership, which is sometimes capable of reacting in an unconventional way.

NEW YORK CITY PENSIONS AND ITS FISCAL CRISIS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, with New York City perilously close to collapse, it is important that every available bit of information to help the Congress analyze the situation and make decisions on the form of aid, if any, Federal action should take.

Of course, not only as a New Yorker, but a concerned national legislator, I believe it is imperative that the Federal Government intercede to prevent the collapse of New York City's finances. New York City has suffered enough as a result of its post indiscretions. Now our concern must be directed to the effect of a default by New York City on the municipal bond market and on the economy of the country as a whole.

As part of a continuing effort to lay out all the information possible on this problem, I am including at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues an article from the September 29, 1975, edition of Money Manager dealing with the New York City pension systems:

NEW YORK CITY RETIREMENT WELL IS RAPIDLY RUNNING DRY

(By Gordon Platt)

New York City is rapidly running out of money to meet its pension costs. Whether its pension system already is broke, or only going broke, is a matter of philosophy. It can't be established as a matter of fact because the City, already strapped over a barrel, doesn't have the money to pay its actuaries to find out. But documents obtained by "The Money Manager" show that the City's pension liabilities already have well surpassed the assets in its retirement system, and in 10 years or less there may be no money on hand to meet any of the costs of benefits for workers then eligible to retire.

This doesn't mean that pensioners won't continue to receive their monthly checks from the City, at least for a while. The situation is somewhat analogous to that of a bank. So long as everyone doesn't ask for the money at the same time, there is no immediate crisis.

The problem for the City is that more and more people are asking for their money now. Ironically, the City's efforts to curtail operating expenses through a freeze on salaries have put an increased strain on the pension system. The rate of retirement has skyrocketed because it no longer pays for City workers to stay on the job in hopes of a raise which would increase the level of their benefits for life.

Rates of retirement and resignation also were transformed significantly by the liberalized benefits enacted in 1968, as well as by the Sanitation Department's 20-year plan enacted in 1967. In that same year, the transit workers bargained for a half-pay pension plan beginning at age 50. Because esti-

mates of the number of employees who would retire at earlier ages were based on experience from 1908 to 1914, the cost of the new benefits turned out to be nearly 40% higher than expected.

Once the City grants improved benefits, it is unable to rescind them because of the guaranteed benefits in Article V of the State Constitution which says they may not "be diminished or impaired."

In a report to the Governor and the Legislature released last March, the State's permanent Commission on Public Employee Pension and Retirement Systems, known as the Kinzel Commission, warned that the financial soundness of the City's pension system "is in jeopardy unless corrective action is taken immediately." It said the deterioration of the systems has been so great as to raise a question of a possible violation of the guarantee against "impairment" in the State Constitution.

"The Money Manager" has obtained a copy of a letter sent to the Board of Trustees of the Employees' Retirement System by the City's Chief Actuary, Jonathan Schwartz, in response to the Kinzel Commission's report. The letter reveals the following:

As of June 30, 1973, the assets of the New York City Employees' Retirement System available to fund benefits for active members amounted to roughly 45% of the liabilities for service rendered in the past by members then eligible to retire.

As a result of the many retirements processed since Jan. 1, 1974, and the special 1974 legislation which allowed the City to take some \$190 million as "excess interest credits" against its contributions to the system, these assets did not likely exceed 25% of past-service liabilities of eligible retirees as of June 30, 1975.

Assuming no dramatic increase in the rate of retirement, "the most likely prognosis" after June 30, 1975, with respect to these assets "is a slow erosion (two to three percentage points annually) with available assets being dissipated some 10 years from now."

Mr. Schwartz concluded that "the only course of action to forestall this anticipated erosion would appear to be a strengthening of the actuarial assumptions, preferably within the next year or two." He added, "I recognize that this is not the optimum time to propose still another strain upon the City's resources, but there appears to be no other choice."

In an interview with "The Money Manager," Mr. Schwartz estimated that by increasing its pension contributions by about \$300 million a year, the City could get four of its five major pension systems on what he considers a sound financial footing in a matter of 15 or 20 years.

The Accounting Principles Board in its Opinion Number 8 has set forth the following four levels of funding for a retirement system:

(1) A retirement system should have sufficient assets on hand to guarantee benefits for life to its retirees.

(2) In addition, a retirement system should have on hand assets equal to its liability on account of service rendered in the past by active members currently eligible to retire and begin drawing a retirement allowance.

(3) In addition to the assets referred to under (1) and (2), a retirement system should have on hand assets equal to its liability on account of service rendered in the past by active members who have a vested right to retirement benefits, but are not yet eligible to retire.

(4) In addition to the assets referred to under (1), (2), and (3), a retirement system should have on hand assets equal to its liability on account of service rendered in the past by active members who neither have a vested right to a benefit nor are eligible to retire.

Mr. Schwartz said that he would consider the City's pension systems to be on sound footing if they could meet the first two requirements. The Kinzel Commission's report noted that "adherence to the full funding principle is of special importance in a public plan, since it assures that government will fully recognize and meet the current costs of pension benefits, and that such costs will not unfairly be shifted to future taxpayers."

While an infusion of another \$300 million a year might be adequate to gradually fund the other systems, the Fire Department Pension Fund presents a special problem. In 1951, the City's Administrative Code was amended to provide that the City would make annual contributions to the fund at three times the rate made by City firemen. When these payments proved to be insufficient to cover promised benefits due to obsolete actuarial assumptions, an impasse developed over who will pay for the increased costs. Therefore, the deficit continues to mount, and nobody is paying the increase.

"It has been estimated," the Kinzel Commission said, "that contribution rates for both members and the City would have to be raised by approximately 80% in order to eliminate the accumulated deficit over the average working lifetime of the current employees."

Meanwhile, accidental disability awards, which provide a retirement benefit of 75% of pay, presently are running at least six times the assumed rate for City policemen, and at more than nine times assumed rate for City firemen. Noting that the rate of accidental disability awards for City policemen and firemen is many times the rate for police and firemen in the Statewide system, the Kinzel Commission said, "The only explanation for the rather drastic difference is that the boards of the New York City systems are granting the higher 'accidental' disability award without requiring any proof that the alleged injury or disability resulted from an accident."

Putting aside these special problems, the first step in getting the system back on sound financial ground would be a full-scale updating of obsolete actuarial tables. The tables in current use, which determine how much the City must contribute to the funds, were prepared for a 1914 to 1918 Commission on Pensions from the City's records of experience from 1908 to 1914. None of the systems have made more than token changes in the official actuarial assumptions adopted when the systems were begun.

The Retirement Boards, which include City representatives, have had no incentive to authorize the preparation of new tables because they would most certainly result in higher contribution rates. In addition, the City doesn't have the money to pay for the substantial enlargement of staff and facilities which the Actuary would need to complete the task.

"I am already understaffed and overworked," Chief Actuary Schwartz said. He noted that his staff has been cut, mostly through attrition, from 48 to 31 since July 1 of last year.

But the City's teachers, alarmed by the Kinzel Commission's report and the continuing financial crisis, have put increasing pressure on their Retirement Board to update the actuarial tables. "It is self-evident that the tables should conform with reality, and we feel that it should be done," Bernard Goldberg, chairman of the Pension Committee of the United Federation of Teachers, said.

At its last meeting on Sept. 18, the Board of Trustees of the New York City Teachers' Retirement Fund contemplated changes in the tables, according to Wallace Sullivan, executive director of the fund. A decision was made to consider changes in the mortality tables when the Board next meets on Oct. 16, he added.

"Extensive studies would take months and months of work," he said, "so we decided to adopt a piecemeal approach." The Board will consider making use of a recent, standard industry-wide table, known as the 1971 Group Annuity Mortality Table.

The Kinzel Commission found that "experience indicates that the City systems have consistently overestimated the death rate for regular service pensioners and their beneficiaries, disability pensioners, and active employees, thereby underestimating the total number of persons who will be alive and drawing benefits at various ages."

Mr. Schwartz said in his letter to the trustees of the City Retirement System that "In general, when a particular set of actuarial assumptions is no longer a proper basis for projecting the benefit payments due from a retirement system, it is advisable to re-examine all of the assumptions, and not merely change some of the assumptions on a piecemeal basis."

But Mr. Sullivan of the Teachers' Fund said, "No manna is going to drop from heaven, so we have to do the best we can with the staff we have." He said he sympathized with the staff shortage in the Actuary's Office and added that the Teachers' Retirement System itself has a 33% job vacancy rate.

In speaking of the City's retirement systems in general, the Kinzel Commission said, "It is ironic that the failure to adopt realistic assumptions in and of itself assures that higher and higher contribution rates will be required—even if benefits are not increased."

"The situation is somewhat equivalent to a business," it said, "which, being in financial trouble solves its problem by purposefully understating its operating costs for the year. . . . The unpaid costs for previous years, when added to the additional costs for the current year, result in a sharply increasing debt as each year passes."

"Each year's delay in eliminating the cause of the problem merely postpones the inevitable fiscal calamity which must ensue. New York City has now delayed in its solution for over a decade," it added.

The Chief Actuary replied in his letter that "It is only recently that sufficient data have become available to serve as a basis for formulating reasonable projections of future experience." He added that "while it is true that the assumptions underlying the actuarial valuations are in need of change, the fact that they have not been changed until now should be attributed to neither malfeasance by the Board nor to the Actuary having been intimidated, but rather to the prior unavailability of essential data."

The director of the Teachers' Fund said there are "self-rectifying and offsetting errors" in all of the tables. But it is generally agreed that an updating would result in higher contribution requirements. None of the four major retirement boards has shown any interest or intention of making even piecemeal changes in the tables.

Where the money would come from to meet increased contributions is problematic. Some pension sources say the only solution would be a Constitutional amendment which allows the City to cut back on some of its pension promises. They say it is obvious that the City has been too generous in the past. Its annual spending on retirement and Social Security programs alone is larger than any other American city's annual outlays for all wages and salaries.

Because an increasing share of the pension burden has been assumed by the City, most of its employees now make only token contributions to the systems. But with wage freezes and layoffs it would be politically infeasible to ask the workers to foot a larger share of the bill. They would probably prefer a cut in benefits, one pension official said.

A study of the City's pension programs released earlier this year by the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University concluded, "The budgetary implications of retirement costs will continue to be substantial for many years to come. And if New York City's current budgetary crisis is soon to be resolved, the solution is not likely to be found in the realm of retirement costs economies."

But the City's pension funds have helped out in the crisis by making substantial purchases of Municipal Assistance Corp. bonds. This practice has been criticized by some pension officials who claim that the funds are being asked to take on the risk of these investments without being able to benefit fully from the rewards. The tax-exempt status of the bonds is of no benefit to the funds.

The purchase of MAC bonds by the City retirement systems "is the strongest argument there is for the extension of the provisions of last year's pension reform legislation to public funds," John F. Thompson, executive director of the Wiesenberger Pension Executives Institute told a recent meeting of the group. He said there is no justification for the investment if pension money in "such highly speculative instruments."

Although the bonds carry high coupons offering income comparable to recent issues of taxable bonds, the return in excess of 4% a year could be used by the City to reduce its contributions to the pension systems through "excess" interest deductions. Thus, the funds would not benefit from the high returns, pension officials said.

The Kinzel Commission described such "excess" interest deductions as "fiscal gimmicks" and "improper from an actuarial viewpoint." In what came to be known as "The Great Interest Rate Grab," the City was able to reduce its 1974-75 contributions to its retirement systems by approximately \$261 million through an expansion of the "excess" interest deduction to three years from one.

Such practices will eventually catch up with the City, and even if it is able to extricate itself successfully from its current fiscal bind some way will have to be found in the near future to fill the widening gap between pension assets and liabilities. Otherwise, there may be a lot of broken promises.

A NOTE ON WHEAT AND THE SOVIET ARMED FORCES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the President has just announced a new long-term wheat deal with the Soviet Union. I deplore this for the sake of the American consumer. If we are to feed foreign countries, there are many more deserving than the Soviet Union, our avowed enemy. Further, there is a military risk in these arrangements, which have just been debated as to whether they favor the farmer or the consumer. There is the military factor. The Soviet Union needs huge grain reserves for wartime use. This is an element in their defense planning. Mrs. Harriet Fast Scott has recently described this factor very well in a recent article which appeared in *Strategic Review*, fall 1975. This publication is published by

the U.S. Strategic Institute of Washington, D.C., and the article, which follows, raises a serious question which all of us serving here in the Congress should take into account.

The article follows:

A NOTE ON WHEAT AND THE SOVIET ARMED FORCES

(By Harriet Fast Scott)

There is a great deal of speculative thought in the United States about selling wheat and other grain to the Soviet Union. Few, however, consider the Soviet point of view.

General of the Army Yevdokim Yegorovich Mal'tsev, Commandant of the Lenin Military-Political Academy in Moscow, explains the Soviet need for wheat in a recent book, *The CPSU—the Organizer of the Defense of the Socialist Fatherland*, issued by the Military Publishing House, which appeared in Moscow bookstores in 1974. General Mal'tsev explains:

Modern war makes great demands for supplying industry with raw materials, for supplying the army and the population with foodstuffs and other material means. "The Red Army," wrote V. I. Lenin, "cannot be strong without great state reserves of wheat because without this the army cannot be moved about freely, nor trained as it should be. Without this one cannot maintain the workers who work for the army." Agriculture in many ways determines the development of branches of industry, including defense.

In the 1930s, according to General Mal'tsev, "it was impossible to build socialism and strengthen the defense might of the country without a radical break-up of the small-farmer villages." Forceful collectivization of the peasants was justified. "Right opportunists resisted collectivization in every possible way, scornfully treated the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, concealed the class struggle with the kulaks and underestimated the military danger from international imperialism. All this harmed the socialist buildup and objectively led to a weakening of the defense might of the Soviet states. The Party decisively swept the right opportunists from its path."

General Mal'tsev's book, sent to the printer in August 1973, may have been written to help explain the huge grain purchases from the West. He emphasizes that no change should be considered in the basic structure of Soviet agriculture. "Collectivization had a direct influence on strengthening the defense of the state, in raising the fighting might of the army and navy. . . . And the development of animal husbandry, the increased production of textile materials such as cotton, flax and others permitted the improvements of the supply of materials for the Red Army. It became possible to create the necessary mobilization of reserves."

With the establishment of the kolkhoz structure and the liquidation of the kulaks, Mal'tsev asserts that "the social base and the rear of the Red Army was strengthened." The next step was to provide modern agricultural machinery to the new collective farms. Almost one million mechanics were required to service the new equipment. "This also had great defense significance. The development of agricultural machine building permitted, in case of war, the rapid switchover of plants of this branch to the production of tanks, military prime movers and other combat equipment. Cadres of mechanics became an important reserve of technical knowhow for replenishing the Armed Forces." (Emphasis added.)

Fifty thousand copies of General Mal'tsev's book were published. One can but wonder how many of its readers will remember some

of the actual results of collectivization. Millions of people died as a result. Insofar as food production was concerned, many of the livestock levels of 1928, before forced collectivization, were not again reached until the 1950s or even the 1960s. For example, there were 60.1 million cattle in the Soviet Union in 1928. Four years later the count was 33.5 million. The 60 million mark was not again reached until about 1958, some thirty years later.

General of the Army Mal'tsev is of four-star rank. The Lenin Military-Political Academy, which he heads, comes under the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy. This organization has the rights of a Department under the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Its purpose is to serve as the Party's ideological watchdog over the Soviet Armed Forces. Spokesmen at the Academy take policies that are approved by the Party and place them in a Marxist-Leninist context for study and indoctrination throughout the Soviet Armed Forces.

This expressed requirement of the Soviet Armed Forces for wheat merits careful examination. Many in the United States today feel smug about our grain sales to the Soviet Union, discerning benefit to the U.S. and thinking that this will help convince the Soviet leadership of the superiority of Western systems of production. However, greater attention should be given to the danger of the Soviet Union becoming dependent upon the United States to supply each year their deficits in agriculture. What might happen if, in a year of severe drought, the United States were to refuse to sell grain to the Soviet Union? There is some question how the nations of the world, including the United States, might react should the Arab nations prohibit the sale of oil. Can one rule out the use of force should the Arab nations not make oil available to the industrialized nations? The sale of wheat to the Soviet leadership might be in the same category as the sale of oil is to the West.

Seemingly, the Soviet leadership will not admit that collectivization of agriculture is a failure, insofar as the peacetime production of foodstuffs is concerned. But failure it is! One need but drive between Helsinki, Finland and Moscow to see the difference between agricultural production in a free enterprise system and under the Soviet system of collectivization.

Climate in the Soviet Union generally is harsh, and rainfall often is lacking in those regions where the soil is potentially productive. If one departs from the Intourist circuit, and sees any part of the Soviet Union as it actually is—not the Intourist showplaces—the main reason for the chronic food shortage becomes apparent. Those who live on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes pay great attention to the tiny plots on which they can keep the fruits of their labor. Tens of thousands of acres may suffer from erosion due to failure to plant covering crops, but the few square feet of soil tended by individuals provide a sizable percentage of the total food production of the USSR.

It probably is obvious to some of the Kremlin's leaders that returning the land to the peasants would solve part of their food problem. However, such an act might lead to a loosening of Party control. Even more important, the abandonment of the collectivized system might lessen the ability of the political-military planners to manage completely food outputs in the event of a war.

The Soviet Armed Forces today number between 4.5 and 6 million men—more than double the size of the Armed Forces of the United States. As General Mal'tsev reminds us, as the momentum of Soviet military power steadily increases, "the Red Army

cannot be strong without great reserves of wheat. . . ."

It might be well for Americans to reflect seriously on this military reality so simply stated by this official pronouncement.

NATIONALIZED MEDICINE: A NARCOTIC ADDICTION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Harold Wilson, as if in recognition of the dramatic failure of socialized medicine in Great Britain, has ordered an investigation of the National Health Service.

In creating a royal commission to examine the service, Mr. Wilson acknowledged that the institution might need an overhaul or, at the least, a financial transfusion from a Government that is already under pressure to cut public spending.

Socialized medicine has provided the people of England with impersonal, bureaucratic, and very expensive health care. There are waiting lists at almost all major hospitals and only emergency cases are assured of speedy treatment.

Unfortunately, the illusion that health care is "free" since it is paid for through taxes rather than direct payments, has served as a narcotic, blinding the people of England to what is really taking place.

Dr. Max Gammon, a British doctor who is trying to reinstitute the private practice of medicine within a system which has become completely dominated by the Government, notes that:

After a generation of nationalized medicine virtually everyone—comes to believe that the system "with all its faults" is the only possible one today. There has been a modification of the metabolism of the body politic and economic, and in the individual psyche. This modification can usefully be compared to narcotic addiction in which the drug modifies the total body metabolism and creates an organic dependency.

Concerning the future, Dr. Gammon states:

Is it already too late? It has been said to me regarding my own attempt at creating an independent medical service in Britain, "You cannot un-scramble an egg." I like this analogy. In scrambling an egg you effect a change which destroys any potential it might have had for reproducing life. But there is one good thing about a scrambled egg—it doesn't last for ever. Ours is 27 years old. You can smell it over here (in U.S.A.). I don't think you are going to swallow it. And we are getting ready to throw up.

Anyone who believes that the United States would benefit by having a system of nationalized medicine should carefully consider Dr. Gammon's words.

I wish to share with my colleagues the analysis provided by Dr. Max Gammon at a meeting of the Congress for County Medical Societies held in Gaithersburg, Md., on September 13, 1975, and insert excerpts from his remarks in the RECORD at this time:

EXTRACT FROM A TALK GIVEN BY DR. MAX GAMMON AT THE CONGRESS OF COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES INC.

I am billed to be speaking to you today on "The Irreversibility of Nationalized Medicine". I feel that it is right at the outset for me to say that I believe that few things are ultimately irreversible. I agree with the British philosopher, A. N. Whitehead, who said "This Universe is not only stranger than we think, it is stranger than we can think". It follows therefore that I believe that ultimately nothing is impossible.

Having established my position in relation to the general principle of "irreversibility" I must now say that my own experiences in Britain in attempting to establish a hospital independent of the State have led me to believe that the Nationalization of Medicine if not an irreversible step comes very close to it. Certainly the establishment of a new free enterprise system for the delivery of health care cannot be achieved without a Titanic struggle. As one British politician said to me recently "Such a project is a massive politico/psychological operation". I agree. The magnitude of the difficulty of correction is co-extensive with the magnitude of the disorder.

I would like to consider in detail for a few minutes the changes in the socio/economic infra-structure of a Nation that nationalization of medicine entails and which make de-nationalization or even the establishment of a complementary independent medical service an enterprise of such unrelenting difficulty.

After a generation of Nationalized medicine virtually everyone from the sophisticated politician, the professor of medicine and the custodian of institutional finance to the hospital porter and the patient on the waiting list comes to believe that the system with all its faults" is the only possible one today. There has been a modification of the metabolism of the body politic and economic, and in the individual psyche. This modification can usefully be compared to narcotic addiction in which the drug modifies the total body metabolism and creates an organic dependency. As in narcotic addiction we are dealing with the result of an indiscriminate general use of an agent which may be beneficial in selected cases and in carefully regulated dosage. When the harmful effects are generally recognised I suggest to you in all seriousness that we shall need the political equivalent of a Dangerous Drugs Act to which all political parties subscribe in order to initiate and maintain withdrawal.

I would like now to examine some of the manifestations and mechanisms of the British addiction.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

Shortly after I left the N.H.S. and began work on the development of proposals for St. Michael's Hospital my old professor of medicine, now dead, who was at that time President of one of our Royal Colleges, said to me "Gammon, your hospital is likely to be good for patients and good for staff, but it will be bad for the N.H.S." to which I replied "For whom should we be working for our patients and our staff or for the preservation, unchanged, of the system?" I should say in fairness that this attitude is not universal among the leaders of our profession in Britain. There are courageous and clear-sighted exceptions; they are few but they outstandingly represent the best.

While many first-rate doctors are totally committed to the N.H.S. and much more important to the care of their patients within the system, it must be stated squarely that the second-rate doctor has a vested interest in the preservation of a virtual State monopoly in the delivery of medical care. Once established it ensures that he has no competition and it gives a guarantee of lifelong

security. Moreover the State system does not demand commitment, indeed it discourages it by its rigid bureaucracy.

The attitude of mind among doctors engendered and encouraged by a Nationalized Health Service is well summed up in this quotation from the British Medical Journal of March 22nd, 1975. Referring to a decline in private practice in Britain some 10 years ago a leading article stated that "Private practice remained what it ought to be, an expensive luxury for those for whom time is money and for whom individual attention is worth the cost".

THE PATIENTS

From the foregoing it may come as a surprise when I tell you that it is a well recognized political fact that the N.H.S. is popular with the majority of the public. By a political fact I mean a factor in political calculations and I will return to this a little later. At this stage I would like to say that this particular political fact probably coincides with reality insofar as most people, most of the time, have no contact with the Service.

The N.H.S. is popular because it lifts the burden of personal responsibility for making provision for sickness. And in parallel with the lifting of personal responsibility is the development of the "as of right" mentality. Bearing in mind Sir William Osler's dictum "The desire to take medicine is perhaps the greatest feature that distinguishes man from animals" and leaving aside the question that this raises as to whether or not it is desirable that medicine should be made totally freely available, we have to ask whether it is possible. Not all desirable things are possible. In this connection I am reminded of a cartoon which I keep on my desk in London. It shows a man reading a newspaper with the banner headline "Rail men demand eternal life". Desirable—for some. But I will not today go into the question of feasibility.

It would need Swift to do justice to the ultimate implications of the totally free "as of right" delivery of medical care. Suffice it to say it would require a huge slave force of medical attendants. Indeed, since we cannot know just when disease will strike, each patient ideally should have his own medical "shadow" in constant attendance. Moreover with the advent of transplant surgery, each medical shadow should be accompanied by an "organ-carrier" specifically bred for the purpose. We have not yet attained this ideal situation, but we are working towards it.

CHARITY

Traditionally the care of the sick in Britain other than by members of their own families was undertaken by the Church. Indeed one of the principle undertakings given by Henry VIII prior to the dissolution of the monasteries in the first part of the Sixteenth Century was that he would build hospitals to replace those religious institutions which he proposed to "phase out". In fact only 5 hospitals were built over the next two Centuries and it took Eighteenth Century charitable private enterprise in the shape of voluntary hospitals to remedy the situation. Not for the first and not for the last time the State, having forcibly assumed a cardinal responsibility on behalf of its subjects, found more pressing priorities standing in the way of the fulfillment of its obligations. In Twentieth Century Britain the situation has recurred. The State has claimed virtually exclusive responsibility for the financing and organizing of the delivery of medical care and the rate of new hospital building in Britain since Nationalisation 27 years ago has been about 6 times slower than under the old system in the period of economic depression between the 2 World Wars. No new hospitals were completed in Britain in the first 13 years following Nationalization.

Charitable and Voluntary organizations were actively discouraged. The policy of active discouragement has now been partly revised but the charitable infra-structure has been destroyed and the very concept of charity has become distasteful. Strange thing that in a "Welfare State" that advertises to the world its superiority in the matter of care for others the word "charity" which means "loving giving" should be more repellent than any four-letter expletive.

In this context I would like to deal briefly with a malignant misrepresentation concerning the N.H.S. which has gained wide credence namely that the Nationalized Service represents a continuity with the older charitable service. With the exceptions of the blood donor service and the dedication of many hospital workers there is no element of charity in the N.H.S. I am purposefully excluding donations from big business which represent one hand of the State automation tickling the other. Nationalized medicine is based upon *taking*—taking from the tax-payer by compulsion and taking by the patient "as of right". This has nothing in common with a charitable system which is based on *giving*—the freewill giving and acceptance of gifts. The basis of a charitable system is a natural and unequal distribution of wealth—an irregular landscape of wealth which has now been levelled and concreted over leaving a few monolithic tower blocks in place of hills and hedgerows through which a chap like me could wander gathering a nest-egg here and a nest-egg there to assist in creating a philanthropic institution.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

We turn now to the "tower blocks"—the great Insurance Companies and Pension Funds—the custodians of the wealth of the people which is the ultimate resource of private enterprise. As one senior executive of a leading British Insurance Company said to me a few weeks ago at the end of a grueling meeting in which I and my colleagues had demolished every objection raised by his Company to making an investment in St. Michael's Hospital "You see we are virtually nationalised already, we just wait for instructions". I won't say any more . . .

THE POLITICIANS

The attitude of the majority of politicians who are not actively hostile to the concept of an independently financed and organized Health Service is summed up by a remark made to me by a British Conservative politician concerning the St. Michael's proposals when the Conservative party was last in office, he said "Your proposals would scare the pants off the Electorate. You cannot expect any support from the Government, but you will find that you will not be obstructed". Here we are confronted by the perennial political problem—the conflict between expediency and principle. The dilemma is as old and perhaps older than many himself. It is summed up in the Biblical proverb "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death"—the seemingly expedient can prove to be ultimately fatal. This problem must have confronted the early berry-gathering tribes who had not yet learned to differentiate between edible and poisonous fruits—the fruit of the deadly nightshade so closely resembles that of the wild blackcurrant. Only in this century has science been able to demonstrate why one kills and the other nourishes.

In this context our political science is perhaps shill at the Neanderthal stage. All we can say is that judged by past experience certain seemingly good courses of action are most likely to become ultimately destructive. I suggest to you that the Socialist way epitomised by a Nationalized system of health care is just such a seemingly benign but ultimately fatal course. It is the urgent business of the politician and the political

philosopher to discover and demonstrate the fatal chemistry.

Is it already too late? It has been said to me regarding my own attempt at creating an independent medical service in Britain "You cannot un-scramble an egg". I like this analogy. In scrambling an egg you effect a change which destroys any potential it might have had for reproducing life. But there is one good thing about a scrambled egg—it doesn't last for ever. Ours is 27 years old. You can smell it over here (in U. S. A.). I don't think you are going to swallow it. And we are getting ready to throw up.

MILITARY MORALE PROBLEM

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, last December, Jerome Verdi, a young Air Force sergeant who had been awarded two purple hearts and a bronze star in Vietnam, was court-martialed for failure to meet Air Force haircut standards.

As a result, I began to ask questions of the Air Force and Army in order to ascertain the current thinking of the military bureaucracy as well as our service men and women on haircut regulations.

I was not too surprised by the responses I received from the military bureaucracy. Regulations were being enforced without any concern for their effect on military morale. Nor was there any indication from the military brass that haircut regulations ought to be reviewed—as they have been in the past.

I must confess, however, that I was genuinely surprised by the enormous number of letters and petitions I have received from service men and women—some 8,000 to date. And 99 percent of the writers say loudly and clearly that Air Force and Army hair regulations have caused a serious morale problem.

Specifically, the several thousand service members indicate that military effectiveness and morale are being undermined by outdated, irrelevant regulations which bear no relationship to job performance.

The letters speak for themselves. Compare the bureaucratic nonsense you will receive from the military top brass in response to your inquiries with the commonsense statements set out below from letters I have received from service men and women:

1. "Through my personal observations, hair lengths and beard regulations are outdated, irrelevant to duty performance and a definite detriment to retention of many highly qualified individuals throughout the military." SSgt., U.S. Army, awarded Outstanding Reenlistment NCA for first quarter 1975

2. "It is a sad day for America when a man can receive a federal conviction that may very well ruin his life, for wanting to wear his hair similar to his peer group in the civilian world." Sp/5, U.S. Army, Dental Hygienist, Germany

3. "There must have been at one time a reason for the military's haircut rules but I haven't found it in my 15 plus years with the Air Force." TSgt., U.S. Air Force Thailand

4. "I personally do not agree with the standards imposed by the Air Force and I

feel that the haircut regulations should be greatly liberalized if not completely eliminated. The real problem with the haircut regulations is having to enforce them without good reasons for doing so. The regulation says so' is a poor argument for enforcing rules that don't make sense and from my point of view this kind of logic forces commanders to appear dogmatic and sometimes just plain silly." Major, U.S. Air Force, Ohio.

5. "Each command I have been in has had their own criteria pertaining to how the length of the hair should be and if an individual was not in conformity with the so-called regulation, he was severely jeopardized in that he was put on the Commander's blacklist and any dirty duty that was to be done, the blacklisted individual was called to do it." Sp/5, U.S. Army, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

6. "I submit that the examples given in Air Force Regulation 35-10 more closely resemble wanted posters than young men in America's Air Force." Sgt., U.S. Air Force, Patrick AFB, Florida.

7. "It is no exaggeration to state that hair length was the single most important factor in my decision to resign. The Army's pathological reaction to contemporary civilian grooming standards throughout the country is easily the most damaging factor to military morale among both officer and enlisted personnel." Lt. Col. Doctor (resigned, U.S. Army, after nine years service)

8. "Why is it in the year 1975 men must be forced to wear hair styles of the 1930's and 1940's? Especially when the Army allows women members to wear their hair at virtually any length they choose. Somehow this practice does not seem to coincide with the idea of an equal opportunity Army." PFC, U.S. Army, Texas

9. "As a 45 year old Colonel, I have no youth axe to grind, but I have long thought that the time and effort that goes into writing and enforcing hair rules is largely wasted and unnecessary. It creates useless hassles and contributes nothing positive." Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Michigan

10. "I am also on Battalion Race Relations. The first problem I hear is about haircuts. Why can Blacks wear long hair and whites can't?" Sp/4, U.S. Army, Kansas

11. "I think for our 200th birthday celebration the Air Force should allow its personnel to celebrate by growing longer hair and beards." SSgt., U.S. Air Force, George AFB California

12. "I do not agree with Air Force grooming standards, especially the 'Adolph Hitler' moustache style. I love the Air Force but I cannot see why grooming standards couldn't be a little more up to date." Major, U.S. Air Force, Texas

BAN HANDGUNS

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an excerpt from a letter I have received from one of my constituents about gun control. Mrs. Josie Cohen asks how long Congress will delay on legislation to ban handguns. What answer can the Congress give? The text of the letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLTZMAN: The murder of a 19 year old Rabbinical student David Krausz at a camp in the Catskills is yet another tragedy which cries out against the sale of handguns to the public. Four hoodlums terrorized a boys' camp and had a free

hand to kill a random victim before the police arrived 1½ hours after they had been called, after murder had already been committed. How many more innocent victims are to be gunned down by murderers with guns! The boys in that camp were absolutely unable to protect themselves. You must speak of this tragedy on the floor of the House. The innocent blood of David Krausz cries out for justice. How long will Congress wait before the blood of all those killed so tragically and unnecessarily pours through your halls. A ban must be made as soon as possible with strong enforcement.

Mrs. JEFFREY COHEN.

REPORT ON VISIT TO MAINLAND CHINA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a month ago I issued a preliminary report on my observations on my trip to the People's Republic of China, which was made as a member of the congressional delegation headed by Representative JOHN ANDERSON, Republican of Illinois, and which also included Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat of West Virginia, Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, Republican of Kansas, Senator SAM NUNN, Democrat of Georgia, and Representative JOHN SLACK, Democrat of West Virginia. We were in mainland China from August 20 through August 29.

We have decided that each Member would write his own report rather than for us to sit down and negotiate a joint report which would be a bland version of six individual views.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a revised edition of my preliminary report which is the official one I am making as a member of this congressional delegation to China:

REPORT ON VISIT TO MAINLAND CHINA BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

My personal view is that the visit of our group to Communist China was educational, somewhat intriguing and certainly challenging, due to the difficulty in objectively analyzing a country as different from ours as the People's Republic of China. One cannot say enough for the great courtesy and efficiency of our hosts.

For many reasons not entirely understandable to me, the American people have been treated to a series of reports about current policies in the so-called "New China" by a number of impressionable observers from the United States over the last few years. Not all, but certainly a substantial number of prominent Americans who like to be identified as "liberals" have returned with glowing reports of the progress made by the Peking regime. They tell us that the "New China" is a "great experiment for all mankind" and a nation where hundreds of millions work happily and enthusiastically to build a "New Order."

We had a very carefully controlled schedule with visits to model factories, model communes, model workers' apartments—which I personally feel utilized the "Potemkin village" strategy.

We were permitted limited but carefully

arranged conversations with selected factory and commune workers who, I believe, were well coached in advance of our visit. No matter what questions we asked, we were basically given the standard line of "Inspired by the teachings of Chairman Mao" with which the entire society has been brainwashed. It is, of course, impossible for an outsider to say to what extent any individual Chinese actually believes the official line.

At the official level, there was a similar lack of genuine communication. I felt we had reasonably frank discussions with Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing and Foreign Minister Chiao Kuan-hua; except for these two top Cabinet Ministers, however, no official would seriously discuss policy (other than to parrot the latest version of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism).

I came away from these talks with ranking members of their government with one overriding impression: the Chinese leaders are preoccupied with a feeling of bitterness and distrust toward the Soviet Union. There were frequent references to the large number of Russian troops along the borders of China and Mongolia; it is well known that the Chinese are building massive air raid shelters in and near all their large cities. We were told of Communist China's concern about events in Portugal and about the dubious value of the Helsinki accords. They put practically no stress on their official desire to see American troops pull out of South Korea, the Philippines, Japan or Diego Garcia, feeling that this is a necessary counterbalance to the Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean. It is obvious that the Peking regime is actually pleased to have U.S. forces in the Pacific area as a possible counterweight to the Soviet Union.

No were told often of China's wish to improve relations with the United States and of the good will of the Chinese people toward our people. The great accomplishments of the Communist government were emphasized. As far as I could see (and from what other observers report), the Chinese government does seem to be taking care of the basic food, clothing and housing needs of the people. Meeting minimum standards, especially in a country as rich in resources as China, however, is certainly not an amazing accomplishment for a modern government.

There is little doubt that the average Chinese is better off than he was in 1949 (after decades of civil wars and foreign invasions). The important point to ask, however, is whether or not the mainland Chinese would have a better life today under a free and democratic government. There is, in fact, no comparison between the economies of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China (Taiwan). As recently as May, I visited the Republic of China and can thus make some comparisons. Although Taiwan has far fewer people and much less in the way of material resources, its annual GNP is now about \$700 per capita, while the per capita GNP of the mainland is only about \$240. The rice output per acre is 50 percent higher on Taiwan than on the mainland. The Chinese on Taiwan have made their small country the second wealthiest in East Asia, after Japan, on a per capita basis. They have built up a large and growing international trade; if present trends continue, Taiwan will be our seventh largest trading partner in 1976, ranking just behind France and Italy.

The Chinese on Taiwan are the same people that inhabit the mainland; the main difference is that they live in a country with a generally democratic framework which allows them to plan their own lives and to keep most of the rewards of their work. Despite the fact that 80 percent of the mainland Chinese are farmers, China had to import large quantities of food last year. The failures of Communist agriculture in Russia, mainland

China and many other Communist countries are so notorious that there is a standard joke to the effect that Communism will immediately collapse as soon as it takes over the entire world because there will then be no country left to sell them food.

Even more important than the vast material differences between the two Chinas, however, is the all-important fact that there is no freedom of thought or expression under the Peking regime. Communist China in one sense can be pictured as a vast prison, with every aspect of human life controlled by an autocratic government—so far as is humanly possible. Even those Western visitors who have returned to praise China admit that they themselves would not want to live there.

Personally, I see no reason for the United States to grant formal diplomatic recognition to the People's Republic of China. While we should continue communications with them, to formally recognize their regime would be in conflict with our moral responsibility and inconsistent with our traditional policy. China has been uncooperative in easing tensions between the two Koreas; not at all helpful in gathering evidence on MIA's in Indochina; still openly advocates support of revolutionary movements.

In my opinion, there is only a limited potential for increased trade between the People's Republic of China and the United States. They do not want consumer goods from us—they need sophisticated technological products. In 1974, the United States exported about \$800 million worth of goods to the mainland (mostly agricultural products), and we imported only about \$100 million of Chinese goods. In 1975, their purchases were substantially less since they did not find it necessary to import the same volume of agricultural products.

By contrast, our trade with Taiwan is roughly four times that of our trade with the mainland. The immediate prospects for trade with the mainland are, in fact, stagnating. While concentrating on building up its agricultural base, the Chinese leaders have also chosen to regiment their people to build a powerful heavy industry and war material sector. They are open in acknowledging that it is not their policy at this time to give any priority to improving the standard of living of their people.

It is apparent that Chinese government officials can completely ignore any pressure from their peoples for making more consumer goods available since there isn't any opposition or even free speech within the country. They have absolute control of all the peoples in the country, including the so-called minorities, the non-Chinese national groups that are scattered throughout the country but are also concentrated in Sinkiang and Mongolia. The government authorities are hard at work eradicating the traditions and beliefs of the non-Chinese ethnic groups, superimposing Maoist dogma upon them. Without the need to bend to public opinion, decisions in government are obviously easy to make, and when wrapped in the aura of the teachings of Mao, total national compliance is clearly possible.

This also means that legitimate people-to-people programs between the People's Republic of China and the United States are not practical or feasible. Obviously, government-to-government relations become the major source of communication and contact.

To sum up, the United States-People's Republic of China relations are unique. There are certain logical reasons why this uniqueness can and will be tolerated by both nations. The tremendous Chinese preoccupation with the threat posed by the Soviet Union makes it necessary for them to maintain reasonable relations with the United States. We, in turn, ought to be satisfied with the plateau of trade that has been reached

and the lines of communication that are being maintained. However, we should be under no illusions that the deeprooted differences of opinion that exist can be resolved, and we should be under no illusions that China is a superpower. Since they vehemently deny that designation, our foreign policy must recognize that reality.

I believe very strongly that we must keep in mind that close to 900 million people are living under a totally regimented society, subject to as intense and effective political propaganda as any government ever directed toward its people. Given our economic principles, the inspiration and ideals of the American way of life, our very legitimate role in world affairs since the turn of the century, we must be constantly aware of the fundamental differences between our system and that of the Communist rulers of the People's Republic of China. Since the Chinese Communists feel that the U.S. is wrong in pursuing détente with the Soviet Union, we should be equally careful in pursuing the Chinese equivalent of détente with the rulers in Peking.

CHAMPUS CUTBACKS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the CHAMPUS cutback issue is under re-examination in the Senate as the Appropriations Committee considers the Defense Appropriations bill, H.R. 9861.

On October 14, 1975, the National Association of Mental Health (NAMH) joined the case of the American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors v. James R. Schlesinger. This suit seeks a permanent injunction against Department of Defense actions which eliminated counseling services—under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services—CHAMPUS.

The National Association of Mental Health has participated in a number of important cases concerning the rights of people needing mental health care, including the landmark "right to treatment" case of Wyatt versus Stickney. The NAMH joined this suit because of the profound implications of the case for mental health consumers in the armed services and their dependents.

In its brief the NAMH argues that arbitrary limitation of such counseling to psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and psychiatric social workers would violate both congressional intent in creating CHAMPUS and public policy.

On February 28, 1975, without any change in the governing legislation, the Military Medical Benefit Act and the Dependent Medical Care Act, as amended, in 1966, CHAMPUS suddenly announced that "the services of pastoral, marriage, family, and child counselors" were no longer to be included in reimbursable benefits in order "to enhance—management and conserve appropriations."

Despite DOD protests to the contrary, this action is not a cost-saving measure.

By forcing members of the military to seek more expensive forms of treatment, CHAMPUS costs would increase.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. District Court ruled against the Department of Defense in its June 9, 1975, decision ordering reinstatement of benefits for marriage, family, and pastoral counseling. In his conclusions Judge Charles B. Richey made these points:

Congress did not intend that CHAMPUS be limited by a similar civilian insurance program. Rather, Congress intended that CHAMPUS benefits be comprehensive and of high quality.

The services received by the plaintiffs are medically related, necessary, and therapeutic, and the providers are quality professionals.

INTERCEPTS APPLAUDED

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I hope you will take a few minutes of your valuable time to scan the article I am inserting from the editorial pages of the Dallas Times Herald.

After reading this, it would be my hope that more of us in the Congress could take the balanced viewpoint of this author: Protect the rights of private citizens and protect the rights of the U.S. Government when acting on behalf of its private citizens.

The article refers to the interceptions of messages between antiwar crusaders Jane Fonda and Dr. Benjamin Spock—in time of war.

Thank you for taking the time to read the viewpoint of this writer who I am sure reflects the opinion of many here in the Congress and in the Dallas, Tex. area. The article follows:

JANE FONDA HOGWASH

Now comes the wrenching revelation that the National Security Agency intercepted telegrams and long distance calls involving Jane Fonda and Dr. Benjamin Spock.

Furthermore, these interceptions of information from antiwar figures in the late stages of the Vietnam war were then crassly circulated to top government officials under a highly classified code designation.

The implication of all of this is that the U.S. government was meddling with the privacy of these citizens.

And the comment here is that if the National Security Agency, the CIA, the FBI and the counter intelligence unit of the Defense Intelligence Agency had not performed precisely as they did—they should have.

Certainly, agencies charged with the protection of the security of this nation should have learned all they could about the activities of Jane Fonda, Dr. Spock or anyone else who was a welcomed visitor to Hanoi.

That is what intelligence, particularly wartime intelligence, is all about. And the current political din concerning activities of American intelligence agencies is beginning to wear very thin with the average citizen.

It would have been disappointing, even dereliction, if the National Security Agency

had not attempted to find out what was on the minds of American citizens Jane Fonda, Dr. Spock, Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver and Chicago Seven figures Abbie Hoffman and David T. Dellinger while they were maneuvering outside these shores during wartime 1969 and 1970.

The scrutiny of American intelligence agencies is beginning to add up to irritating hogwash.

The rights of privacy of citizens should be protected from undue invasion by any agency, but the Jane Fonda types who openly put down this country lay themselves wide open for legitimate investigation.

REPORT ON REFUGEES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the conditional entry into the United States of 10,200 refugees annually who because of persecution or fear of persecution, or on account of race, religion, or political opinion, have fled from any Communist-dominated country or from a country in the general area of the Middle East, or who are uprooted from their homes by natural calamity.

Furthermore, section 203(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act requires the Attorney General to submit a report containing a complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of each alien conditionally entered pursuant to the above section. The reports must be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year. In accordance with this section of law, the following report summarizing the operation of the refugee section was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In order that the House may be fully informed of the operation of section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, I wish to insert this report in the RECORD:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., July 31, 1975.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On December 31, 1974, there were pending 12,718 applications for conditional entry under Section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, submitted by aliens in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Italy and Lebanon. During the six-month period ending June 30, 1975, and additional 7,205 applicants registered in these countries. During this period 5,170 were approved for conditional entry, 7,413 were rejected or otherwise closed, and there were 7,340 applications pending on June 30, 1975.

The following reflects the activity in each of the countries in which conditional entry applicants were examined during the period between December 31, 1974 and June 30, 1975.

Country	Applications pending Dec. 31, 1974	Registrations received during period	Total	Found qualified for conditional entry	Rejected or otherwise closed	Pending June 30, 1975
Austria	478	782	1,260	431	571	258
Belgium	442	292	734	428	121	185
France	213	211	424	207	84	133
Germany	213	333	546	189	135	222
Greece	39	47	86	56		30
Hong Kong	8,853	1,830	10,683	775	4,230	5,678
Italy	1,616	2,949	4,565	1,859	2,218	488
Lebanon	864	761	1,625	1,225	54	346
Total	12,718	7,205	19,923	5,170	7,413	7,340

The following listing shows the country of visa chargeability of 5,170 aliens approved for conditional entry during the six-month period (includes accompanying spouses and children):

Albania	8
Belgium	4
Bulgaria	71
Burma	12
China	762
Cyprus	13
Czechoslovakia	52
Egypt	38
Ethiopia	4
France	3
Germany	4
Greece	8
Hungary	161
India	1
Indonesia	8

Iran	20
Iraq	769
Israel	12
Italy	1
Kuwait	2
Lebanon	51
Lithuania	1
Pakistan	2
Poland	211
Rumania	268
Spain	4
Syria	73
Turkey	77
U.S.S.R.	2,276
Vietnam	1
Yugoslavia	253
Total	5,170

Established screening procedures resulted in the rejection of 5,280 applicants during the period, on the following grounds:

Ineligible	456
Security grounds	43
Criminal grounds	2
Medical reasons	20
Undesirability	16
Firmly resettled	4,113
Spouses and children of above principals	630
Total	5,280

During the six-month period ending June 30, 1975, 190 aliens in the United States were accorded permanent resident status pursuant to the proviso to Section 203(a)(7).

In compliance with Section 203(f) of the Act, detailed reports on aliens who conditionally entered the United States are attached.

Sincerely,

L. F. CHAPMAN, Jr.,
Commissioner.

JACK BRINKLEY ASKS YOUR OPINION

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of my October 1975 94th Congress questionnaire newsletter which soon will be mailed to the constituents of Georgia's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent:

The questionnaire reads as follows:

JACK BRINKLEY ASKS YOUR OPINION
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 1975.

DEAR FRIENDS: It was Thomas Jefferson who once said, "That government is the strongest of which every man feels himself a part." Because you ARE a part of the government, I want to know what you think about important issues facing the country. Although the volume of expected returns will not allow me to reply personally to each one, your comments will be read and given attention.

Please check your answers and fold so that our Washington address, appears on the appropriate side for mailing. Working together, you and I can make this a better America.

Thanks and best wishes,

JACK BRINKLEY,
Member of Congress.

(NOTE.—Provisions made for two replies: Either "yes" or "no" or "favorable," "unfavorable.")

DOMESTIC

Government regulations

1. Should Congress and the administration reduce government regulations in such areas as business, trade and transportation, in order to enhance the free market system?

2. How do you feel about the following federal agencies?

A. Occupational Safety and Health Ad-

ministration (OSHA)—created to reduce incidences of injury, illness and death among workers resulting from employment; has reputation for arbitrariness, nit-picking and requiring excessive business expenditures.

B. Federal Communications Commission (FCC)—created to regulate interstate and foreign communications by wire, t.v., telephone and satellite in the public interest; more than one pound of forms must be completed on license renewal.

C. Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC)—created to regulate carriers: r.r., trucks, bus, etc. and to settle controversies over rates, mergers; example of regulation is "dead head" return runs in which a trucker cannot haul goods.

D. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)—created to protect health of nation against impure and unsafe food, drugs, cosmetics, and other potential hazards; has been criticized for proposed rules to severely control the sale and use of vitamins.

Environment

1. In your opinion, are efforts to reduce air, water and other types of pollution now receiving adequate attention by various levels of government?

2. Do you think the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the policeman of the environment, is coordinating closely enough with state and local government?

3. . . . with an adequate cross section of the people?

4. Have you ever had contact with the EPA?

5. Should car emission controls be relaxed?

6. Should car emission controls be postponed?

7. Should car emission controls be kept as is, no backsliding?

Welfare (Helpfare)

1. How do you feel about food stamps?

2. How would you improve the system?
A. Allow only basic necessities to be purchased with stamps.

B. Sharply delineate recipient, with the

able-bodied being provided WPA-type public service employment. This is similar to the successful "California Plan" which is also known as "work-fare."

C. Do away with welfare altogether.
D. Legislate a negative income tax, taxing only income over a set minimum, thus providing an incentive to work.

3. If you checked B, should those remaining, who have greater need, be provided more generous treatment in acquiring stamps?

Energy

1. The Administration has proposed eliminating all current federal price controls on domestic oil, asserting that higher prices will encourage domestic exploration and production and reduce our dependence on foreign imports.

Others believe that de-control of oil will mean major price increases for consumers of gasoline and heating fuel, adding to our inflation.

A. Do you favor de-control of the price of oil?

B. Do you favor an excess profits tax?

2. The U.S. now imports approximately 37% of our oil needs. To reduce that dependence, various plans have been proposed to get people to conserve energy. Do you think the government should enact tough measures to get people to use less gasoline?

3. If so, would you prefer (check one or more)

A. The implementation of gas rationing program.

B. A 20¢ per gallon tax increase on gasoline.

C. A tax on new automobiles in direct proportion to their energy efficiency (miles per gallon) or horsepower.

D. Allocation—odd/even: purchase gas on odd or even dates only, corresponding to last digit of tag.

E. Decal—by color, to designate day of week chosen not to drive.

F. Accelerated research and development (solar and other).

G. Reduced military use.

H. Limitation of amount of foreign energy imports.

1. An inverse tariff against OPEC, risking embargo.
4. In the event of embargo, would you support counter embargo and total economic sanctions?
5. If gasoline were rationed, could you get by on the predicted allotment of 9 gallons per driver per week?
6. As one way of meeting future energy needs, do you favor building more nuclear power plants?
7. Should government stay out of direct oil production and ownership?

Education

1. Should more federal funds be budgeted for vocational schools and courses?
2. Should more federal funds be budgeted for special education classes such as remedial reading and talking typewriter school?
3. Should the G.I. bill be discontinued for the all-volunteer, better paid military establishment?

Responsive government

1. Which of the following levels of government do you feel is most responsive to the people?
- A. Federal.
- B. State.
- C. Local.
- D. Elected Officials.
- E. Appointed Officials.

FOREIGN Defense

1. Have world tensions relaxed to the point that the U.S. should substantially reduce its defense establishment and expenditures?
2. If so, how should we reduce expenditures? (Check)
- A. Manpower.
- B. Overseas Commitments.
- C. NATO (20 billion annual cost).
- D. New Weapons Systems.
- E. Spend as necessary/cut fat, if any.
3. We now have troops in Korea. Should we defend South Korea in the event of an attack from the North?
4. Should we stay in Korea for strategic defense purposes, i.e., to reinforce SEATO and our commitments to Japan and other Asian allies?
5. In the Middle East situation, should our effort be (check)
- A. Limited to the direct national interest of the U.S.
- B. More international in scope.
- C. Through the United Nations.
- D. In conjunction with other major Mid-east powers, i.e., "Kissinger diplomacy."

GENERAL Perspective

- As the Bicentennial celebration approaches and we look at the nation's heritage, at which of the following periods in history do you feel the average American family had the most difficult times and the most trying problems? (check)
- A. Revolutionary Period (1776).
- B. Civil War Period (1862).
- C. The Great Depression (1933).
- D. World War II (1942).
- E. The Present (1975).

Priorities

One of the most important functions of the Congress is setting priorities to meet the country's human needs. If you were in Congress and faced with the conflicting problems of restraining inflation and stimulating the economy, how much attention, using the following scale of 1 to 5, would you give these issues?

- 1—much more; 2—more; 3—same; 4—less; 5—much less.
- A. Aid to the Elderly.
- B. Crime.
- C. Pollution Control.
- D. Poverty.
- E. Education.

- F. Tax Reform.
- G. Drug Abuse.
- H. Health Insurance.
- I. Unemployment.
- J. Recession.
- K. Equal Rights.
- L. Energy Shortages.
- M. Housing.
- N. Postal Service.
- O. Conservation of Resources.
- P. Mass Transportation.
- Q. Highway Safety.
- R. Consumer Protection.
- S. Welfare Reform.
- T. Government Waste.

NEW SURVIVAL CENTER

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the August/September issue of *Animal Kingdom* contained a brief statement by William G. Conway, the general director of the New York Zoological Society, outlining the value of Survival Centers in perpetuating vanishing species.

My bill, H.R. 1154, contains a provision for funding additional Survival Centers, and Mr. Conway's article makes it very clear that such centers are of vital importance. I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

A NEW SURVIVAL CENTER

A problem that has troubled conservationists for years is the need to find additional space, beyond the now-limited areas of the nation's zoological parks, for the propagation of vanishing species. Several foreign and United States zoos have initiated such programs, most notably the National Zoological Park in Washington, D.C., which has acquired more than 3,000 acres of the old Front Royal cavalry station in Virginia.

And now, the New York Zoological Society also has advanced in this direction, with a pilot propagation program, made possible by the Edward John Noble Foundation, on St. Catherine's Island off the coast of Georgia. This new Survival Center is dedicated to the study of native wild animals through a long-term scientific research program, and to the propagation of all endangered species for which the island's climate and facilities may be suitable. Already, herds of African antelopes—addax, sable, and gemsbok—are in residence, roaming large, fenced ranges, under careful supervision.

Although St. Catherine's animal propagation areas are not planned for casual visitors, the program is a public one in every sense of the word. The survival Center will play host to scientists and serious students, and its "produce" will not only help to fulfill man's responsibilities toward other living things, but also to insure that future generations are not deprived of the opportunity to see at least some of Earth's most spectacular creatures.

The new Center is planned as a cooperative effort. The National Zoo has placed a nuclear herd in one of the island's facilities, and other organizations, including the Department of the Interior and the Philadelphia Zoological Society, are expected to participate. While initial attention has been focused upon foreign species, special programs are being planned for the possible propagation and re-introduction of native animals. The brown pelican, sandhill crane,

and bald eagle are leading candidates for this part of the project.

St. Catherine's is a large island, twelve-miles long, with a significant population of native birds, and even alligators. Yet, it has been used for agriculture and grazing for more than 200 years. The Survival Center's programs are concentrated upon the areas once used to grow cotton and to raise pigs and cattle. The island's climate—its temperatures are remarkably similar to those of Nairobi, Kenya—and its isolation—a twenty-five-minute boat ride from the mainland—uniquely qualify St. Catherine's as a latter-day ark.

WILLIAM G. CONWAY,
General Director.

FICTION PUTS FACTS IN ORDER

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with my fondest hope that you and the other distinguished Members of this body will read the following bit of satire.

Tongue-in-cheek, yes. Fiction, yes. In perspective, yes.

A small town paper in Texas—Hood County News, Granbury, Tex.—ran a column relating a story told second hand. But it is a parody on the current crude oil dilemma.

Hopefully, my fellow colleagues in the Congress will enjoy the humor, and note the parallels to crude oil shortages.

The article follows:

TTO (THIS, THAT, AND THE OTHER)
(By Larry L. Crabtree)

Fella on the Lake sez: "The fellow who goes out looking for trouble doesn't need to get ready for a long trip."

TTO

Decontrol of crude oil prices takes some of the edge off the following tongue-in-cheek story about Wildcat, Wyoming. George Baker, a friend of ours from Fort Stockton, sent the story to us. He gave credit to Wendell Tooley in Floydada for its origin. Now just where Wendell got the story we haven't the slightest. At any rate here is the way it supposedly happened in Wildcat:

"Wildcat, Wyoming was a prosperous town where the populace subsisted (at least partially) on buffalo with which the local Indian hunters kept them supplied. To supplement meat from this source, Wildcat residents (called Wildcatters? or Wildcatians?) bought some of their buffalo meat from far-off hunters. By buying enough outside they were able to hold the local price to \$2 a buffalo, which didn't make the Indians very happy, but who cared?"

"Then one day the distant hunters decided to quit delivering buffalo meat. Panic ensued. The local Indians just couldn't increase the domestic supply fast enough so rationing was instituted. Even the Indians had to stand in line for their share.

"The townspeople blamed the Indians for the shortage. Some even said the tribe purposely made unsuccessful hunts—even stampeded buffalo over the cliffs in order to create shortages. The Government Agency came to the Indians and told them they must procure more buffalo. Fine, said the Indians. But their bows and arrows were old and had been stored in tepees for years. They needed twine and arrowheads with which to repair them.

But bow and arrow makers were two years behind on deliveries already.

"Buffalo were not as plentiful as before, and the Indians had to roam farther and farther to find them. New braves recruited for the stepped-up hunts demanded higher wages. Bow-and-arrow prices shot up. The buffalo price would have to be raised to \$10 to cover higher costs. 'Excess profits!' the people cried. Some suggested using canned food instead of buffalo, but cans hadn't been invented yet.

"Many years before, the Government Agency had ruled that the tribe must give it part of the buffalo earnings each year. But a portion of this was returned at times in the form of a depletion allowance when the hunting was bad.

"Now, even though the Indians were working harder than ever to try to scare up more buffalo meat, the townspeople stepped up their attacks on them. They said the hunters' horses messed up the land and smelled up the air (even though some had never even visited the hunting grounds where this fouling was alleged to be taking place).

"Some Indians began hunting from the water in canoes. Townspeople complained that this would ruin the rivers. One day, despite all the Indians' precautions, a buffalo did fall in the water. The Indian who shot it cleaned up the mess by himself and paid all the expenses while the townspeople stood on the bank and complained.

"The Agency then decided to make hunting safer. It decreed Indians must put saddles on the horses, tie the braves to the saddles, put safety tips over arrow heads, and wear hard-toed mocassins—all at Indian expense. The tribe protested that this would hamper the hunt; besides, the tribe already had safety regulations of its own.

"Next an Agency safety group, called 'Safety and Health for Indian Tribes,' was set up; its membership included storekeepers, bartenders, blacksmiths, and other experts on Indian safety. Despite all these handicaps, the hunt went on.

"Then the evil spirit—Agency leader 'Trader Jackson'—came upon the tribe. He said that the depletion allowance should be taken away and that the price should be rolled back to \$2 a buffalo. The Agency and the townspeople agreed and it was done. So the beaten Indians put away their bows and arrows and returned to the reservation never to hunt buffalo again. The next winter was extremely long and cold. Most of the townspeople starved to death. The town of Wildcat perished."

SENSE FROM NEW YORK'S SUBURBS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, New York City's financial crisis may well prove to presage the central financial theme of the second half of the 1970's. The way we handle complexity of the dilemma faced by the city and the State, the extent of the human tragedy, and the implications for municipal financing across the Nation and around the world will perhaps tell us more about the nature of our Government and our people than almost any other issue we face. It is a time for clear thinking, compassion and understanding. Above all, we need Government leadership that will put aside partisan cheap shots and start to deal forthrightly with the truly difficult questions.

In that light, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial aired on WGSN, a radio station in Huntington, Long Island. It presents a sensible balanced view of New York's troubles, and I hope that Members of this body will heed its urgent message.

The article follows:

THE 1930'S—NEW YORK CITY HELPED FEED THE NATION! THE 1970'S—WILL THE NATION HELP FEED NEW YORK CITY?

During the Depression, and shortly thereafter, the farmers of this nation were in desperate shape. Foreclosures were common . . . farm prices were at rock bottom. Natural catastrophes, such as drought, compounded the problem. The Federal Government recognized that the farming community was vital to the nation; that the country's food supply had to be maintained.

The President and the Congress responded to the crisis situation with low cost loans to farmers . . . with Federal guarantees . . . with price supports and subsidies . . . with needed massive aid to the rural community. The Department of Agriculture was mobilized to battle farm failure. Much of the money that went to the rural areas of the Midwest and South came from the cities of this nation . . . from the taxes of city dwellers. There was nothing in the Constitution about the Federal Government helping farmers but the need was there.

Now the cities are in desperate fiscal trouble. New York City is but the first, a clue, a hint as to what might well lie ahead for many of this nation's troubled urban areas. The cities have sent more taxes to Washington than have been returned to them for decades.

Presently, not only New York City, but other New York communities, as well as the State itself, have been financially immobilized. In Nassau and Suffolk Counties, college building projects are stalled. New York and its subdivisions are simply unable to borrow. Washington's answer is one of indifference, even of hostility. The President and his inept economic advisors want to punish New York City. What the President really wants to do is run against New York City in next year's election and, by grandstanding his opposition, pick up votes in Middle America!

Despite New York City's fiscal incompetence of the past, a default by the city would have grievous implications for every state, municipality and taxing authority in the nation. Internationally, it would justifiably undermine confidence in our government. For a government that can let its greatest city fail, without lifting a finger to help, simply is not a competent government. Although the President and his Treasury Secretary certainly don't have a grasp of that reality, we hope the Congress does and acts before it is too late for all of us.

NATIONAL EPILEPSY MONTH

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which will authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the month of November each year as National Epilepsy Month. I have a growing concern regarding the misunderstanding which surrounds this affliction, and have had occasion recently to communicate frequently with the National Epilepsy

Foundation. This year, the foundation's national poster child, Stacie Elizabeth Meacham, is a resident of Bakersfield, Calif., which I have the honor of representing in the Congress. Through my discussions, I have learned that it is not epilepsy itself which is tragic, but rather the somewhat medieval attitude toward it in the minds of the ill informed. Epilepsy can be successfully treated—what we have difficulty correcting is the public outlook, and the answer to this is greater enlightenment. I firmly believe that the designation of November as National Epilepsy Month will help provide public education regarding the problems—and, more importantly the non-problems—of epilepsy. In previous years, our President has issued only a Message to the Foundation, calling November National Epilepsy Month. As these messages have not done enough to terminate erroneous assumptions concerning epilepsy, I would like to see a Presidential proclamation issued annually. Through such a measure, bringing to the attention of our citizens the many among us who handle epilepsy daily, it is my hope that those so afflicted will find greater acceptance, and that the general public will come to understand that epilepsy is not the great handicap it was once thought to be.

SOVIET INTIMIDATION OF NORWAY UNDERWAY—WHERE IS NATO?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, very quietly a troop buildup has been taking place on the Norwegian-Soviet border. Soviet naval vessels have been maneuvering in plain sight of Norwegian harbors. The Soviets have also inaugurated a new airline service to the disputed island of Spitsbergen where it mines coal, although Norway owns the island. All of this is a calculated "war of nerves" designed to unsettle Norwegian negotiators when they meet next month to shape a dividing line in the Barents Sea. At stake is "freedom of the seas" in the area, the rich coal deposits of Spitsbergen, and potentially rich oil and mineral deposits offshore. The ominous thing is that the United States and NATO have done nothing to bolster or back Norway in this quarrel, which is so typical of the Soviet imperialism and Communist "salam" technique. Therefore, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the background story on this struggle, which appeared in The New York Times of October 2, 1975. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1975] SOVIET-NORWEGIAN DISPUTE IS UNFOLDING OVER BARENTS SEA OIL

OSLO, NORWAY, Sept. 27.—A quiet and tense drama between Norway and the Soviet Union is unfolding over each nation's sovereignty in a remote Arctic area.

The drama, closely watched by the United States, is being enacted against a backdrop of potentially vast oil deposits and a major Soviet military buildup over the past decade near the Norwegian border. At stake,

Norwegian officials say, is a portion of the Barents Sea with strategic, economic and political importance.

Beyond this, Western diplomats fear that the dispute marks an effort by the Soviet Union to flex its muscles near Spitsbergen, a Norwegian group of islands on which the Soviet Union has a coal-mining concession.

As the most northerly habitable area of the world—and dominating the approach waters to the Soviet naval base at Murmansk—Spitsbergen has served as a source of uneasiness for years between Moscow and Oslo.

Now Norwegian officials are planning talks in Oslo in November with the Russians to shape a dividing line in the Barents Sea for both nations. Spitsbergen is not on the agenda, but sovereignty over the waters around the archipelago may loom as a source of tension.

The issue was raised two weeks ago when the Soviet Union conducted sea maneuvers, firing missiles in waters that are to be negotiated. Oslo expressed its concern to the Soviet Union, and the missile tests were viewed as a strongarm tactic to unsettle the Norwegians.

The nation's largest newspaper, *Aftenposten*, termed the tests "a curious kind of negotiation tactic" adding: "Good neighbors should have no need to demonstrate their military power to enter into a dialogue in such a complex problem."

Spitsbergen lies some 200 miles north of Norway in the access route between the North Atlantic and the Barents Sea. On the south shore of the Barents Sea lies the Kola Peninsula and Murmansk, which have witnessed "a dynamic" Soviet build-up, according to the Norwegian Foreign Ministry.

There is some feeling, especially among Western diplomats that Moscow would be content to work out an agreement limiting access to the waters to Norway and the Soviet Union only. Such a measure would meet objections from the United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Under a 1920 treaty, signed by more than 40 countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union, Norway was granted sovereignty over Spitsbergen, but all the nations involved retained the right to explore the natural resources.

Only Norway and the Soviet Union maintain coal-mining operations there.

With the discovery of oil under the North Sea between Norway and Britain, the tempo of economic activity has picked up around Spitsbergen. Norwegian officials, convinced that there are oil and mineral deposits in the Barents Sea, pressed for an international agreement with the Soviet Union to settle the rights to whatever minerals may be found. Talks last year in Moscow broke off inconclusively after one week.

The Norwegians seek a median dividing line, equidistant between the borders and islands of both nations. The Russians want a line leading from the Soviet-Norwegian border to the North Pole. The amount of territory in dispute is nearly one-third the size of Norway.

**CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. BURTON
EXTENDS CONGRATULATIONS TO
JAMES GABBERT AND HIS STAFF
AS RADIO STATION K-101 CELEBRATES
ITS 18th ANNIVERSARY
OCTOBER 27**

HON. JOHN L. BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my

colleagues to the outstanding accomplishments of Radio Station K-101 which will celebrate its 18th anniversary on October 27.

The success of K-101 FM and AM is due in large part to the untiring efforts of James Gabbert. Eighteen years ago Mr. Gabbert opened the doors for the first time at his radio station and began a record of service to the community that continues today.

Mr. Gabbert believes in community involvement, and has gone to great lengths to insure that the public has access to his broadcast facility.

He was one of the first broadcasters in the country to provide a "community access van," a completely portable recording studio which allows citizens to air their opinions without leaving their neighborhoods.

Besides an extensive assortment of news and public affairs programs, K-101 was a pioneer in the areas of live stereo radio drama and is currently involved in the production of a live amateur show.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all Members of the House of Representatives join with me in extending congratulations to Mr. Gabbert and the staff of K-101, and wish them continued success as they observe their 18th anniversary.

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE IN
STRASBOURG**

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to represent the Committee on International Relations at the 27th session of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France on October 6-7, 1975.

The Council of Europe's Assembly is the principal forum of European parliamentary democracy. It is the only parliamentary group which includes all of Europe's democracies, including the neutral countries. In recent years, with the growth of the European community's institutions and the continuation of the work of the North Atlantic Assembly of NATO, the Council of Europe has concentrated on the political and cultural aspects of Western Europe, and especially, the human rights field.

I presented a short paper which follows, in the Assembly's debate on United States-European relations which I hope Members will find of interest:

**A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW OF UNITED STATES-
EUROPEAN RELATIONS**

(By Congressman LEO RYAN, Democrat, of California, prepared for the Council of Europe Assembly, Strasbourg, October 1975)

The end of American involvement in Southeast Asia, instead of reassuring our Western allies, has marked the start of a period of uneasiness in Western European nations and especially with our NATO allies. The Trade Reform Act of 1974 and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, each of which contained congressional limitations on the American Presidency's traditional powers in foreign relations, are often seen in Europe as confirmation of both a new hostility in Congress (and, therefore, the American body

politic) toward executive branch commitments abroad, and a trend toward greater congressional involvement in foreign policy which may be dangerous.

The strong public and congressional criticism of the Helsinki conference on European security which faces the American President even today might be included as a further example by those inclined to seek evidence of a new hostility by a country known for its past periods of isolationism.

I would like to examine both the antecedents and the assumptions of these assessments from Europe which I believe are both wrong in their conclusions and misleading if our European allies should act upon them.

Since an unruly Congress is the common element in these European fears, and since this assembly of parliamentarians invited a Member of Congress, for which I am personally pleased and grateful, I would like to begin by examining several examples of what appear to many of you as untoward and even irresponsible congressional behavior in foreign affairs.

From an institution which consistently supported the policy outlines of Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Rusk and Kissinger, we now perceive (in the United States, as well) a new direction by Congress.

The milestones of this change are agreed upon: The War Powers Act, the Trade Reform Act of 1974, with the Jackson amendment; the suspension of military aid to Turkey; and the refusal to grant additional military aid in Southeast Asia. There are others which are less visible.

What is less clear is the long-term significance of these instances of congressional independence in foreign affairs:

Are these isolated cases, brought together only by their coincidence in time?

Do they reflect the peculiar leadership weaknesses of the Ford Administration, the only one in American history where the President never won a national electoral mandate?

Or do these congressional acts represent a more substantial shift of authority to a Congress clearly reacting against too much foreign involvement, of which Vietnam is the symbol?

ORIGINS OF TRADE BILL DISPUTE

The seeds of the trade bill dispute came from the lack of caution by the Nixon Administration which, in October 1972, signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union which promised, among other items, most-favored nation (MFN) status. In the euphoria before the anticipated election victory by Nixon that fall, the Administration forgot that congressional approval was needed for MFN status. At the same time, the Nixon Administration ignored the bitter reaction among the Jews in America several months earlier to the Soviet emigration tax. That reaction should have warned both governments that congressional approval would not be automatic. Whether or not one agrees with the final congressional action, it could have been anticipated for over two years.

The Turkish aid suspension had its roots in the cynical policy employed by two American Administrations in the eastern Mediterranean since 1967.

Faced with a Greek military dictatorship, the Johnson and Nixon Administrations proceeded on a business-as-usual basis in Athens. When that dictatorship provoked a coup on Cyprus last July, the United States, still eager to protect its Greek bases, refused to condemn the attack on the legal Cypriot government. The inevitable Turkish reaction came in the July invasion. But when the Turks, in August, expanded that beachhead to over one-third of the island, and over three-quarters of its economic wealth, the situation shifted dramatically. As Greek Americans turned hostile toward the Turkish action they began to pressure their Congressmen for action.

The Turks, who in July were the aggrieved

party, were now the aggressor, armed almost entirely with American weapons, employed against an explicit and long-standing prohibition in U.S. law. Secretary Kissinger failed to face the legal issue—and also failed to understand the militancy of Greek-Americans who now pressured the Congress. These factors assured that aid to Turkey would be suspended.

The Turkish affair, therefore, must also be charged to ineptness by the Administration against a formidable and well-organized domestic force, rather than to a congressional design to seize unprecedented authority. I state this as one who believes the Congress wrong in this instance for insisting on a legal argument and ignoring the serious foreign policy consequences.

REFUSAL ON VIETNAM

On the third example, Vietnam, a widespread disenchantment with the war in Southeast Asia had developed in the U.S. since 1968 when Democrats refused to renominate their own party leaders on this issue. The recent refusal of the Congress to vote extra aid to Vietnam was entirely consistent with Congress' own record and with the temper of the American people. That this refusal surprised the President and the Secretary of State is itself surprising.

Even if these three episodes appear unrelated, do they not reflect a lack of leadership by the Ford Administration? The answer is clearly "yes" if the question asks whether the political effects of these congressional acts could have been otherwise represented. Yet the new President, with a conventional and conservative approach to foreign affairs, which he developed in the House of Representatives in the quarter-century when Presidents made foreign policy, was paradoxically, not a likely candidate to sense the new Congressional mood for several reasons:

First, the new President was confident that he knew the House and could lead it in foreign affairs as Truman, Eisenhower and even Kennedy and Johnson had. President Ford failed to see the special difficulties of the three problems outlined above and his special weaknesses as an interim President.

Second, President Ford relied too much on Kissinger when the Secretary of State was already beginning his decline. The Kissinger credibility was badly tarnished by Chile, by his Salzburg temper tantrum and by a style increasingly perceived to concentrate more on managing his critics and less with dealing with international problems. Yet, Ford's weakness in foreign affairs could not allow him to release Dr. Kissinger.

So the weaknesses of the President supplemented those of his Secretary of State, creating the appearance that the institution of the Presidency was weakened in foreign affairs.

How unreal this appearance is, we can see by projecting ourselves two years ahead. By spring of 1977, we can be confident these events will have taken place:

A President, elected in his own right, will be in the White House with a new foreign policy team. There is today, I believe, a 50-50 chance that Gerald Ford will be this "new" President to be elected in November, 1976.

Vietnam will have receded from the public consciousness.

The new President will have used his initial strength to remove both Turkish aid and the Jackson amendment as major problems, assuming that they are not completely removed by the present Congress.

WHAT KIND OF CONGRESS?

What kind of Congress will the new President face in the foreign affairs field?

To the great disappointment (or relief) of those, in and out of the Congress, who see

today a "revolution" in the legislative branch, there is a good chance that two years from now no one will know what today's excitement was about. Congress changes its ways very slowly. The dramatic changes in internal procedure taken by the present Congress is proof of that relative inertia and not a refutation of it. The principal change was to elect 3 of 21 committee chairmen by merit and not seniority.

Coordinating the work of 435 Members, elected every two years largely on their own and not as party representatives, is a task which has occupied the House since its creation. "Revolts" against both Presidents and its own leaders have been a characteristic of Congress since its establishment. Numerous reorganizations have been discussed, a few adopted, but the theme of the House's history is that few men and few groups have ever tamed the essential (and healthy) disorder of the institution. When the House seemed to become too organized (under the Speaker in the late 19th Century, and under the Caucus, in the early 20th century) the House itself reacted by limiting the trend toward too much order.

Today, the House, especially in foreign affairs, seems to be reacting against too much control by the President. The Vietnam conflict symbolizes that concern. Here was a major American military engagement into which the Congress was led by three Presidents who controlled both the diplomatic and military facts available to the legislative body. The disaster of Vietnam, from its origins and its execution, will remain a symbol for Members of Congress of its own weakness for some years.

The reaction to this weakness so far has come in the Democratic Caucus, the assembly of all Democratic party members in the House. But past experience indicates that the Caucus is unlikely to be a continuing or a consistent guide for the House.

A more constructive and more feasible possibility is that Congress, in both its branches, will reflect its Vietnam experience through an improved use of its capabilities to understand and evaluate future foreign policy problems before they become Vietnams. These capabilities are slowly developing within the congressional committees on foreign affairs. Individual members now have adequate staff and have new access to research facilities. Committee staffs also are larger and more capable.

IMPROVING CONGRESSIONAL CAPACITIES

Improving the capacity for independent critical judgments and developing Congress' own sources of information in international affairs are a sign that Congress is seriously committed to a continuous and mature role in this area.

The next two years, therefore, while the public's attention is focused on the consequences of the Vietnam experience, will also be a test period for Congress. With a relatively weak President in the White House for the first time since World War II, the Congress faces a responsibility—and a test—for which past performance is little guide.

The important, but isolated examples, of the Trade Bill and of Turkish and Vietnam aid, should not obscure the principal issue: Is Congress prepared for a continuing commitment in the foreign affairs field or will the post WW II domination by the Presidency reassert itself in two years?

Many thoughtful Americans hope that a responsible Congress can perform the task which Vietnam has set before it. Whether or not it will do this is still an open question.

Defining the proper congressional role in foreign affairs does not, however, deal with the substance of the examples discussed above or, for a further example, of the controversy over CSCE.

Was the West too accommodating to the Soviet Union and its allies in Helsinki? Should not the Western democracies, many of whom are represented here today, insist on a minimum standard of human rights consideration in the world community? If noninterference in a country's internal affairs means the West must tolerate rigidly controlled societies in Eastern Europe does not that principle also mean that the West should insist on the principle of majority rule in Portugal and Spain?

One of the reasons why my constituents were disenchanted with Helsinki was because the Western European countries appear weak and divided when they enter a conference with the communist countries. And my constituents in California do not look upon this as primarily an American problem. We live nearly halfway around the world from the Soviet heartland. You, and your constituents live within a few hundred miles from the Soviet bloc. What does Western Europe have to say about democratic values when you address Eastern Europe?

EXPOSING THE LACK OF FREEDOM IN THE WARSAW PACT NATIONS

The inability of the West to counter effectively and even aggressively the pressures of communism remains one of our great weaknesses. I believe that the Western European governments, and their parliamentarians, bear an important share of the responsibility for this work. So far, that work has not been adequately done. Too little effort has been made to expose the shortcomings of the communist approach; the refusal of the Soviet bloc countries to take seriously the Helsinki efforts on freedom of movement and human contacts is the first example which come to my mind. There has been little response to the Soviet attempt to use the Helsinki conference to harass Western European attempts to encourage democracy in Portugal. We should not let the world forget that it is the communist countries which build Berlin walls and impose exorbitant exit visa requirements. How should we forget the price we must pay in men, arms, munitions and national anxieties because of continued belligerence of the Soviet-Communist bloc to all Western nations.

In this responsibility, especially within Europe, the United States cannot take the leading role. Because of the proximity of Western Europeans to their eastern neighbors, these criticisms of the communist system are more persuasive if they come from you. While the United States cannot and will not forsake its military presence in Western Europe, it must yield to you in addressing the vulnerabilities of social and political systems of the East.

It is not for me to prescribe the specific steps which the European democracies must take in this criticism. I would only suggest that while the Soviet Union may be as difficult to approach for you as for the United States, the other Eastern European countries are more accessible.

There are strong ties, for example, between your countries and the Central European nations of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Building stronger trade and cultural ties with these countries will strengthen the progressive elements in their societies. The Soviet Union must continually face the hard choice between another Prague of 1968 and the gradual and inevitable political emancipations of these countries.

I am not preaching counter-revolution; rather, I would insist that the West—and that means especially, Western Europe—has a profound story of freedom and individual responsibility to tell the world and particularly that part closest to you to the East. I have traveled in Eastern Europe, as I am sure you have, and I know that this message has a meaning there. We should not let pass

the opportunity to send that message regularly often.

WHY NO ACTION IN EUROPE BY EUROPEANS?

Why have your democracies failed to do this? Why, my constituents ask, has the Berlin Wall not been razed as part of the Helsinki agreement? Why does it seem that the West can look only to the United States or primarily to us for defining relations with the East?

It would be a serious and even a tragic error if Western Europe looked upon those questions as indications of a revival of American isolationism. Most Americans remain convinced that the enormous military, political and economic power of their country will not allow them to be isolated from the world. But many Americans are also aware that the dependence of the West on the United States which has marked the past quarter century must be redefined today to account for these changes:

The enormous economic growth of both Western Europe and Japan since the end of World War II.

The irreversible steps already taken by nine Western European countries toward political union.

The extent of the needs of the Third World countries for economic support and political understanding as they develop.

We, as Americans, are much more aware after Vietnam of our limits in changing the world. But even if Vietnam never occurred we would not be able to continue to operate as if only two superpowers could dominate all international forums.

In certain areas, like nuclear weapons, the United States and the Soviet Union, will continue to dominate. Hopefully, this domination will allow more rapid progress toward control of such arms. But in foreign economic assistance, and in limitations on conventional arms sales, the United States should urge and even insist on more responsibility by Western Europe.

The United States has a permanent relevance for Europe in a world where most values are less than permanent. But for the United States, and its people, Europe is also a permanent and vital American interest beyond questioning. These values are permanent because ultimately they reflect our continuing mutual vital interests.

Within this understanding, there is much opportunity and much need for a continuing and healthful redefinition of our respective roles.

SUPPORT OF HATCH ACT REFORM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret not being present to actively support the passage of H.R. 8617, the Federal Employees' Political Activities Act of 1975. As one of its cosponsors, I would certainly have voted "aye" on this much-needed and long-overdue legislation.

Assuming this bill is enacted, we will have corrected certain provisions of the Hatch Act which, in my opinion, violate individual rights to political participation. Federal employees have virtually been prohibited from all partisan political actions short of voting on election day, and such stringent restrictions go beyond what is necessary to prevent the resurgence of patronage armies manning the Federal agencies.

Political participation among Federal workers, with the bill's safeguards to

prevent coercion or job interference, may actually enhance the reputation and performance of much-maligned bureaucrats. The clerical and professional staffs of the departments and agencies are all affected by politics, either by congressional funding and oversight functions or by local contests and issues, and they should be able to gain valuable experience and share their expertise in voluntary political action.

It is high time that we bring Federal employees back into our democratic system, and I commend the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing the bill before us today.

COMMISSIONER CARDWELL'S TESTIMONY ON SSI

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there have been some recent complaints that the Social Security Administration has not been responsive to Congress in providing information on the supplemental security income program.

To set the record straight, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an item-by-item breakdown of the occasions Commissioner Cardwell has testified before Congress on the SSI program, as well as a summary of written responses furnished Members of Congress on the program. Also included is a list of the studies which have been or are being undertaken on the program:

COMMISSIONER CARDWELL'S TESTIMONY ON SSI SINCE JANUARY 1974

April 29, 1974—House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (1975 Budget Hearings): implementation of the SSI program; estimates of recipients; operating statistics; legislative changes since P.L. 92-603; proposed automatic cost-of-living increases; administrative costs; food stamp eligibility; and appropriations requests.

June 12, 1974—Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (1975 Budget Hearings): total benefit payment statistics; implementation of the program; estimates of recipients; legislative changes since P.L. 92-603; proposed automatic cost-of-living increases; and appropriations requests.

July 15, 1974—Senate Special Committee on Aging: implementation of the SSI program; how the SSI program evolved; first 6 months of program operation; problems and issues relating to SSI; and relationship of SSI with other programs.

February 28, 1975—House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill): request for additional appropriations for increased SSI program costs and administrative expenses; request for an increase in appropriations for additional manpower necessary to administer the SSI program and process disability claims and hearings and appeals; Federal benefit payments; hold-harmless payments to States; and vocational rehabilitation services.

April 25, 1975—House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (1976 Budget Hearings): complex administrative nature of the SSI program; progress made in dealing with administrative problems; Federal benefit payments; "hold harmless" payments; SSI budget requests; SSI provisions, prob-

lems and issues; and vocational rehabilitation.

April 29, 1975—House Select Committee on Aging, Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment: current operating statistics; and resolution of certain administrative problems and program issues.

May 1, 1975—Senate Special Committee on Aging: overview of the SSI program; operational problems in the program and steps being taken to improve operations; and SSA staffing.

May 5, 1975—Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill): request for additional appropriations for increased SSI program costs and administrative expenses; and request for an increase in appropriations for additional manpower necessary to administer the SSI program and process disability claims and hearings and appeals.

May 8, 1975—Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW (1976 Budget Hearings): benefit payment rolls; automatic benefit increase; appellate workload backlog; complex nature of SSI; administrative problems and progress made in dealing with them; and creation of external review group.

May 21, 1975—House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security: SSI disability and blindness statistics and general SSI operating statistics; and problems and achievements of the SSI program.

June 3, 1975—House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Public Assistance: basic operating statistics; how the program evolved through legislative changes; status of SSI operations; SSI Study Group; possible areas for improved SSI operations; and need for coordination of the SSI and food stamp programs.

September 8, 1975—House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight: current operational status of the program; accomplishments to date; potential sources of error; optimism as to improved operations; and ongoing studies of SSI.

September 19, 1975—House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security: hearings and appeals procedures; hearings and appeals backlog levels; causes of backlog; classes of hearings officers; characteristics of hearings process; efforts being made to reduce backlog, improve processing and reduce number of appeals; current outlook on hearings and appeals situation.

SUMMARY OF SELECTED MATERIALS CONCERNING THE SSI PROGRAM FURNISHED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS SINCE JANUARY 1974

May 20, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Congressman John F. Seiberling, Jr., concerning processing times for disability claims through initial, reconsideration, and hearings levels.

May 29, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Congressman Ogden R. Reid regarding the administrative difficulties experienced by SSA during the first few months of the SSI program.

July 12, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Congresswoman Ella T. Grasso on delays in processing disability claims.

August 22, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Congressman Daniel J. Flood detailing the efforts being made jointly by the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department at expediting the replacement of undelivered SSI checks.

August 30, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Congressman Charles A. Vanik covering two SSI issues—check replacement, and the SSI outreach efforts being made by SSA.

August 30, 1974—Letters from the Secretary of HEW to the Chairmen of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees concerning SSA's efforts and the

problems involved in implementing the provisions of law requiring treatment referral and monitoring for disabled drug addicts and alcoholics under the SSI program and payment of benefits to these individuals through representative payees.

October 21, 1974—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Representative Barber B. Conable, Jr., concerning various aspects of the SSI program, including problems of administration.

March 13, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Senator Edward W. Brooke (as a followup to discussions during the March appropriations hearings) concerning SSI operational and programmatic difficulties.

March 26, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Representative Frank Horton concerning the status of and some of the administrative problems with the SSI program.

April 14, 1975—Letters from the Commissioner of Social Security to the Chairmen of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees concerning the status of the SSI program and the initial findings of SSA's quality assurance reviews including comparisons of rates of incorrect payments under the SSI program with rates under the former adult assistance programs in the States.

June 26, 1975—Letters from the Secretary of HEW to the Chairmen of the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees concerning negotiations with representatives of the City of New York regarding implementation of the provisions of law requiring payment of SSI benefits to disabled drug addicts and alcoholics through representative payees.

July 10, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Senator Edward M. Kennedy addressing numerous questions (arising from the May 1 hearing by the Senate Special Committee on Aging) on SSI operations, administration, beneficiary population, and hearings and appeals.

July 29, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Assistance of the House Ways and Means Committee transmitting detailed criteria SSA has developed for use in evaluating disability of children under age 18.

August 11, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Assistance of the House Ways and Means Committee detailing the extensive outreach programs and efforts that have been undertaken and the money and manpower expended to reach the people for whom the SSI program is intended.

September 3, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee transmitting letters from the Commissioner and the Acting Deputy Commissioner of Social Security to the Editor of the Washington Star and from the Acting Deputy Commissioner to the Editor of the Washington Post, commenting on newspaper articles concerning problems in the administration of the SSI program and so-called overpayments.

September 23, 1975—Letter from the Commissioner of Social Security to Senator Birch Bayh responding to detailed questions about SSI overpayments and related administrative problems.

September 24, 1975—Letters from the Commissioner of Social Security to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees, the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and the House Select Committee on Aging, on SSA's extensive efforts to locate and enroll potential supplemental security income eligibles.

STUDIES OF SSA ADMINISTRATION OF THE SSI PROGRAM

STUDIES INITIATED BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SSI Study Group—In the spring of 1975, the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appointed a special study group chaired by Philip J. Rutledge. This group has held hearings across the country and is well into a comprehensive review of the program and its administration.

HEW Audit Agency—States which elect Federal administration of their program have the right to conduct an annual audit of the expenditure of their funds. The HEW Audit Agency is currently finishing an audit of fiscal year 1974 expenditures on behalf of the States.

OMB Review—The Director of OMB is scheduled to review SSI problems and the need for improvements.

Treasury Department—Two studies are being conducted in cooperation with the Treasury Department: A national check-forwarding study, and a study on nonreceipt of SSI checks.

Friedman Study—Initiated by SSA and conducted by a former SSA executive skilled in systems and management. Review covered SSI systems situation as of last spring.

CONGRESSIONALLY INITIATED STUDIES

Senate Finance Committee—The Committee staff has been studying the problem for several months and is expected to issue a report in September.

General Accounting Office—GAO has been conducting an audit of the general program operation and will soon issue a final report.

THE WOLF

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the September/October 1975 issue of *Colorado Outdoors*, published by the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, contained an excellent article on wolves by Mr. Kevin Fitzgerald. Mr. Fitzgerald is a graduate student at the University of Colorado, in Boulder, and the article is a result of his independent study.

I would like to call my colleagues' particular attention to the final paragraph in the article, since it seems to me to strike a most reasonable balance between the opposing views regarding wolves. I hope that legislation such as House Joint Resolution 89 and H.R. 1155 can help make such a balance a reality.

The article follows:

THE WOLF

(By Kevin Fitzgerald)

If a census were taken to determine which animal appeared most in our myths and legends, the wolf would almost certainly emerge as a primary figure. Children in our society are constantly made aware of this animal from their earliest years onward. A youngster may be reprimanded for "wolfish" table manners or "wolfing down" his supper, and, as he matures, young ladies may remind him of yet another of his wolfish characteristics. Our fairy tales are filled with this animal; we have wolves who dress as sheep (or grandmothers), men who turn into wolves with the full moon, wolves who blow houses down, and boys who cry wolf.

Despite this presentation of the wolfish character, there is another side to the wolf. Not the sly malicious creature but rather a noble courageous figure has also evolved in our legends. The foster mother of Romulus and Remus, the protector of the early English kings, the standard and mascot of the Roman legions were all wolves. The early Anglo-Saxon heroes added the term to their own names in hopes of personifying the lupine virtues, hence the names Beowulf, Wulfred and Wulfstan. Thus we have the wolf loping through the pages of our folk-lore either as the ultimate in villainy or as some noble innocent.

Despite the frequent appearance of the wolf in our history and myths, very little is known about the literary creature's wild counterpart. Much misinformation and unfounded fable exists while sound scientific inquiries have been few. As a result, thoughts of the wolf may elicit some long forgotten stirrings in modern men; vague recollections of sounds beyond the campfires emerge from some hazy past. As far as our knowledge of the wolf goes, we remain in that haze, for not much more is known now than when naked hunters competed with the pack for food.

The wolf evolved about two million years ago in what is now North America from some primitive, flesh-eating, mammalian ancestor. Wolves appeared first in a somewhat larger form, the "dire wolf." A number of these fearsome looking beings were preserved in the oil pools of this period. These pools, such as the famed La Brea tarpit, served as a type of prehistoric animal "scrapbook," faithfully recording an array of now extinct creatures as they passed into evolutionary obscurity. At about the same time, a smaller version of the dire wolf appeared, and by about one million years ago the wolf was much as it is today.

Once the geographic range of the wolf was unmatched by that of any other land mammal. They were found in all of Europe, North America, much of Asia, and parts of northern Africa. This far flung distribution brought them into contact (or conflict) with almost every group of people on earth. In terms of this wide distribution and long relationship with man in their mutual developments, perhaps we can explain man's unique fascination with the wolf and the universality of wolf stories. However, we seem to lack the ability to distinguish the wolves of the storybooks from those that once trotted Colorado ranges. It seems people would rather believe in a wolf molded by legend than in a real animal molded by natural laws. Hopefully, as we reflect upon an animal gone from our state for almost 40 years, we can keep him in the right perspective.

Wolves lived and were numerous in Colorado long before the Indians defied them or the trappers sought their pelts. They were intelligent, social animals that lived and hunted in well ordered packs. The wolf can be described as a predator of large and small game. It actively pursues and attacks birds, fish and mammals ranging from field mice to moose. Wolves have tight family units that are the basis of the pack. Mates are chosen within the first year and remain together for life. At two years wolves mature and have one litter of five to seven pups each spring. Wolves are fierce, determined hunters; however there is not one authenticated report of a wolf ever attacking a human being. This news is usually somehow disappointing to us since it ruins the plot of so many Hollywood westerns. Wolves hunt primarily at night, often covering vast distances. Usually the same region is periodically traveled in search of game. Thus the pack established set "runs," or circuits used only in that group. One wolf run in Rio Blanco County in northwestern Colorado was of elliptical

October 21, 1975

shape and was at least 100 miles long. It was located within the so-called "wolf-belt" near Meeker, that stretched west to the Utah line. On this run was a large stock ranch which the wolves visited regularly every nine or ten days.

Wolves existed in our state in fair numbers well into this century. The naturalist Emerson Carney wrote in 1902 that, of all the big game of the state, only the wolf "not only grows more abundant but adds new territory to his possessions and refuses to be ousted." Edward Warren in his *Mammals of Colorado* in 1910 claimed that wolves were present in every county of Colorado with the possible exception of Denver. Within the next 20 years however, wolves were zealously eradicated from the state. In 1929, Stanley Young, a government hunter and naturalist with the old Biological Survey, left a den intact on the Uncompaghe plateau. He claimed he didn't want to be the man who "had killed the last wolf in Colorado." The last authenticated wolf taken in our state was in the Conejos region in 1943. Today, almost certainly, no wolves remain.

Generally wolves are now found mostly in the inaccessible parts of our continent, the wilds of Alaska and the Canadian Arctic, certain other Canadian wilderness areas, and a national park in Michigan. They are confined to areas where there is little or no conflict with livestock interests, for it was as a result of this conflict that wolves disappeared from our state.

As the human population in our area increased, untouched areas became ever more scarce and much of the wild range lands were turned over to man's domestic creatures. Big game mammal populations rapidly dwindled, and it became evident that man and the larger wild beasts could not both exist in the same area in high densities. The packs of Colorado were forced to turn their attentions to domestic stock; certainly also the calves and sheep must have been easier to prey upon than adult deer and elk. Thus ranchers, forced to protect their livelihood, and the wolf, unable to change the way it lived or existed on grass and roots, became locked in a deadly battle.

As the wolves became more destructive, certain individuals became recognized as particularly notorious. The stockmen and hunters knew these by sight, identifying defects or other peculiarities and quirks in their appearance or behavior. Colorado had its share of these wolves named for their dubious achievements. Names like Three Toes, Bigfoot, Old Lefty, the Phantom, the Greenhorn, Old Whitey and Rags can still be recalled by some old-timers. Many of these animals showed incredible shrewdness in eluding traps and hunters, sometimes for years. Stanley Young, in his work, *The Wolves of North America*, recounts some of the more memorable local individuals. "Old Lefty" of Burns Hole, a wolf that lost his left foot to a trap, killed 384 head of cattle in Eagle County from 1913 to 1921. "Old Whitey" and his mate, "Three Toes of the Apishapha," plagued the Bear Springs Mesa region near Trinidad for 15 years before their capture in 1923. In the Meeker region, long noted for its wolf stories, a shaggy maned wolf called "Rags" was claimed to have killed \$10,000 worth of livestock before he was taken. Other famous Colorado renegades were the "Unawep Wolf," named for Unawep Canyon and now in the Museum of Natural History, "Bigfoot" of the Grand Junction region, "the Phantom" that ranged near Fruita, and the "Greenhorn Wolf" that tormented the ranchers of the Pueblo region.

In the early part of this century wolf depredations became so great that in some areas of the state their toll was one-third to one-half of the calf crop. Joseph Neal, a

stockman and conservationist of the Meeker area, in an interview with Stanley Young in 1940 claimed that, when wolves were at their greatest abundance on the ranges, one-quarter of all cattle showed scars caused by wolf bites or some other wolf inflicted injury. This estimate may not be exaggerated. A newborn calf, even when protected by its mother, was no match for four or five wolves. The blossoming cattle industry had to take steps to control the rocketing losses inflicted by the native wolf population.

In Colorado, there had been a government bounty beginning in the 1860s which authorized the range territories to pay up to \$2.00 a wolf pelt. In areas of particular wolf problems, the county as well might have paid an additional bounty. This bounty alone was not sufficient to justify a trapper putting all his time into wolf hunting since other animals' pelts could be sold to clothing agents far more lucratively. By the early 1870s, local county stock associations such as the Bent-Prowers County Cattle and Horse Growers of Southern Colorado, the Piceance Creek Stock Growers Association of Rio Blanco County and the North Park Stockmen's Association were formed and began offering bounties for wolves in addition to existent county, state and federal bounties. As a result some trappers made incredible money for that time. To one trapper, who in 1912-13 brought in 140 wolves, the Rio Blanco group paid \$7,000 which is \$50 per wolf, and this didn't include the government bounties the hunter was eligible to collect. The North Park group paid \$35 per wolf and \$10 per pup. It was said that wolves were so numerous in this region that a good hunter could easily earn \$100-\$200 per week. Between 1904 and 1908, the Rio Blanco group was paying \$150 for each wolf. It is easy to envision then how, between government and industry sponsored incentives, the wolf population of Colorado was effectively exterminated by 1930. The wolf, with minor variations in its manner of living, had existed and hunted in Colorado for close to two million years. Within less than a century, through extensive use of poisoned bait, elaborate traps and improved firearms, man had eliminated him.

Today, occasional wolf sightings and tracks are reported, but more than likely these are coyotes or domestic dogs. Reintroduction suggestions and proposals surface from time to time, usually without much substance. In an area where the raising of livestock is an integral part of the state economy, most ranchers are understandably less than keen on the idea. The livestock industry, which views the wolf's smaller cousin, the coyote, warily, has not easily forgotten the very real damage wolves can accomplish. Also there are more basic problems with reintroduction. Foreign wolves would have to be brought into and released in an area completely unfamiliar to them. Wolves being great wanderers, there would be no guarantee reintroduced wolves would stay together, much less stay in the unfamiliar foster area. Before this can be accomplished much more has yet to be learned about the very nature of the wolf.

Wolves are gone from Colorado, but hopefully areas where wolves still are plentiful may learn a lesson from our action and view the wolf in a more favored light. Perhaps in these areas, wolves could come to be seen as a valuable natural resident with as valid a right as any to be allowed to continue living much as they have for millions of years. Less severe control methods might be devised insuring both the safety of domestic stock and the survival of the wolf. If present protective measures are not rigidly enforced, we will be banishing the wolf to our zoos and our textbooks and exiling it forever from the greater natural scheme of which it is a part.

BRIGADIER GENERAL YEAGER TO QUALIFY FOR THE MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of identical legislation, I would like to relay my words of support for a bill which the House passed yesterday. This measure, H.R. 8151, authorizes the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager. This outstanding gentleman and American patriot risked his life and computed odds in flying the XS-1 research aircraft faster than the speed of sound. The date of that historic event, October 14, 1947, will long be remembered as the beginning of a new era in aviation. Today, supersonic speeds are commonplace, but in October 1947 many leading scientists were convinced that the shock effect would pitch a plane up, roll it wildly and virtually explode it against that invisible wall of speed. I take a personal pride in the fact that this historic event was recorded at Edwards Air Force Base, a part of California's 18th Congressional District.

This legislation has been offered in order to make an exception to sections 8741 and 8744 of title 10, United States Code, in that this award will qualify as a noncombat Medal of Honor during peacetime. Brigadier General Yeager would thus rightfully join fellow recipients of this exceptional honor, Comdr. Richard A. Byrd, Jr., and Capt. Charles A. Lindbergh. Now retired and living in Grass Valley, Calif., Brigadier General Yeager's record of service to his country is a brilliant one: one which is highly deserved of this special form of recognition. His wartime score of 63 missions, 13 German planes shot down, 3 damaged, 5 Messerschmitt 109's on one mission and 4 Focke-Wulf 109's on another has already been recognized by receipt of a Silver Star, a Cluster, a Distinguished Flying Cross with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Bronze Star, Air Medal with six Clusters, and Purple Heart. He was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Harmon Trophy by President Eisenhower for flying at a speed of 1,650 m.p.h.

Yeager's own account of October 14, 1947, is a harrowing one indeed. Wearing a parachute that would have been useless had the X-1 gone out of control or exploded and aching from broken ribs that should have disqualified him from the mission, Yeager sealed himself inside the cockpit when a B-29 ferried his craft to 7,000 feet. At the 26,000 foot mark, the B-29 dipped its nose for the 1,000 foot dive preceding the drop. When he dropped, Yeager recounts his first reaction of a "fiery sun about 6 feet away" which blinded him as the "the plane bucked and fell." "The plane came to life and lunged forward," the B-29 was left

behind, and Yeager watched the mach needle creep past .9 indicating 90 percent of the speed of sound. When the mach needle went past 1.0, he was flying ahead of sound. "I was so high and so remote, and the airplane was so very quiet that I might have almost been motionless."

This feat in itself, in my estimation, is most deserving indeed of special recognition. Taken in combination with his entire record of service to America, Brigadier General Yeager's breaking of the sound barrier crowns a glorious career. The Medal of Honor is a very special award, and Brigadier General Yeager is a very special man, whose spectacular record of achievement must be acknowledged in kind. It is my great honor to speak on behalf of this fine American and I commend my colleagues for their confirmation of this most deserved recognition.

NORTH CAROLINA CLAIMANTS FACE LONG DELAYS WITH SOCIAL SECURITY APPEALS PROCESS

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues in the Congress know, the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security has been conducting hearings on the problems individuals across the country are experiencing with delays in the Social Security Administration's appeals process. I would like to insert the statement I presented during the subcommittee's hearings showing some of the problems faced by the people I represent in North Carolina in having their social security benefits claims reviewed within reasonable time periods.

The following is the statement I presented:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION APPEALS PROCESS

(Statement of Representative W. G. (BILL) HEFNER, Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina, before the Subcommittee on Social Security, Committee on Ways and Means)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I appreciate having this opportunity to present testimony before your Subcommittee during these hearings concerning the problems of delays in the Social Security appeals process. These delays are indeed causing many claimants to have to wait long periods of time before their rights can be adjudicated by a hearings officer as required by the Social Security law.

This is not my first effort to determine the reasons behind the huge backlog of hearings cases and to try and find a solution to this situation. I've encountered many problems in trying to assist the people I represent in North Carolina in having their claims reviewed within a reasonable amount of time. Since coming to Congress, my staff and I have consistently been frustrated in our efforts to try to help people receive prompt consideration of their disability claims and other social security problems.

I believe that the long delays we've been

experiencing are inconsistent with the intent of the social security programs—namely, to provide insurance against loss of earnings in the event of retirement, death, or disability.

I realize that there are several factors which have contributed to the present dilemma of huge backlogs of pending claims and payment problems. An informal survey of Members conducted by Congressman St Germain revealed that constituents across the country are experiencing delays of anywhere from 6 months to 3 years in having their appeals cases heard. The reasons for the backlog appear to be numerous, ranging from the Supplemental Security Income program (SSI) caseload to the fact that Administrative Law Judges are required to have seven years of experience and are comparatively underpaid. Also, with a reversal rate of approximately 50%, the benefits of appealing a social security decision are apparent. Therefore, we have the current intolerable situation of at least 120,000 backlogged cases.

Often the people seeking these decisions are those most desperately in need of assistance, and yet their hearings are delayed indefinitely. The disastrous financial effects this delay in processing and approving disability and other claims of people who are totally dependent on social security payments is tragic.

Commissioner Cardwell has indicated that the median processing time for disability hearings in July 1975 was about 7 months, and, of course, half of the cases took longer than 7 months to process. Also, figures released by the Social Security Administration show that in January 1975, the average processing time for initial disability claims was 110 days for allowed claims. However, before the present crisis situation, disability claim processing time averages have fluctuated between 60 and 90 days. In reality, unfortunately, the actual number of days and months people must wait for decisions on their claims is substantially higher. The length of time spent in processing allowed reconsideration determinations is generally longer than for initial disability determinations.

It is my understanding that the average processing time for a hearing decision has jumped in the last 3 years from 93 to 213 days as of December 1974. This figure represents the amount of time elapsed from the date a hearing request is made until the date of the decision. Even more shocking are some of the cases I've experienced from the region of North Carolina that I represent.

I estimate that the number of pending Social Security claims in my office alone total between 200 and 250 cases. Of those, at least 50% are at the hearing stage.

In July, I made several inquiries through the Social Security Administration in an effort to try to do something about this huge backlog of hearings cases. Of particular concern were the delays my office was experiencing and still faces today with the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals (BHA) office in Charlotte, North Carolina, which handles almost all hearings cases from the 8th Congressional District.

I requested that Administrative Law Judges (ALJ) from other regions be assigned to the Charlotte BHA office on a temporary basis to clear up some of the backlogged cases which have been waiting for a hearing since 1974. But I was informed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge of the Social Security Administration that such delays at the hearings stage is a nationwide problem and that the situation in Charlotte is not as severe as in other areas.

As of September 13, 1975, I have been advised that the national average of cases pending per Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) totaled 153. In the Charlotte BHA office the

average number of pending cases per ALJ came to 167.

I was advised in July that a new Administrative Law Judge would be assigned to the Charlotte office in August. And I received assurances that two more Administrative Law Judges would be assigned to the Charlotte BHA office as soon as possible. However, our problems with hearings delays have not yet been resolved by any means. Within the past several weeks, a number of incidents have been brought to my attention which illustrate these problems.

Through a telephone call to the Charlotte BHA office requesting the status of a claimant's hearing, we were advised that a hearing decision had been rendered on this claim. However, we were told that the delay in advising the claimant of the decision was caused by a lack of clerical personnel to type the final decision. Furthermore, we were informed that a two months' backlog of cases existed: these cases had been decided but were waiting to be typed.

Now, I really can see no valid excuse for this type of delay. Typists do not require the specialized knowledge that ALJs do. Therefore, I cannot understand the reasons for hiring additional clerical personnel on a temporary basis to clear up this particular backlogged situation.

A very discouraging and frustrating problem that I've consistently experienced with the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals relates to my efforts to be advised of the action taken on an individual's claim. I believe that when my office contacts the Social Security Administration requesting to be advised of the action taken on a case, this information should be made available to me at the same time it is provided to the claimant. Many times my office has not even been given the courtesy of a response to my inquiries made concerning such claims. Therefore, a number of constituents who have asked for my help with their claims receive a notice of denial or approval from the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals without my ever knowing that a decision on this claim has been rendered.

In checking on the status of cases at the hearing stage, I have found it easier, quicker, and more reliable to obtain this information from the Managers of the Social Security District Offices located within the area I represent. For example, after repeated efforts to obtain the status of a hearing request file in 1974 by a claimant from the Charlotte BHA, my office finally contacted the District Manager of the Social Security office in Kannapolis, North Carolina, for a status report. The Kannapolis District office Manager advised me that this claim had been sent to one of the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals offices in Mississippi for a hearing determination. I did not receive at that time nor have I to this date received any word from the Charlotte BHA office as to the action taken on this claim.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the Subcommittee's attention also several examples of the truly inordinate delays in the processing of disability claims which I've experienced within only the past several weeks.

One woman in my district filed a "Request for a Hearing" on her claim January 2, 1975. Another woman filed for a hearing on her claim January 27, 1975. On the same day both individuals called my office concerning their claims as they had received no word from Social Security since filing a hearing request. Upon checking with the District Social Security office, I was advised that neither of these claims has yet been heard; no hearing dates have been set; and there is no indication as to when hearings for these two claims may be scheduled.

In another instance, I received the fol-

lowing information in a letter from the Knapolls District Social Security Branch Manager on May 20, 1975, in response to my inquiry concerning the status of a constituent's claim. (In referring to a specific case, for purposes of identification, I will refer to the claimant as Mrs. Jane Doe and to the Judge as Judge Smith, although these are not the individuals' true names.)

"This concerns your telephone inquiry on this date regarding the above-named claimant. . . ."

"Mrs. Doe filed a request for Social Security (SSA) disability on October 31, 1973. . . . She filed a request for reconsideration on July 12, 1974, and the denial was affirmed. She filed a "Request for a Hearing" on September 30, 1974. Mrs. Doe's case is ready to be heard but was assigned to Judge Smith. Unfortunately, Judge Smith has been hospitalized for five weeks and the date he is to return to work is uncertain at this point in time.

"I inquired about the possibility of re-assignment of this case to another judge, but as you know, each of the judges are heavily backlogged. Mrs. Doe's case is at the top of Judge Smith's list. We are hopeful that she will have her hearing shortly."

After receiving no further word from the Charlotte BHA office concerning this case, I again made another inquiry through the Knapolls District office, and received the following response dated September 26, 1975.

"This concerns your recent inquiry on behalf of Mrs. Doe. This case is still pending at the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals (BHA) in Charlotte, North Carolina. As you know, Judge Smith has been sickly and has been able to hear only a limited number of cases. In addition there is a continuous prevailing backlog to be heard.

"I called the BHA in Charlotte on September 25, 1975, and they indicated that it may still be several weeks before Mrs. Doe's case is scheduled for a hearing."

Therefore, as this information indicates, over one year has elapsed since this claimant filed a "Request for a Hearing" (September 30, 1974), and her case has still not even been scheduled to be heard by an Administrative Law Judge.

I also received the following letter from a constituent dated September 28, 1975, concerning this person's request for a hearing on her claim.

"Thank you so much for your recent letter and for the interest you have shown in my problems with Social Security.

"I filed an application for a hearing this past week. The Social Security representative advised me at that time that it usually takes about one year to process an application and schedule a hearing.

"I would again appreciate anything you could do to speed up this process and to assure that I receive a fair hearing. A year seems like a ridiculously long time for processing, and a person could starve to death during that year if it were not for the goodness of relatives and friends."

In my view, hearings delays such as these few examples among many that I have mentioned to the Subcommittee are unnecessary, unfounded; and in addition, they were a real hardship on those people who are unemployed due to disability and who must depend upon this assistance from Social Security—whenever it may come—in trying to meet their daily, basic needs. In the meantime, many such individuals lose their homes and all their belongings.

In addition, I would like to bring to the Subcommittee's attention a recent incident of the Social Security Administration providing me with erroneous information with respect to an individual's disability claim. After writing expressing my interest to the Social Security Administration in this claim for disability benefits, I was advised by the Bureau of Disability Insurance in a letter dated August 5, 1975, that this claimant's records were under review by the headquar-

ters disability staff. In a subsequent letter from the Bureau of Disability Insurance dated September 23, 1975, I was informed that the Bureau was not yet able to provide me a complete report on this person's claim as the review of her records was not completed.

In the meantime, I received a letter on September 29, 1975, from this same individual stating: "On September 6, 1975, I received my first disability check from Social Security. It took eight months, but thanks to you . . . it was finally resolved."

This is only one among the many occasions when I have received erroneous and misleading information on the status of an individual's claim. There is clearly a need, in my view, for the Social Security Administration to be able to respond to such inquiries properly so that I may advise constituents correctly of action taken on their claims.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have cited enough examples of the delays and mix-ups I have experienced with individual Social Security claims. However, let me stress that these represent only a few of the numerous problems my office has encountered in trying to assist constituents with their claims.

I greatly sympathize with the problems and concerns of the people who contact me regarding the long delays in the processing of their claims. Such delays work a real financial and emotional hardship on these individuals who are waiting for their disability claims to be heard by an ALJ.

The problem of backlogged hearings cases has become a very emotional issue. As a result, hundreds of bills have been introduced in the Congress in an effort to deal with this problem and to rectify some of the current delays in the Social Security appeals process. I too have co-sponsored such legislation, particularly the Social Security Rights Act, introduced by Congressman Seiberling. This bill would require the Social Security Administration to make decisions on social security benefits claims and payment problems within reasonable periods of time.

However, I'm not certain that any one of the many proposed bills contain the sole answer or the correct solution for eliminating these backlogs. It would seem to me that some of the burden for eliminating such backlogs must rest with the administrative personnel within the Social Security Administration. Therefore, the question I raise is: what exactly can be done at the administrative level and what exactly can be done at the legislative level to reach a meaningful and lasting solution to these problems in the processing of benefits claims?

The Commissioner has proposed an increase in the number of Administrative Law Judges within the Social Security Administration in addition to providing legal assistants and other support personnel for each ALJ's personal staff. There's no doubt that a doubling of the number of personnel within the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals will help to reduce the backlog of pending cases.

Also, as I mentioned before, a number of legislative proposals have been introduced to try to deal with this problem. Some of these measures would provide for an increase in the grade and pay of Social Security Administrative Law Judges, and other measures would expand the coverage of the Administrative Procedure Act to bring SSI hearing examiners under its provisions. However, I question, as have others, whether the APA is suited for the type of benefits claims adjudicated by such agencies as the Social Security Administration.

Of great concern to me is the cost of hiring additional ALJs and ALJ support staff as well as the cost of increasing the pay for Social Security ALJs since these costs must be paid for with Social Security trust fund monies. I believe we are all aware of the concerns which have been expressed about the current and future financing problems of the Social Security trust fund. Individual

payroll taxes which go into the trust fund to sustain its operation will have to be increased in order to pay for the future retirement and old age and survivors benefits to which individuals are entitled.

I firmly believe that any attempt to add an extra financial burden to the Social Security trust fund and to spend our citizens' money by substantially increasing the costs of the Social Security hearings and claims adjudication process should be approached with great care and caution. Irresponsible use of these funds could result in individuals having to pay more and more of their paychecks to support the Social Security trust fund as money goes out for increased hearings and claims processing costs with no definite assurance that such actions will indeed prove helpful in expediting the processing of benefits claims.

Therefore, I would suggest that before the Congress take any legislative action that the GAO or some other independent source bring together all of the studies that have been conducted on the processing of benefits claims and make any further needed investigations, with the result of putting together all of this information into one complete study. Such an effort should be conducted for the purpose of determining the most efficient means of adjudicating the claims of individuals filing for Social Security or Supplemental Security Income benefits.

The study should contain an audit of the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals to determine if the Bureau is making maximum use of its current resources. I would suggest that the impact of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) and its use in adjudicating the benefits claims be included in this report.

Furthermore, I believe that any such report should address itself to the possible need to review the productivity level of SSA Administrative Law Judges. Under the APA, as I understand it, there is no provision stipulating the number of hearings an ALJ should process, and there is no review mechanism under which the performance of ALJs can be evaluated. Therefore, a discussion of the merits of implementing such an evaluation procedure could prove beneficial in determining the criteria and standards ALJs should use to process hearings in a more expeditious manner.

Another question I raise that could be included in this study is the proposal of setting shorter time limits in which claimants can request further consideration of their claims. It is my understanding that although the Social Security law currently provides for a 6-month time period in which persons may request further review of their claims, the time in which individuals now request such reviews averages between 60 and 90 days. Lastly, I would suggest that this study include an assessment of the major legislative alternatives pending before the Subcommittee to discuss their viability toward making beneficial and lasting solutions to the processing of benefits claims.

I believe that with the proper directives established and a time limit indicated for the GAO or another independent source to use in producing this report, the results of such a study could provide the Congress with the proper framework to determine the needed areas in which to channel our legislative responses to the problems of adjudicating benefits claims within a reasonable time.

I appreciate having this opportunity to present my views on this truly pressing problem to the Members of this Subcommittee. I trust that my testimony will be helpful in pointing out some of the specific problems I have experienced with respect to the processing of benefits claims. I hope that as a result of bringing these problems to your attention, the people of the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina and people in other areas of the country may look forward

to receiving the prompt and careful attention their benefits cases deserve.

PAUL ROBESON REMEMBERED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the history of blacks in America has been written in invisible ink. Our struggles and achievements have gone unrecorded, and their importance has been minimized. Slowly, we are reversing this trend. Slowly, the history of America and the history of its black people begin to merge.

In our own lifetime, we have witnessed this process occur, to a man whose achievements have already made him a legend—Mr. Paul Robeson. The artistic and political activities of Mr. Robeson have made a permanent contribution to the life of our Nation. And yet, his name remains virtually excluded from the public record. There are those however, whose lives are indebted to the precedents established by Mr. Robeson, who have proudly begun to reverse this silence. I now commend to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in *Alternatives*, a publication of the Harlem Commonwealth Council:

PAUL ROBESON REMEMBERED IN HARLEM

In the age of Muhammed Ali and Abdul Kareem Jabbar (Lew Alcindor) it is possible to forget the heroes and heroines in our rich cultural history. It is therefore noteworthy that this spring the James Varick Community Center, Inc. and the Paul Robeson Archives, Inc. sponsored a benefit concert at the Mother A.M.E.Z. Church in tribute to one of America's all-time great artists.

The souvenir program for the concert began with the following message from Dr. George W. McMurray, pastor of Mother Zion, "It is not a coincidence that the Mother A.M.E. Zion Church and the Paul Robeson Archives are sponsoring a joint venture to highlight the achievements of the Black church and those of one of its native sons—Paul Robeson. Both have been proclaimed as champions of freedom and equal justice for a depressed people."

In the Spring of 1973, on the occasion of Robeson's 75th birthday, a group of his friends sponsored a "Salute to Paul Robeson" at Carnegie Hall. This celebration produced an overwhelmingly positive response from people in all walks of life across the country. The Salute Committee felt that, in view of decades of virtual exclusion of Robeson's name from reference books and the files of the mass media in the United States, it was essential that there be a center in this country that would assemble, preserve and make available to scholars and the public, a complete record of his life and work. Hence, the proceeds from the "Salute" were used to establish the Paul Robeson Archives. The Archives Board of Directors includes Harry Belafonte, Lloyd Brown, Roberta Yancy Dent, Martin Popper, and Paul Robeson, Jr.

Since June of 1973 the Archives has processed over 10,000 items—tape recordings, film, photographs, news articles, documents and writings. A body of materials documenting the period from 1915 through 1949 has been made available for research on a limited basis. Meanwhile, additional materials already on hand are being organized, and the Archives looks forward to beginning the

microfilming and cataloguing phases of its work by Fall, 1975.

This is a unique collection which, in addition to documenting Robeson's career, helps to document an important era in Black history in America. The materials have come from various sources, including Robeson's personal collection, which he has permitted the Archives to copy in its entirety. The Salute Committee contributed tapes, slides, film and other materials used in its tribute; and individuals from around the world have donated memorabilia from their private collections. It is estimated that ultimately, the collection may include nearly 50,000 items.

Guest stars at the Benefit Concert included Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Howard da Silva, Pete Seeger, Don Shirley, and the Cathedral Choir of Mother A.M.E. Zion Church.

Ossie Davis commented that in the Soviet Union there is a Mount Paul Robeson in honor of the giant native son of the United States, but that in our country there is scarcely a "molehill." Those who wish to help that "molehill" grow into a mountain may send their tax-deductible contributions to the Paul Robeson Archives, 157 West 57th Street, New York City 10019.

"ON THE ROCKS" AT VARIANCE WITH THE FACTS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the National Association for Justice has been working for prison reform since 1972. They have spotlighted many of the false notions about what a prison is really like and sought to bring about true reform in our prison systems so that the recidivism rate directly related to adverse prison conditions can be substantially cut.

Recently they objected to the ABC-TV network show, "On the Rocks," which portrays prison life in a friendly, humorous way. Certainly there is nothing enjoyable about being in prison; but without programing or information that portrays the true conditions in our Nation's prisons, Americans continue to close their eyes to the need for prison reform.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including at this point in the RECORD a copy of the text of the letter sent by the National Association for Justice.

The text follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE,

Washington, D.C., October 13, 1975.

DEAR —: The National Association for Justice, a non-profit organization founded in 1972 to promote constructive reform of prisons and the criminal justice system, hereby lodges with you our strong protest regarding the ABC network's program "On the Rocks."

On behalf of the thousands of our members now in prison, on behalf of the half-million men and women incarcerated in America on any given day, we urge the termination of this program.

"On the Rocks" deletes the severity of prison conditions to make a comedy, but prison is no laughing matter. Prisons and jails are, with few exceptions, greatly overcrowded, dirty, noisy, ill-heated, poorly ventilated, and highly dangerous places to live. Each year, dozens die and thousands

suffer from the lack of basic medical treatment. Inmates live in danger of their lives, in an environment of beatings, shootings, stabbings, Mace and homosexual rape. Yet, "On the Rocks" portrays prison quarters as spacious, like a college dormitory. Medical facilities are represented as being on a par with "free world" private hospitals. There is no terror in "On the Rocks," for no one is going to get hurt, by guards or inmates.

NAJ believes that "On the Rocks" violates the letter and spirit of the Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters, which expressly states that:

"No program shall be presented which through artifice or simulation would mislead the audience as to any material facts." (NAB TV Code, Program Standards, Sec. IV, para. 19)

"On The Rocks" obstructs the efforts of such parties as NAJ to effect urgent and necessary reforms, by misleading the public regarding material facts of prison life and thereby undermining the public will to support such reforms.

NAJ does not advocate "coddling criminals". We believe that prisons are socially necessary and that the laws of the land should be enforced. We insist, however, that prisoners are citizens and human beings and have the right, therefore, to fair and humane treatment while incarcerated.

"On The Rocks" must, in all justice and human decency, leave the airways.

We believe further that ABC should provide suitable equivalent time for presentation of a realistic portrayal of penal conditions, one which gives proper prominence to the prisoners' view of their circumstances.

NAJ calls upon you to take whatever steps are within your power to help rectify this mockery of human suffering.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. SHEA, Ph.D.,
Administrative Assistant.

SPAIN KNOWS THE COMMUNISTS—TOO WELL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Communists will never forgive General Franco and the Spanish people for defeating them more than 35 years ago. The Nationalist revolution which began in 1936 and was victorious in 1939, prevented the Communists from establishing a beachhead in western Europe.

Spain was neutral during World War II. Had the Communists won in 1939, when World War II broke out, France would have been encircled. Communist armies would have attacked France together with the Nazis, since they had signed a joint nonaggression pact at that time. The possibility exists that France would have fallen much earlier and Britain would have been the next victim of Hitler's aggression. A neutral Spain blocked the Nazis from that opportunity.

With the southern flank of NATO in complete disarray as a result of the Portuguese move to the left, anti-American bias in Greece and Turkey, and the social and economic disruption in Italy, Spain stands out as the only reliable ally the United States has in that region.

Spain has been the victim of Communist organized and supported terrorism

for 4 decades. In recent months the campaign of terrorism has intensified. It is hoped by the Communists, that the liberal and socialist communities will support them in their efforts to overthrow the Spanish Government and establish a leftist regime. Spain's response to the increase in terrorism has been to apply appropriate counter-measures, including the execution of terrorists who murder police officers. As the Communists expected, the liberals and socialists throughout the world began screaming against Spain for executing those who had murdered Spanish police officers. The same liberals and socialists are usually strangely silent when the Soviet Union or Red China murders innocent political opponents or imprisons them in slave labor camps for decades.

The Washington Post, September 30, 1975, in an editorial, made it clear that Spain's execution of terrorists, convicted of murdering police officers, could not be tolerated. They recommend that the United States should delay agreement with Spain on military bases. The Washington Post never suggests that we should delay agreements with the Soviet Union on the grounds of the prosecution of intellectuals, religious believers, Jews, or the other usual victims of Communist persecution, the Soviet people.

I would like to call my colleagues attention to a valuable article that appeared in American Opinion for September 1975, written by Gary Allen. The article entitled "Détente with Monsters" gives chapter and verse of Communist persecutions in every country of the world in which they have had power. From 1917, when the Bolsheviks took power in Russia, to today, political, religious and national persecution have been constant. Mr. Allen's account of the persecutions that took place in Spain during the Red Regime of 1936-39 is of particular interest in the light of Spain's refusal to allow communism to be inflicted upon them again. I would like to ask that part of Gary Allen's article in American Opinion, "Détente with Monsters" be included as part of my remarks:

DÉTENTE WITH MONSTERS

(By Gary Allen)

TERROR FOR TERROR'S SAKE

When V.I. Lenin was raised to power in Russia following the St. Petersburg coup of November 1917, the world began to hear much of him and his commitment to violence and terror. Setting the pattern for Mao's epigram decades later that "Power comes out of the barrel of a gun," Lenin declared: "Power is not handed over, it is taken by arms." Consequently, he warned, "the substitution of the proletarian state for the bourgeois state is impossible without a violent revolution." After Lenin's death in 1924, the new Soviet tyrant, Joseph Stalin, emphasized: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on the use of force against the bourgeoisie."

Much to the distress of many pioneers on the road to "peaceful coexistence" and "détente," the Communists never failed in practice to make clear their utter contempt for those in their power. Seeing brute force as the only means with which they could deal successfully with others, they developed that weapon into the strategy of deliberate terrorism to insure conquest and subjugation. Terror as a fine art was encouraged by Lenin, perfected by Stalin, and remains an important part of Communist policy to this day.

It was Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, prosecutor of the Soviet Purge Trials of the 1930s, who analyzed terrorism as "a toll of the coup d'état," whereby "The whole matter is in the top, therefore the top must be removed. . . . Heads are peculiar in that they do not grow on again." Simply speaking, the Communists put into practice the Leninist concept that terrorism and violence were not only "inevitable" but desirable to assure the Communist advance. It was only a matter of time before the heads really began to roll. By the tens of millions.

The atrocities began not only where the Communists encountered resistance to their plans, but even where they did not. The idea was (and remains) that to be truly effective, terror must be applied without reason—everywhere and against everyone. In 1918 and 1919, according to the records, Lenin was executing his captives without trial at the rate of one thousand a month.

Securing Communist power over the U.S.S.R. has required the imprisonment of scores of millions of human beings in a network of death camps which still spans the Soviet Union. These slave camps are more active today than in the era of the Party purges of the 1930s. According to a recent Associated Press report, Henry Kissinger's friends in Soviet Russia are now holding more than a million people in concentration camps. Other sources place the number as high as five million. A U.S. Senate Report, issued three years ago, says that such concentration camps number in the thousands; that conditions of starvation and servitude in these camps are as bad as ever they were under Stalin; and, that twenty-five percent of all heavy labor in the U.S.S.R. is done by political prisoners. The Senate document quotes eyewitness testimony of continuing forced labor (in the open) at forty degrees below zero, of cruel medical experiments on slave laborers, of slaves so starved that they cut themselves for blood in which to dip their tiny crusts of bread, of hundreds of women prisoners being crushed by tanks, of nuns stripped and dragged through the snow for the crime of praying in the forced labor camp

One of those testifying at the Hearings was Avraham Shifrin, who for the crime of being a Jew spent ten years in a dozen Soviet concentration camps, and who has at last escaped to the West. Shifrin told from his own experience of how slave labor is today used in Russia to gather raw materials for export—the very raw materials Mr. Kissinger is seeking in return for American technology and agricultural products. Shifrin recalls, for instance, one slave laborer who cut off his own hand with an axe and asked another prisoner to put the hand inside a load of lumber destined for shipment to the West. The prisoner said that the severed hand would warn those still living in freedom of the conditions in which lumber is cut under Communist slavery.

One must count it a double tragedy that no such grisly hand is likely ever to be delivered to Henry A. Kissinger, that master of *détente* through trade, at the State Department.

Another of the laboratories for the testing of Red Terror was Spain. By the time the three-year Spanish War was over, at least one million people had died, literally decimating the country. Over two hundred thousand of these fatalities were the result of systematic assassinations by the Communists who controlled the 1936 "Popular Front" Government. Scores of G.P.U. jails were operated to torture and murder those resisting in Madrid and other major cities. Once again, as everywhere else, the clergy were almost universally targeted for torture and death. From the documented eye-witness accounts of these widespread atrocities, we have selected a few of the thousands that are typical. The following accounts were recorded in 1936 at Puente-Genil, Province of Cordova:

"One hundred and fifty-four citizens were murdered here between July 24th and August 18th by the Communists, who also burnt seven churches, twenty-eight private houses, an almshouse for old men, and the barracks of the Civil Guard.

"Seventeen of the murdered men were forced to remain with their arms raised above their heads for several hours—a boy of sixteen among them fainted from the pain—and they were then shot dead on the railway line near the station. Of the forty people held in the jail on the eve of the entry of the Nationalist troops, the following were shot dead: Jesus Cisneros; Angel Morales; Julio Aguilar and his son Julio; Francisco Estrada Morales, and his five special constables from Lucana.

"One witness among the prisoners, Juan Rubio Zurita, who managed miraculously to escape, relates that three of the prisoners, Jesus Cisneros Rull, a secondary school teacher, and two working men named Rafael Morales and Antonio Fernandez Jurado, were frequently taken out into the prison courtyard, where they were scourged with ox-sinews and threatened with death

"Antonio Baena Castellano, the owner of a fruit farm known as Porto Alegre, was killed there by two local Communists named Herrerias, who hacked him to death with axes. Then they cut the body to pieces and put it in a trunk, where it was found by a brother of the victim. This is sworn by Jose Garcia Diego Ballon. The same witness also relates that Francisco Ortega Montilla, seventy years of age, and his wife, were tied to their bed, soaked with petrol, and burnt alive. Francisco Florida Lucerna, a working man, was wounded by a rifle bullet. He was then tied by one leg to a motor lorry and dragged about the village amid the jeers and rejoicings of the mob. His body was finally burnt on the outskirts of the town. The witness in this case is Federico Valentin Gimenez, seventeen, a printer.

"Luis Sicilia, a student, was present when Sergeant Ocana, in charge of the local station Civil Guards, was mortally wounded by a bullet and then cut in two with an axe. This happened at the station living quarters.

"After having handed over one hundred thousand pesetas as the price of their liberty, Manuel Gomez Perales saw his four sons put to death by the revolutionaries and was later killed by them himself. This is from the evidence of Jorge Alcantara Reina.

"Manuel Martin Lopez, a trumpeter of the Civil Guards, was killed with an axe, after which they cut his throat and carried his head in triumph on the point of a sword through the village.

"The remaining victims were murdered by means of the procedure which the butchers called 'the little walk.' This consisted in walking them through the streets to be subjected to the most abject humiliations on the part of the revolutionary rabble and then having them shot dead by lads from sixteen to eighteen years of age.

"All the statues in the churches were hacked to pieces with axes, and those ecclesiastical vestments which were not burnt were dragged through the mire of the streets. A gang also played football with the head of the statue of the Immaculate Conception, who is the patroness of the village."

The inhumanities listed above are virtually identical in nature to those chronicled and photographed in town after town, province after province, throughout Spain. Thousands of nuns were publicly raped, thousands of priests murdered, many being burned to death in their churches, and hundreds of clergy were literally crucified. The crypts of the churches were opened and the mummified bodies of beloved clergymen dumped onto the church steps. Everywhere the Communists operated, always and everywhere, it was the same.

USES OF THE WAR

When we come to the millions of Communist victims during and after the Second World War, the epic cruelties shrink behind the visage of cold statistics. In their millions they apparently have no effect on our masters of *détente* even when expressed as aggregate totals. How does one measure mass murder? What does it mean that according to official estimates the Communists have murdered 100,000 Hungarians; 300,000 Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians; 1,200,000 Poles; 150,000 Romanians; 1,200,000 North Vietnamese; 300,000 Serbs; 100,000 Macedonians; 900,000 Croatsians; 1,000,000 Tibetans; and on and on and on?

We need to remember the crimes of the Communists during the subjugation of Eastern (and Central) Europe and China. We should not forget the more than fifteen thousand Polish officers and intellectuals who were shot in the back of the head and buried in mass graves at Katyn forest. We need to remember the two to five million anti-Communist Russians who, with General Vlasov, were forcibly returned to Stalin's torturers and killers on orders of General Dwight David Eisenhower immediately after the end of hostilities. We must not forget that Communist agents at Buchenwald and other Nazi concentration camps actually helped the S.S. to administer the genocide that the Reds are still practicing in Russia today.

Nor should we forget that the extermination camps and death marches which Solzhenitsyn has described from his sufferings in Russia are also being employed at this minute in Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, East Germany, Mainland China, North Korea, Tibet, Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Since 1917, more than one hundred million human beings have been murdered . . . and the killing of the helpless continues.

By such methods all resistance to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is suppressed or destroyed. The methods are always the same. The West has repeatedly seen and recorded such Communist methods . . . and forgotten.

Let Solzhenitsyn have the last word here . . . a courtesy he has earned in the slave camps and asylums of the very Communists with whom President Ford has been touring. Here is what he says:

"One of your leading newspapers, after the end of Vietnam, gave a full, big headline: 'The Blessed Silence.' I would not wish that kind of blessed silence on my worst enemy. I would not wish that kind of national unity upon my worst enemy. I have spent eleven years in the 'archipelago.' And for half of my lifetime I have studied this question. Looking at this terrible tragedy in Vietnam from a distance, I can tell you: A million persons will be exterminated. Four to five million—in accordance with the scale of Vietnam—will spend time in concentration camps and will be rebuilding Vietnam.

"What is happening in Cambodia you already know. It is genocide. It is full and complete destruction, but in a new form. Once again, the technology is not up to building gas chambers, so in a few hours the entire capital city, the guilty capital city, is emptied out—old people, women, children, are driven out without belongings, without food. Go, die!

"Now we hear voices in your country and in the West: Give up Korea and we will live in peace. Give up Portugal, of course. Give up Japan, give up Israel, give up Taiwan, Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand, ten African countries. Just let us live peacefully.

"Give us the possibility to continue driving our beautiful cars on our splendid highways. Make it possible for us to play tennis and golf. Let us mix our cocktails as we are accustomed to doing. Let us see the beautiful, toothy smile in the glass on every advertisement page of a magazine."

DAYS OF INEXPENSIVE FOSSIL FUEL ARE LONG GONE

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has come where the citizens of this Nation are beginning to realize that the days of inexpensive and abundant fossil fuels are long gone. Apart from the actual shortages we have experienced in these fuels, dramatic increases in their price have hit the consumer both directly and indirectly in the form of price increases in the goods and services of nearly every industry which uses fuel. It is this situation that has made it abundantly clear that energy independence be one of the country's first goals.

A major contributing factor to the situation we find ourselves in is the technological lag that has left this country dependent on increasingly scarce resources such as fossil fuels. Similarly, this same lag, in the face of increased environmental concerns, has forced industry to install relatively primitive and generally more expensive pollution control devices, thereby exacerbating our present problems with inflation.

Increased research and development in both the energy and environment fields has been much discussed as a solution to these problems and some steps have been taken by both Government and industry in these terms. However, little has been done to establish the kind of priorities that are needed. Much of the research necessary for new energy and environmental technologies requires high-risk investment with no guarantee of immediate success. Private capital for such investments is difficult to obtain and many of the larger corporations capable of this kind of endeavor have found it financially unattractive. Moreover, this kind of research cannot realistically be budgeted through annual appropriations where it will be forced to compete with other short-term concerns.

In order to resolve these problems on June 12, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7841, which would create a corporation as an instrumentality of the U.S. Government to make investments and guarantee loans in order to fund research geared to further developing energy sources and solving the problems of waste disposal, pollution, and resource conservation.

In September, shortly after the President's Domestic Council proposed the Energy Resources Finance Corporation which this body is today considering, I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to Members of Congress requesting comments on my proposal. These comments proved most helpful in determining both the strengths and weaknesses of this bill, and I am presently redrafting many of its provisions.

Much concern was expressed by my colleagues that such an instrumentality would provide unwarranted benefits for large corporations and would be too far removed from the oversight functions of the legislative branch. In light of these

concerns, I would like to take a moment to summarize the provisions of my amended bill, which I intend to reintroduce when the Congress reconvenes in late October.

The Corporation created under this legislation would, first of all, seek to maximize the diversification of assistance and enhance competition in industry by providing assistance to those individuals and organizations with impaired access to capital markets. Moreover, under the act no assistance in the form of a loan or guaranty could be granted unless the board of directors was satisfied that such assistance would not limit competition in the private sector. Similarly, the bill specifically states that the Corporation will give preferential treatment to small- and medium-sized concerns which can provide additional competition in the energy and environmental fields.

I believe that these provisions are especially important in light of the recent finding of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that there is reason for concern that the small pioneer in solar energy research may be shouldered aside by present ERDA policies. According to the committee's report many small businessmen feel that up to now Federal policy has virtually ignored the contribution of small business specifically in the field of solar energy research and development. Under the type of institution I propose, the small businessman would receive significant benefits.

Similarly, the bill I have introduced would provide for a truly significant role in the creation and review of energy and environmental policy for the legislative branch. The bill would require the Corporation's board of directors to establish loan and guaranty categories within which applications for assistance will be considered. Categories will be developed after public hearings and with the advice of a Science Advisory Panel broadly representative of the science, engineering and consumer communities.

These categories would be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to Congress. Either House of Congress could disapprove any of the categories. In addition, either House of Congress could cut off funding in any previously published and approved category and may by concurrent resolution suggest to the Corporation other possible categories which it deems consistent with the purposes of the bill.

Moreover, my proposal would place a significantly smaller burden upon the U.S. Treasury than the proposal made by the Domestic Council. The Corporation would be issued only \$1,000,000,000 in capital stock and would, where possible, limit its activities to loan guaranties. Similarly, either House of Congress could disapprove the issuance of corporate obligations exceeding \$250,000,000, any guaranty or loan exceeding \$5,000,000 and the purchase of obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury. Moreover, the bill provides for the public use of any invention developed with Federal assistance upon the payment of a royalty a portion of which may accrue to the Corporation.

At this point, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a short summary of the major provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the creation by Congress of financial institutions for investment purposes vital to national welfare is a time-honored means which clearly fits our present technology needs. I believe that this kind of action is a vital step toward providing new sources of energy and I feel that the program I have outlined for you today provides a more reasonable, and more well thought out course than that of the President's Domestic Council.

The material follows:

FACTSHEET—PROPOSED NATIONAL RESEARCH CORPORATION

Purpose

To improve the economy and efficiency of Government Operations by establishing a National Research Corporation to finance through guaranties of loans and through direct loans high-risk research and development to meet critical environmental and energy needs. The Corporation would seek to maximize diversification of assistance and to enhance competition in industry by providing this assistance to individuals and organizations with impaired access to capital markets and existing governmental research programs. Moreover, the Act would ensure that benefits gained by means of Federal assistance would accrue to the citizens and consumers of the nation and would provide the Congress with meaningful input into the making and reviewing of policy in technological development.

STRUCTURE AND FINANCING OF THE CORPORATION

A. The Corporation shall have capital stock of \$1,000,000,000 subscribed by the U.S.

B. The Corporation shall be managed by a Board of Directors consisting of nine persons: the president of the Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and six public directors; four appointed by the President, one by the Speaker of the House and one by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

C. The Public Directors shall serve staggered terms of five years.

D. No director, officer, attorney, agent or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner participate in or benefit from deliberations affecting his personal interests, or receive any supplementation of his Government Salary from a private source for his service to the Corporation. The Attorney General of the United States may investigate any violation of this Conflict of Interest Clause, and if he believes that any person has violated this provision it shall be his duty to instigate a civil action against that person. Both civil and criminal penalties are enumerated in the Bill.

E. The Corporation may issue notes, debentures, bonds and other obligations in amounts determined by the Board.

PROCEDURES FOR ISSUANCE OF GUARANTIES AND LOANS

A. The Corporation shall issue a loan or guaranty only if the loan is within a published category (see below); the Board is satisfied that competition among private entities will in no way be limited or precluded; and the Board has determined that there will be a continued reasonable assurance of full repayment.

B. The Corporation may guarantee not more than 90% of the interest and principal of any loan made by any bank, etc., at a rate not more than 1½% above the Federal Reserve discount rate.

C. The Corporation can make direct loans only at a rate of interest no less than the United States Government is paying on borrowings and only where the borrower is

able to present evidence that he has been unable to secure a loan which the Corporation has offered to guarantee.

D. The Corporation may charge a fee for the guaranteeing or making of any loan.

E. In making loans or guaranties the Board shall require that any invention developed with Federal assistance be available to the public for a royalty and that a portion of royalties be paid to the Corporation.

F. The Board shall consider the environmental advantages and disadvantages of each proposed action and shall require and obtain all information that may be required in order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

CATEGORIES OF LOANS AND GUARANTIES

A. The Board shall establish a Science Advisory Panel which shall be broadly representative of the science, engineering and consumer communities and shall include representatives of the National Science Foundation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Bureau of Standards, the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Federal Energy Administration and other appropriate Federal agencies.

B. The Board shall establish categories within which guaranties and loans will be considered after consultation with the Science Advisory Committee and after public hearings.

C. No loan or guaranty may be made within a category until 60 days after publication in the Federal Register and transmittal to Congress.

D. In making guaranties and loans the Corporation shall give preferential treatment to small and medium-sized concerns which can provide additional competition in the energy and environmental fields; to projects designed to lower the cost of energy to consumers; and to projects which incorporate development of energy resources with maximum protection to the environment.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

A. Either House of Congress may disapprove the establishment of any category.

B. Either House of Congress may disapprove the further granting of assistance by the Corporation within a category previously published and approved.

C. Congress may by Concurrent Resolution suggest other areas as categories as it deems consistent with the purposes of the Act.

D. Either House of Congress may disapprove the issuance of corporate obligations exceeding \$250,000,000, or any obligation bringing the total outstanding obligations to \$10,000,000,000 or the purchase of corporate obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury.

E. Either House of Congress may disapprove any guaranty or loan which exceeds \$5,000,000.

F. The Corporation shall make an annual report to Congress.

G. The Corporation will be audited annually by the General Accounting Office as a Wholly Government Owned Corporation.

CITY UNIVERSITY—A CLASSIC SMOKESCREEN

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written recently by opponents of Federal aid to New York City about allegedly extravagant services offered by the city to its residents. Probably the greatest criticism has been

leveled against the City University—a network of eight senior colleges, an upper division college, a graduate center, and nine community colleges located in and maintained largely by New York City. Apart from fees of \$60 to \$110 per year, City University students pay no tuition. This has drawn attack from no less a critic of New York than President Ford, who reportedly told Mayor Beame, "Why should the Federal Government provide free tuition for the students in New York City and not in other cities of the Nation?"

Comments such as these show a woeful misunderstanding of the City University and the role it plays in the budget crisis. First, the record should be clear that New York is not requesting money from the Federal Government for the City University or any other city program. Despite the fact that New Yorkers contribute five times as much to the Federal Government as they receive, the city is asking only a limited Government guarantee of city and/or State bonds so that emergency interim financing may be obtained. Unless the city should subsequently default on such bonds, the Federal Government would not have to contribute 1 cent toward the city's services.

Second, the amount which the city invests in not charging tuition for the City University is relatively small. In the current city budget of \$12.3 billion, only \$280 million, less than 2.5 percent, is earmarked for the City University. This compares to more than \$1 billion which the city will spend this year on welfare. Since a large percentage of the university's students come from families of modest means, charging tuition to those able to pay would not add significant amounts to the city's budget. A better reform would be for New York State to raise its per capita contribution to the City University to a level comparable to that for educating students in the State university system. This would reduce city outlays by \$50 million and correct the anomalous situation where an extensive State system of higher education maintains itself no facilities to service the State's largest city.

Third, the city has already made crippling cuts in the university's budget and is planning even more. In the middle of the last academic year, the university was forced to slice \$20 million from its budget. This year's budget is \$87 million below that officials said would be required to continue at last year's level of operations; additional cuts have been ordered that would require further reductions of \$63 to \$68 million. Moreover, if recent recommendations made by the chancellor of the university are adopted, the operations of the university would be curtailed another 20 percent.

Fourth, New Yorkers place a great priority on higher education. Since its inception in 1847, the City University has been a symbol of the principle that college study is as much a citizen's right as a primary or high school education. New Yorkers have paid the highest taxes in the Nation to guarantee this principle. As Mayor Beame's projected budget cuts demonstrate, New York will right its finances through draconian measures in other vital areas to insure

that free tuition survives. Non-New Yorkers may rightly demand that the city balance its budget before outside assistance is forthcoming, but if the federal system of government has any meaning, it requires that the precise nature of the economies should be New York's decision alone.

The issue of free tuition at the City University is evidently a smokescreen for the broader debate over whether the Federal Government will recognize its responsibility to assist the Nation's largest city. This case is well made in an article by Hobart Rowen, "Mr. Ford and New York's Free Tuition," in the October 10 Washington Post. Given the great urgency of aid to New York, I am pleased to reproduce this article so that all my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Rowen's views:

MR. FORD AND NEW YORK'S FREE TUITION
(By Hobart Rowen)

Vice President Rockefeller has given us—not intentionally, to be sure—a revealing insight into the way that President Ford views the urgent credit crisis in New York City and New York State.

In an interview in U.S. News & World Report, Rockefeller said that six months ago when the President first discussed New York City problems with Mayor Abe Beame, he took note of the fact that tuition at the City University was free.

"Mr. Mayor," Rockefeller quoted Ford as saying, "I understand you have free tuition in your city university, and you're asking us to provide money for the city. We don't have free tuition in Lansing, Michigan. Why should the federal government provide free tuition for the students in New York City and not in other cities of the nation?"

Beame responded, according to Rockefeller, that "If we hadn't had free tuition, I wouldn't be here." Rockefeller told the USN&WR editors that Beame's comment was "very human, but I'm not sure it was a fundamental principle."

Before dealing with this appalling comment of Mr. Ford's, I must disclose to the reader that I am a graduate of the City College of New York, a part of what is now known as the City University. I take great pride in the fact that New York City staked me to an education in a great institution of higher learning.

The willingness of the City of New York to provide a college education, without cost, for its high school graduates of proven ability has been symbolic of the American dream since 1848, 127 years ago.

Over the long haul, City College graduates have repaid the city and the nation in many ways. A long list of distinguished graduates includes Dr. Jonas Salk, who discovered a polio vaccine; Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter; philosophers Morris Raphael Cohen, Sydney Hook and Ernest Nagel; George Washington Goethals, builder of the Panama Canal; and countless others.

To latch onto C.U.N.Y.'s free tuition at this time of great crisis shows that for all of his supposed dedication to the principle of keeping the federal government out of local affairs, President Ford really is willing to interfere to satisfy a bias.

The President doesn't believe in federal aid to education, certainly not free university tuition.

New York City's financial problems go much deeper than the cost of free tuition at City University, which is something well under \$100 million out of the total accumulated city deficit of \$3.2 billion.

Without immediate federal action to help New York City and New York State, neither can borrow money in the markets, and both

could go into bankruptcy. Between the City and the State, there is some \$27 billion of debt in jeopardy.

The problem doesn't end there. Well-run cities in other parts of the country also find it increasingly difficult and more expensive to borrow money. In part, this is due to a basic change in the municipal bond market: commercial banks, enjoying newer tax loopholes (notably through leasing arrangements and in foreign investments) no longer need tax-exempt income.

Therefore, the banks, which used to buy 70 to 80 per cent of municipal bond offerings, bought only 12.6 per cent of all municipal issues in the first half of 1975. The same is true of fire and casualty insurance companies, which, having suffered losses based on inflated replacement costs, need tax-sheltered income.

But layered on to this important reduction in institutional demand for city and state bonds is the anxiety created by the New York City-State crisis. David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank sees the issue clearly: "We feel from both a local and national perspective that temporary federal support for New York City is of the highest priority."

As Wallace O. Sellers, director of municipal bond activities for Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. wrote in a New York Times article, "Action will obviously become necessary at some point, and should be taken now before the entire credit market is adversely affected."

The cavalier attitude of the Ford administration toward New York City simply cannot be defended. One would have to conclude that if the administration dallies any longer, it must be convinced that the rest of the country doesn't care much about New York, its eastern liberalism, and its multi-racial population, and can safely let it go broke.

What municipal officials, the investment community, and Vice President Rockefeller's banker brother, David, appear to be telling the President in one voice is that if New York goes belly up, so could Lansing, Michigan. Whether or not New York abandons free tuition at C.U.N.Y.

ONE OF ARIZONA'S OUTSTANDING PUBLISHERS

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, Arizona lost one of its outstanding newspaper publishers on October 13 with the untimely death of Mr. Eugene S. Ely. Mr. Ely was injured in a fall in his home in Goodyear on September 28, and died 2 weeks later in a Phoenix hospital.

Mr. Ely was, both professionally and personally, a man who had earned the respect of his peers in the field of journalism. During a 33-year career as a newspaperman, he owned several community newspapers. They were successful, because he injected into their operation his personal expertise, energy, and enthusiasm, and he never wavered from a simple credo of fairness and accuracy.

It was the belief of Mr. Ely that editorial views and opinions were not only the right, but the responsibility, of a newspaper. But he also believed that opinion should be labeled as such, and should be published on the editorial pages, not in the news columns.

At the time of his death, Mr. Ely was president of the Pueblo Publishing Co., a

printing corporation, and president of West Valley Newspapers, Inc., which publishes the Northwest Peoria Times, the Westsider, South Mountain Star, Maryvale Adviser, Luke Tally-Ho, and Arizona Racing News. He formerly owned the Youngtown Record and the Sun Citizen.

VIOLENCE ON NATIONWIDE TELEVISION

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to introduce a concurrent resolution with the cosponsorship of seven of my distinguished colleagues. The resolution expresses the concern of the Congress with the continued broadcasting of unacceptably violent programming on the public airwaves, particularly in light of the continuing parade of facts and evidence that such violence leads a certain percentage of young American viewers directly to a hospital bed with multiple fractures, lacerations and sometimes total paralysis. We are continually faced with the problem of such violence on national television, particularly during the highly touted "family hour" which the networks piously held forth as their answer to self-regulation. It has become a meaningless exercise in the orchestrated drive for ratings during prime time.

While the portrayal of violence of all types in the American living room disturbs me greatly, I have been especially concerned with the announced plans of the ABC network to once again televise another of the lunatic stunts of daredevil rider Evel Knievel. You might recall the massive public relations campaign prior to his Snake River Canyon jump last year. I have no doubt that no one in the television industry took similar pains to disclose to the public the hundreds of children who were severely injured in emulation of Knievel's compulsive self-destruction. Time does not allow me to itemize the hundreds of case histories of children impaled on bicycle handlebars, those with broken necks, backs, arms and legs; those suffering partial and total paralysis, and the thousands more who were less severely injured. These, I emphasize, are directly attributable to the imitation of Mr. Knievel's pointless stunts. The children were stirred to be "just like Evel," as the emergency room records quote many of these children who were able to speak after their accidents. It is a simple concept: children imitate the examples which adults set for them.

Mr. Knievel plans to make yet another spectacular just this weekend. But what is more incredible to me is that the ABC television network once again plans to broadcast the jump on national television. There is but one purpose behind this act: in the commercial television world, the ratings game is a do-or-die proposition. The winner makes a lot of money, and the loser devises yet another scheme to grab the ratings next time.

I have already engaged in a series of correspondence quite a few weeks ago with the ABC network in an attempt to remove this violent influence from the airwaves. The general tone of their earlier response was that the network could not interfere with the "creativity" of their programming department, and that they considered such programs "pro-social." But their later response is even more appalling: they have spent countless thousands of dollars promoting Knievel's jump over 14 buses this weekend in Ohio—to be aired "live"—or will it be "dead"?

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that ABC has made a "pact with the Devil." It has become obvious that the network never, even for a moment, considered the possibility that their investment would be sullied by the maiming of a few children. For it is exactly that about which we are speaking: ABC has made a dollar commitment, and nothing will be allowed to get in the way of the almighty buck—not even the blood of a few hundred children.

Let me give you a little background: Before last year's Snake River Canyon jump, a national publication quoted one of that extravaganza's promoters in an interview published after the jump, that the event had ABC's direct backing. The promoter stated that ABC provided Robert Arum and his company, Top Rank, Inc., closed circuit telecasters, some of the \$250,000 front money for Knievel's jump. In addition, the interview goes on, ABC supplied the equipment and camera crews to Top Rank to show the event on closed circuit—for free. In return, Top Rank allowed the network to show the jump on its "Wide World of Sports" program the following week. I might also point out that ABC spared no expense in promoting the event: They devoted 2 prime time hours to Knievel—a documentary, "One Man, One Canyon," narrated by Jules Bergman, and the "official" George Hamilton film version of Knievel's life.

And now we come to this year—ABC has already devoted 1 of its prime time family hours to yet another documentary on Knievel's career which, after depicting all the blood and broken bones, just happened to mention that you could watch Evel flirt with death again on October 25. They have also devoted many prime time promotion spots during the past few weeks to be certain the American public knows it can watch Evel "live" this Saturday, and perhaps be killed before your very eyes. Another first for the family network. And, during the family hour this past week, we were given another hard sell pitch—an Evel Knievel plastic toy for our kids which does all the jumping—and crashing—of the real thing, and we were exhorted to be sure to watch him this weekend. The sale of such toys during the family hour is, of course, a direct appeal to our children to be present for the carnage.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic stories which inevitably follow each of Knievel's jumps are heartbreaking. Broken backs, paralysis, impalement on handlebars, concussions, broken legs and arms, and on and on and on. No amount of safety precaution by Mr. Knievel will stop a 6-year-

old child from trying to "be just like Evel," whom he watched on television.

My argument is not with Mr. Knievel, even though I disagree with his reasons for his choice of profession. If you, as a rational adult, choose to pay \$25 a head to watch him defy death, and you wish to expose your children to such an example, that is, right or wrong, your choice. My argument is with the networks who, in protecting their investment, give no thought to the bloody consequences—or after giving it some thought, simply ignore it.

I have asked the Federal Communications Commission to act—6 weeks ago. I have yet to receive any response. Mr. Knievel and I have both requested hearings before the House Communications Subcommittee, but the press of current business has not made this possible in time. There are, incidentally, dozens of proposed witnesses who have asked to testify, including parents of children who have been crippled in Knievel's wake.

Mr. Speaker, are we prepared to watch again this week as the network covers its bet, and the children on bicycles who are too young and inexperienced to understand the consequences of their actions follow Knievel's tire tracks directly into the hospital? In some cases, the injuries will be serious enough to destroy any chance for a normal life.

Congressional hearings, although desirable to air both sides of the problem, simply cannot occur in time to stop the carnage. The FCC, in its nonresponse, has shown it cannot handle the job without congressional guidance. I, therefore, place before the House this resolution calling on the FCC to act, and act now.

Mr. Speaker, I also attach for the RECORD my report to Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which documents some of the effects upon small children:

REPORT TO HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, ON THE EFFECTS OF THE TELEVISION PUBLICITY ATTENDANT TO THE SEPTEMBER 8 EVEL KNEIVEL JUMP OVER THE SNAKE RIVER CANYON, BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. MURPHY—OCTOBER 14, 1974

The Federal Communications Act was in part designed to promote broadcasting in the public interest. One of the major concerns of the Federal Communications Commission has been in the past, e.g., during the time of outstanding Commissioner Freida Henock, the impact that television has on the children and youth of America. Through years of Congressional hearings and finally the Surgeon General's report that established a scientific relationship between violence and aggression on TV and young people's behavior, the Federal Communications Commission has played an increasingly weaker role in carrying out its mandate of programming in the public interest, especially as it relates to children.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I attempted by persuasion and by legislation to stop the televised promotion and to take some of the heat out of the high powered publicity campaign attendant to Evel Knievel's jump over the Snake River Canyon on September 8, 1974. This stunt—by the admission of its promoters—was in large part aimed at the nation's children, without the slightest regard for its consequences. Last minute appeals to the FCC and to the President of

the American Broadcasting Company met with no success. ABC broadcast the replay of the Evel jump on September 14, 1974, with a one sentence admonition to children that they should not "emulate" Knievel's jump. In view of the fact that most children who tried to do so were between 8 and 16 years old, it is doubtful they even understood the warning. (In any event, studies of behavioral scientists prove that children do not heed such warnings, a fact of which I advised ABC.)

Almost everyone, from doctors and behavioral scientists to the police on the street and to the nation's parents, intuitively knew that large numbers of youth would try to imitate the antihero Knievel. As a result of my efforts, parents, lawyers, doctors, and concerned citizens began to call my office with anecdotal evidence on the effects that the Knievel jump was having on children. Because of the publicity concerning my letter to the FCC, people began to send newspaper photographs from around the country of children hurtling through the air, with and without crash helmets, on jerry-built ramps, miniature Evels intent on "derring-do." Many ended up with cuts and bruises, and all too many ended up with serious injuries from broken bones and concussions to lifetime paralysis. Beginning with the death of 20 year old motorcycle enthusiast Joe Pleso on August 5, 1974, to the on-going rash of broken bones and punctured organs of teens and pre-teens across the land, the effects of this irresponsible commotion are still with us.

My concern was heightened by the increase in cases such as the following:

On September 6 the following telephone report came into my Staten Island Congressional office:

"Two days before Evel's 'death leap' a mother from Oakwood, Staten Island, called the office to talk to Congressman Murphy about his effort to prevent the televising of the Knievel leap. She said, 'I really didn't pay much attention to what you were saying about children imitating Evel Knievel and that it was so dangerous. I just put it off as a publicity stunt. But I had to call you to tell you you were right. My eight year old son built a ramp with bricks and laid a board over it and rode up the ramp as fast as he could—and he flew off the bike and his chin hit the ground and he ended up getting ten stitches at the hospital. Frankly speaking, I don't agree with most of what Congressman Murphy says, but he was right this time.'"

A Staten Island lawyer, Anthony DeMarco, called to tell me that he had taken his daughter to the emergency roof of Staten Island Hospital. However, she had to await treatment while emergency aid was given to a 12 or 13 year old boy who tried the "bicycle in the air trick" and for his efforts was at the moment unconscious, with a concussion, suffering convulsions and vomiting.

A letter to my office dated September 14, 1974, from Dr. and Mrs. R. A. Hoops of Muncie, Indiana, eloquently told of the tragedy that is forced on this nation by the TV networks. The movie based on Knievel's life which was shown on ABC-TV was the cause in this case of nine incidents coming to the attention of just this one family—including their seven year old son. The parents letter to me contained as an enclosure another letter they had written on September 2, 1974, to Knievel and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (which was never answered by either party) and which I consider of major import to this report. In part, their Knievel letter read as follows:

"DEAR MR. KNEIVEL: You surely have no time for reading letters, but I have reason to believe (after hearing you direct your attention to the young people of our country) that you will give this your concern.

"The week after your movie was shown, our 7 year old son, Drake, left the supper table to ride around the block on his bike. An older youngster in the neighborhood had built a high ramp that day for his bike. He and other older boys made the jumps—then they begged Drake for his bike—he refused until they insisted and he let them use it. They got over the ramp with his bike—then handed back his bike and left for their homes for supper. I needn't tell you what went on in that little guy's mind next. They could do it—so could he. He didn't make it.

"We took him to the hospital. He went straight downhill for 2 days. The surgeon told us he could wait no longer and found in surgery that the front impact had been so hard that the backbone had acted like a knife and cut his pancreas in half. So he had 1/2 of his pancreas and his spleen removed.

"Let me go a step further. Before Drake had been in the hospital 24 hours, another 7 year old became his roommate—he had been watching older boys do the same thing on their bikes clear across town. A 30-year-old motorcyclist came along and asked if they'd like to see it done like Evel Knievel himself. He didn't make it either but did not hurt himself—lost control of the cycle and ran down this 7 year old who was just watching. He suffered a broken leg, broken arm, and required stitches covering one side of his face.

"The county sheriff is a neighbor—when he expressed his concern for Drake, he indicated there had been 7 ramp related accidents that week following the showing of that movie—and he wondered what that meant in terms of numbers across the nation.

"These accidents not only affect the child's life as a youngster, but very certainly have continuing effects in adulthood for them—for example, Drake's choice of careers is now suddenly limited. Insurance companies as well as employers are rarely understanding on these accounts. And that is understandable. . . ."

Mr. Chairman, the importance of this letter is that the tragedy happened in September of 1973 a year before the September 1974 Knievel spectacular. Further, Dr. and Mrs. Hoops sent a copy of this letter to the President of ABC-TV, Mr. Walter A. Schwartz, who responded to them as he did to my requests a year later—ABC-TV not only telecast the replay of Evel's jump, but they ran the movie based on Evel's career again and in prime time.

As a result of the above and continuing reports coming into my office from across the nation, I decided to have my staff survey some of the major children's hospitals across the country to assess the damage that was being done. I have also received reports from the National Association of Children's Hospitals.

The following preliminary information has been developed by the staff study:

Utica, New York.—A 14 year old boy by the name of Gerard Plante from Utica went out into his backyard and used the hood of an old car as a launch ramp. With the encouragement of his friends, he took his bike up onto the hood of the car and somersaulted off the hood. He crashed into the ground and crushed the bones in his neck. Doctors say that he is paralyzed from his neck down for life. He has a twin brother who was deeply affected by his brother's accident and his sister told my office the mother, Mrs. Royal Plante, would like to publicize the event so that other children will not do what Gerard did.

Salem, Massachusetts.—The North Shore Children's Hospital in Salem, Massachusetts reported a twelve year old boy who told his

friends he was going to make a jump "like Evel Knievel" constructed a ramp and jumped over it on his bicycle. He suffered multiple contusions and a concussion. He was hospitalized for one day at a cost of \$141.00 but was not operated on.

A second incident was also reported by the North Shore Children's Hospital in Salem, Massachusetts. This involved a ten year old boy who "grossly misplaced his arm" (fractured his arm). He was hospitalized for three days and operated on. Like the other child he had constructed a ramp and jumped off of it on his bicycle, a la Evel. The cost of his hospitalization was \$307.00 and his arm will be in a cast for several weeks.

Utah.—The incident in Utah involved a seven year old girl. The hospital refused to be identified, but the National Association of Children's Hospitals supplied the following information. The girl was brought into the emergency room with "head trauma", was treated and subsequently discharged. She, as with her male counterparts, jumped off a ramp on her bicycle.

New York, New York.—Drs. Russell S. Asnes and Roger MacMillan of Babies Hospital in Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center told my staff of the following cases:

One case involved an 8 year old child who ran his bicycle up a ramp and was impaled on the handlebars. Injuries included a severe laceration of the right lobe of the liver. An exploratory laparotomy was performed. Dr. MacMillan found a partial debridement of the right lobe of the liver with suture ligation of bleeding points. The laceration was packed with hemostatic agents. In other words, the child sustained an extremely dangerous injury of the type which results in one of the highest fatality rates. He spent 3-4 weeks in the hospital.

The second youth constructed the familiar "Knievel" ramp over a barrel. His older brother made the jump successfully but when he tried it (he was 12 years old) the ramp gave way and he suffered a perforation of the jejunum. His operation consisted of an exploratory laparotomy and the doctor found debridement of jejunum and perforations with primary closure. He was hospitalized for five days in intensive care and almost died.

The doctors said they had seen six other cases of injuries to the extremities (arms, legs, etc.), in the hospital related to Knievel's jump.

Brooklyn, New York.—St. John's Hospital in Brooklyn, New York reported six year old John Beasley built a ramp of three milk crates and a plank and attempted to recreate the Evel jump. He fell off the bicycle and ended up in critical condition with severe head injuries.

Brooklyn, New York.—Kings County Hospital reported serious injuries to two youngsters ages 6 and 11 who were imitating Knievel. The two boys were patients at the hospital, the six year old with a fractured forearm and the eleven year old with a fractured elbow.

Queens, New York.—Mary Immaculate Hospital in Jamaica, Queens reported a nine year old Vincent DeFalco took off from the familiar wooden plank and milk crates, fell off the bike in mid-air and hit the pavement with his head which required surgery.

I sent letters to the parents in the Beasley and DeFalco cases asking for the details. The DeFalco family is recently arrived from Italy and the mother cannot write, but she called my Manhattan office and said after Vincent was injured he watched the replay of the Knievel jump. The mother told my office regarding the warning ABC gave to youngsters not to emulate him, "How could you expect a little boy who is inquisitive and daring to take that warning seriously when Evel himself receives so much admiration and notoriety?"

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.—Ten year old

Aubrey Ray Clark attempted to ride over barrels and planks at a construction site on a toy motorcycle patterned after Evel Knievel's. Aubrey fell off his bike and received a ruptured spleen, a concussion and injuries to his nervous system and muscles.

(This was the second such case in Delaware County of a youngster who sustained serious injuries trying to emulate Knievel. The parents are suing the TV station, the toy manufacturer and the TV advertiser of the toy. The lawyer in these cases has written to me urging the Congress to prohibit such enticing promotions to "prevent this from happening.")

Minneapolis, Minnesota.—The Hennepin County General Hospital sent the following report:

One case involved Chad Sedlacek who is nine years old. He told his father David, the custodian of the Aldersgate Methodist church in St. Louis Park, of his plans to try Knievel's stunt. The father forbade his son to try it and said, "Remember, you don't have a drag chute." Despite this, Chad and a friend built a ramp at the end of which were five garbage cans laid end to end. While the adults were preparing for church, Chad launched himself and actually cleared five cans. However, he landed on his face which prompted his father to tell the Minneapolis press, "I just want to tell all of the prospective young daredevils who want to play Evel Knievel look at their father's bank account before they leap." Chad needed fifteen stitches to sew up his chin and a four-hundred dollar repair job on his chipped teeth.

Commenting on the Knievel craze, the Minneapolis Star reporter stated, "For the next multi-million dollar extravaganza, Evel Knievel should jump over the Mayo Clinic to pay for the hospital bills of all of his Little League imitators." Medical agents informed the Star, "There has been a tidal wave of accidents involving daring young bicyclists attempting to vault obstacles ranging in difficulty from the neighborhood culvert to the family wash."

Boise, Idaho.—Thomas Turner of St. Alphonsus Hospital in Boise, Idaho, reported to me of several cases of Evel inspired injuries. The worst case involved a 16 year old male who constructed a ramp over an irrigation ditch beside a house on private property. He trumpeted his jump beforehand which prompted the local sheriff to try to stop it. As in the case of Evel Knievel, however, the boy was attempting the jump on private property and it could not be legally prevented. The boy jumped the ramp on his bicycle and crashed head on into the house on the other side of the ditch. He received a severe concussion and required hospital care.

Bruceon Mills, West Virginia.—Bob Gill, a would-be professional daredevil (a la Evel Knievel) as a promotion stunt jumped over the Appalachia Lake. Gill claimed that he was "better than Evel Knievel" and used this claim to attract a large crowd. He was trying to set a world record of 200 feet. The first day of the scheduled jump over the Lake the weather was bad and he was forced to cancel. This occurred on August 18th. When he cancelled the jump the crowd who had paid six dollars a ticket started a "mini-riot" and tried to overturn the trailer in which Gill was staying. Gill, according to the West Virginia State Police, under the influence of tremendous crowd pressure, re-scheduled the event for August 25th. When Gill made the jump on the 25th he cleared the lake (which was about 195 feet) but crashed into the bank on the other side. He is now paralyzed from his waist down for life.

Doctors Russell Asnes and Roger MacMillan of Babies Hospital at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City have received press attention because of their involvement in the Evel related cases. In an interview Dr. Asnes characterized the Knievel stunts as "widespread in the neighborhood of

the hospital at 167th Street and Broadway. The kids are really caught up in the Evel fervor. The television carried a special on Saturday night just before he made his big jump, showing him jumping over 10 trucks or whatever he does, and this is what the kids are trying to imitate." Dr. Asnes stated that some of the teenagers actually refer to themselves to hospital doctors as "Evel Knivel."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the cases I have recited are just a few examples of the scores of cases that we have already uncovered and I am sure that when the full reports are in it will show a substantial number of serious injuries, permanent disfigurements, paralysis and even deaths. And as the high powered promotion of millions of dollars worth of Knivel cycles and knickknackery continues on TV the list of injured will continue to grow.

I think this is a black mark on commercial American TV and reflects the ineptitude of the Federal Communications Commission. A clear danger was evident before, during and after this national titillation with suicide. Yet the FCC sat idly by and did nothing. It would appear that the public no longer owns the airwaves and the Federal Government has abrogated its limited control over them.

I think this is a national disgrace and cries out for full blown hearings by the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Preliminary reviews of the 1974-75 TV season indicate that crime, violence, brutality and aggression are bigger than ever on American TV. The Evel Knivel affair was just a symptom of how America's giant TV networks cater to the basest instincts in man and of their continued enticement of innocent children to the TV tube with violence. This is a sad commentary on a society which is already one of the most violent in history. The Attorney General of the United States has pointed to violence on TV as a major cause of this country's love affair with violent behavior. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should call before it the half dozen men who dictate what our children see on TV and they should be held accountable for their actions under the Federal Communications Act as the Congress originally intended.

The networks for 20 years have duped the Congress, neutralized the FCC and exploited the American public with one purpose in mind—to make money.

And this they have done.

TV is the second highest income industry in the United States and aside from drug peddlers and pornographers—I think it has been one of the most irresponsible.

The young people of the United States deserve much better than what they are getting and unless the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee takes bold and affirmative action they will continue to be manipulated, exploited, and mentally twisted by a conscienceless group of hucksters, one of whose number has appropriately referred to themselves as "mahatmas of mediocrity."

OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has before it legislation to abolish the Mining Act of 1872. This act, in my view, has served this country well by providing to America's prospectors incentive

to commit their energy and capital to the location of vitally needed minerals. Mr. A. F. Allio, a concerned prospector from my State of Nevada, has offered the following evaluation of recent trends in the laws and regulations governing mining on the public lands. I commend his thoughts to my colleagues:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM A CONCERNED CITIZEN

GENTLEMEN: I submit to you, that Historically, a Country without Resources, is a Country without strength! Paradoxically, here we are, actively, no I should say *feverishly*, legislating our natural resources into extinction by withdrawing all of our open Public Lands into so-called "wilderness areas", which is a Myth under the definition of "Wilderness". This is an area "untrammelled by man", and pray, *where* is there such an area? Only where the Dept. of Interior and its various agencies has seen fit to exclude and make unavailable to man, the areas now being designated as "Wilderness". There never was an Acre of ground in this Country that somebody would not buy, if offered for sale, nor an area he would not settle in, if allowed by Law. So let's not add insult to injury!

To further insure that these "wilderness" areas remain "wilderness", these various agencies have "Decreed" that man shall not travel on this land by grasping onto Executive Order 11644, by President Nixon which was primarily intended to curtail recreational vehicles out for "fun and games", and not for pursuit of a legitimate business venture, permitted under the mining laws, and rule that he shall only travel on foot, or on Horseback, and then under such stringent rules as to discourage even this mode of travel, which sets us back 100 years. This, in spite of the fact, that under the "Wilderness Act", it specifically states, that "until midnight Dec. 31, 1983, the United States mining laws shall, to the same extent as applicable, prior to Sept. 3, 1964, extend to Wilderness areas, and subject to such *reasonable* regulations governing ingress and egress as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture consistent with the use of the land for mineral location and development and exploration, etc., including where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment. This means of ingress and egress is emphatically denied. Is it *reasonable* to expect a man to walk, or use a Horse? It would take a Pack train to carry all the supplies or equipment for a Prospector or Miner to explore and stake out a claim! And by no stretch of the imagination could a vehicle tear up the land like a pack of horses.

Admittedly, mining in previous years was destructive, and legislation was passed to control this tendency. But in recent years, there has been an "overkill" in requirements to put the land "back the way it was". I believe the Mining Industry has become "aware" and cognizant of the fact that the surface of our lands must be used judiciously, and that damage must be controlled. I believe they have "learned", and will cooperate. Denial of entry into these areas by vehicles, is totally unrealistic.

It may be a "unique" concept, to those opposed to mining, but fairly obvious to anyone with an open mind, that Minerals do not lend themselves to specific geographic areas of control as desired by various Ecology groups, or agencies of the Interior Dept. Our civilization is built upon the use of Minerals, and apparently increasing supply of minerals must be forthcoming! Three basic numbers stand out: 5 billion years of Earth history, 6 thousand years of human history, and about 100 years of intensive industrial use of minerals. So far as Mankind is concerned, all there is to work

with, is what was formed during Earth history; there will be no more! Already, during the 100 years use, the high-grade deposits and the easily found ones, have been discovered and worked out or are being worked out. Lower and lower grade deposits must be found and worked, necessarily with more and more efficiency.

Minerals are thus unique among natural resources. Depleted forests may be regrown, depleted soil improved, but to keep the minerals coming, they must be sought, found and exploited, wherever that may be! This fact, generally, eventually, forces Society to assign, to Mining, a Higher Use function, whether we like it or not. It is a fundamental fact, that a Prospector must look for minerals, wherever he thinks they occur. Conservation in its most realistic sense should aim for (1) wise use of the finished product, (2) maximum recycling of scrap, (3) efficient extraction of new minerals, without leaving sub-ore in such a way, it is lost forever; and (4) a minimum interference with other uses of the land, compatible with (3), above.

Keeping all this in mind, then, let us take a broader look at the facts: Since less than 10% of the Earth's bedrock surface is exposed, it is imperative that geologic and geophysical mapping, geochemical exploration, and the latest concepts of Satellite Resources Technology be used increasingly, to discover minerals under the remaining 90%. A means is needed to provide reconnaissance of large areas of virtually virgin prospective mineral producing areas by modern and progressive techniques. In this respect, the U.S. Geological Survey's vast resources should be put to use mapping, testing and reporting, and assisting the Prospector and Miner, and not being used as a Tool for the Interior Dept. to withdraw lands as "wilderness". To expect an honest, and unbiased survey of mineralized areas, without an intensive unhampered, independent survey, is, at best, wishful thinking. You do not oppose the wishes of your "boss", if you want to keep your job! Let's put the Geological Survey strictly within its own Domain, our Mineral Resources, without interference. Working with Prospectors and Miners, implementing, and instructing them in the latest and newest techniques, the mining booms of yesteryear will fade into obscurity! There are still more minerals under the ground than there ever was above. This is a basic, well-known concept to most Geologists and Prospectors.

It is my contention that any agency, seeking to control our mineral resources, should seek opinions, and interpretations from qualified personnel within the framework of our Mining Industry, Mining Bureaus, and Geological Survey organizations within all our States, and evaluate their suggestions, based on their experience. Let's not send a boy to do a man's job! Let the Bureau of Land Management, manage land. Let's rely on our Geological Survey and Mining Bureaus to manage our Minerals. They will tell you that Minerals are found wherever they are, not within well defined, segregated areas, and that 90% of our resources have not yet outcropped, and never will. They must be found by well-intentioned, cooperating agencies working together, not by self-appointed, self-serving interests, who seek to insure their reign by expanding their horizons to absorb every facet of our Resources under the pretext of Ecology and Environmental Protection. Let's stop destroying our Mineral Industry, which is our means of survival, and let's launch a program to help and foster its goals. Let's put a stop to this headlong, destructive course perpetuated by zealous, well-intentioned individuals, who have no concept of our needs, and let's become truly Realistic!

We now import over 90% of 8 vital raw

materials, all of the Platinum, chromium, strontium, aluminum, and manganese ores. We do not have sufficient reserves of 47 out of 87 other raw materials required to satisfy the nation's needs to the year 2000. These are statistics of the Dept. of the Interior! Do you believe this? Here is an agency, perfectly aware of our precarious position, doing everything in their power to kill off the small Prospector and Miner instead of trying to encourage him! Does this impress you as a responsible agency to manage our resources, and safeguard our future? I'm appalled! We let this same agency put us in a position to be blackmailed by the Oil-producing countries. Are we going to sit idly by and let them do the same with our minerals?

Many of the areas designated as "Proposed Wilderness", have only been given cursory, or visual examination. Much has been "surmised", by current prospects, or operating mines. Most so-called abandoned mines have been abandoned because of intimidation, lack of technical help, and economic support. Obstacles are placed in the way at every turn. When will it stop? In the event of War, if our outside sources were cut off, pray, where would we obtain our Vital raw materials! Do you have an answer for that? Do you believe that Russia knows the condition of our Mining Industry? Don't doubt it for one minute!

I charge you, Gentlemen, that immediate steps are required to curtail the current trend of this Government Agency to destroy Mining in this country and that a Committee be appointed to thoroughly investigate the actions already taken, which we are cognizant of, that are not in keeping with your wishes and actions such as the Minerals and Mining Act of 1970, the Wilderness Act of 1964, and other Laws passed by Congress to stimulate and encourage mining. These Laws are consistently and brazenly ignored by every agency of the Interior. When asked why the laws that allow Prospecting and Mining are ignored, you are only quoted those laws that are in conflict, that they choose to select. They may date back to 1910, 1920, 1952, or whatever is convenient. Those portions that state that Prospecting and Mining are allowed are omitted, or ignored. These are not idle accusations! Investigate them yourself. There is a definite, no critical need to assert your wishes and Policy so there is no distortion of the facts! Better yet, obtain copies of the literature, rules, Edicts, and regulations printed in the Federal Register; study the "tone", and "tenor" of these publications. Tell me, if you get a little irritated, and if you bristle a little at the dictatorial undertones. Try the "Regulations" of the Forestry Service for a starter, and then their "Questions and Answers About The 1872 Act Use Regulations Affecting Prospecting And Mining In the National Forests", Sept. 1974. The regulations are entitled, "Memorandum of Understanding" Subject: Work procedures Governing Action on Applications or Claims for Lands Within National Forests." If you can read these and not get a feeling of being a 2nd. class citizen, your skin is thicker than mine. The section on Patented claims should receive special attention. Ask Interior how many Patents they have issued lately, and how many have been pigeon-holed and have been completely forgotten! Read the Off-Road rules, drafted for recreational vehicles, and tell me if a Prospector or Miner can live with these rules, and do his job efficiently? Try and obtain Mineral Survey reports from any agency of Interior, as a citizen, on withdrawn areas.

I think the results will be a revelation. Thank you for listening!

Sincerely,

A. F. ALLIO.

LIVE BICENTENNIAL GARDENS

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 200th birthday of our Nation, our cities and communities are preparing for the celebration with elaborate projects which, for the most part, are costly. One of my constituents, Louis B. Meyer of Oceanside, Calif., has suggested an imaginative, pleasurable, and relatively inexpensive way whereby every citizen with a front or back yard can participate in and contribute to the Bicentennial celebration—namely, by growing red, white, and blue flowers.

Mr. Meyer, an avid gardener and garden writer, prepared an article on this subject which recently appeared in the Blade-Tribune, Oceanside, Calif. Since I feel that this article deserves wider circulation, I am inserting it in the RECORD for the edification of its readers. The article follows:

GLORIOUS BLAZE OF PATRIOTISM

Every gardener with a front or back yard to a large plot can give three cheers for the red, white and blue!

The Nation's Bicentennial birthday party will be celebrated all of next year, 1976. Every city will be competing as well as the home gardener. Gardens can show a glorious blaze of patriotism in growing one's own dramatic effect of red, white and blue flowers for the celebration.

Seed companies, nurseries and garden shops could be a great help in arranging the colors in separate color-combined seed packets, growing plants and seedlings. No one, as yet, has commercialized on the packaging of red, white and blue flowers for our 200th birthday.

Individuals, garden clubs, schools, churches, civic and veteran groups, City Parks departments and Bicentennial committees could prepare plantings of our Nation's colors in designs that hold no limit to the imagination.

Out of the colors we can grow early flags of our country as well as today's "old glory"; liberty bells can be designed plus flowers forming the dates 1776-1976, plus thousands of other ideas that can be worked into combining cluster displays of red, white and blue.

Not all flowers bloom in reds, whites or blues. The fun will be to shop around to find the kind of plants that suit your display area and will bloom all at the same time. Plants grow in all sizes from ground covers, small and large bushes and shrubs, from inches to several feet in height, single stems to wide spreaders, plus vines for trellis or fence, and bulbs or tubers.

Red, white and blue can be used in rock gardens, borders, beddings, edging, bank covers, container plants, pots and for cut flowers. Different heights can be combined from foreground to background.

There are red, white and blues for every season. Planning and timing is important for a showy display. Spring flowers are planted in the fall or early spring. Summer flowers are planted in the fall or early springtime. Fall flowers are planted in late summer or early fall. Proper planting time will give one the colors of "old glory" during each season.

For perennial spring blooms try the Cineraria for long blooming bright colors in shady areas; Columbine for a plant that attracts humming birds; Polyanthus Primrose

for containers or in the shade and the Viola which does well in coastal areas.

Annual spring flowers in red, white and blue are Bachelor Button, Larkspur and Pansies. Sweet peas grow on tall vines. Stock grows to three feet and Nemesia Strumosa makes a good bulb cover or bedding plant. Spring bulb types can be found in the Anemone, Freesia, Hyacinth, Bearded Iris and Sparaxis.

Annual summer blooming flowers are the China Aster; a tall vine Morning Glory, Petunia and the Verbena. Gladiolus grow in all areas. For garden pools try the Water Lily. A long blooming shrub that could grow to ten feet is the Hydrangea.

Last follows the fall season for our Bicentennial red, white and blue flower garden with some of the same types which are also grown in the spring; Sweet Pea, Stock, Pansy, and Viola. A perennial shrub or vine known as Cineraria can be grown in the dwarf size under twelve inches or the tall variety to three feet for dramatic mass plantings.

Each of these plants can be researched in garden books in more detail under the scientific name or plant genus with subordinate classes or species. You'll find the main subdivision is the genus name which is capitalized while the species name is not capitalized. In the species is where we find the selected colors.

1976 will be our giant Nation-wide birthday party. Displays can be planned and designed on paper then transferred to the planting area.

Colored photos should be kept to record your Bicentennial garden from the first step to the final bursting of blooms forming your handy work. Photos could be entered in all local City Bicentennial Centers or at the County Fairs with honors for best design or most original display—or a local-grown floral float for the next 4th of July parade.

JACK ANDERSON SMEARS HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, Jack Anderson's smears are always well timed to aid the left. The October 7, 1975, Anderson column in the Washington Post was a classic example of this. Anderson complained that there were still eight former staff members of the House Committee on Internal Security on the payroll of the House Judiciary Committee. Anderson did not point out that the staff members had been retained by Judiciary supposedly to carry out the work of the former House Committee on Internal Security. Of course, Anderson also neglected to point out that almost all of the effective committee staff had been discharged and that in the 9 months that have passed since the abolition of the committee, the Judiciary Committee has done no work in the internal security field. The committee has held no hearings on terrorism, has not announced hearings on Congressman ASHBROOK's terrorism bill, has held no hearings on any matter relating to subversion or violence oriented groups.

The Judiciary Committee is now making a determination on what to do with the files of the House Committee on Internal Security. This is the real reason for the Jack Anderson diatribe against the former House Committee on Internal Security. The three alternatives facing the Judiciary Committee are, to set up the files for use by the Congress, send the files to archives, or destroy them. Jack Anderson is trying to lend his pressure to destroying them. It is very important that these files remain intact and that the material in them be made available to the Members of Congress. They were always available to Members when the House Committee on Internal Security and its predecessor the House Committee on Un-American Activities were functioning. I urge the Judiciary Committee to keep those files intact and to continue making them available to Members of Congress.

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will amend the Natural Gas Act in an effort to enable interstate pipelines to compete with intrastate pipelines for natural gas produced onshore in the United States.

At the present time, intrastate buyers are able to successfully outbid interstate pipelines for available onshore supplies because they are in a position to offer a higher price than that permitted by the FPC. Unless the interstate pipelines have the ability to compete with intrastate buyers for onshore gas, that market will continue to be foreclosed. Regulation of the intrastate market is no solution for it will dry up the incentives to look for gas in the market.

The bill provides that with respect to offshore supplies—which cannot be sold in intrastate commerce but must be sold to the interstate market—that the price to be paid will be established by the commission using the formula set out in section 8 which adds new section 24(A) to the existing Natural Gas Act. Section 24 requires the Commission to establish on January 1 of each year through 1980 a price for offshore gas which is the equivalent of the average dollar valuation for old and new oil used by USGS in computing royalties to the Federal Government. At the present time this formula would result in a price of approximately \$1.25 per Mcf. for offshore natural gas. The bill contemplates that by 1980 supply and demand will be in reasonable balance and that there will no longer be any need to have Federal price controls on the offshore.

The bill also provides in section 25 that the commission give priority to essential agricultural uses of natural gas in order to eliminate curtailments to fertilizer, food processing, and packaging

plants where natural gas is essential to the process.

Finally, the bill provides that it is the intent of Congress that the use of natural gas as boiler fuel for electric generation is contrary to public policy and gives authority to the Federal Energy Administration to eliminate such uses as soon as possible.

RATIONING MEDICAL CARE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the idea that a socialized medical system can, somehow, provide first class medicine to everyone, at all times, without long waiting lists and other bureaucratic inconveniences, and without ever mounting costs, is one of the myths which those who advocate such a system have fostered within the public arena.

It is interesting to note that in every country with a totally socialized system, whether we are thinking of England and Sweden or the Soviet Union and Communist China, the individual citizen is at the mercy of an impersonal government bureaucracy. Each of these countries has a shortage of hospital beds and facilities while the United States, with its private practice system of medicine, has a surplus. In the United States, every patient has the opportunity to choose his own doctor. This is hardly the case in the regimented medical systems of Europe.

Under socialism, health care, much like everything else, is a rationed commodity. Recently Dr. David Owen, the man directly in charge of Britain's National Health Service made this clear. He declared:

The health service is a rationed service. There will never be a government or a country that has enough resources to meet all the demands any nation will make on a national health service.

Discussing the relative merits of free enterprise and socialized medicine, Harry Schwartz, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times, notes:

"Free medical care"—that paid for by the government rather than the recipient—is a bottomless pit. No society can supply all the medical care consumers could want and that doctors, hospitals and others might provide if there were no limits on resources. Potential demand for 'free' medical care is infinite; human resources are finite and there is severe competition for these resources from many quarters.

If we do not want rationed medicine, but want a medical system in which those who are truly in need can be taken care of without bureaucratic inefficiency and long waiting lists we will maintain our current private practice system. Socialized medicine, by whatever euphemism its supporters may call it, leads directly to rationing.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Rationing Medical Care," by Harry Schwartz, as it appeared in the September 9, 1975, issue of the New York

Times, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

RATIONING MEDICAL CARE

(By HARRY SCHWARTZ)

Vice President Rockefeller has created a minstrel by asserting that government cannot afford to give everyone first class medical care. Mr. Rockefeller's critics feel particularly betrayed because as governor of New York he was an outspoken advocate of national health insurance and a decade ago sponsored the most generous state Medicaid law in the nation.

The Vice President's critics seem unaware that his present position almost echoes the official stand of the British Labor Government toward the demands on the National Health Service, Britain's generation-old "free"—that is, tax-supported—medical system.

The Wilson Government's position was put this way earlier this year by Dr. David Owen, the man directly in charge of the National Health Service: "The health service is a rationed service. There will never be a government or a country that has enough resources to meet all the demands any nation will make on a national health service."

Last month the editor of the respected British magazine, *New Scientist*, gave this description of the bitter reality behind Dr. Owen's words: "The plight of Britain's Health Service conflicts desperately with the avowedly utopian ideals of its founders. Yet the myth persists—the myth that the NHS not only can but does offer a high and unvarying level of medical care to all members of the community. For most of us, it is only when we join a year-long hospital waiting list, or have to take an injured child to a hospital casualty department on Saturday afternoon, that we realize just how threadbare and starved financially the service really is."

But even before Dr. Owen or Mr. Rockefeller had spoken, many medical economists realized that "free medical care"—that paid for by the government rather than the recipient—is a bottomless pit. No society can supply all the medical care consumers could want and that doctors, hospitals and others might provide if there were no limits on resources. Potential demand for "free" medical care is infinite; human resources are finite and there is severe competition for these resources from many quarters.

This conclusion is a bitter one, especially for those Americans captured by the idea that the "right to health care" necessitates "free" medical care for all. Efforts to escape the conclusion range from those who see salvation in more emphasis on health education and prevention to those who think it's all the fault of greedy entrepreneurs like those exposed in the nursing home industry and finally those who think the need for rationing can be averted by getting more efficiency through reorganizing the medical system.

Unfortunately in this increasingly permissive United States there is little evidence that health education has done very much to curb such sources of disease as smoking, promiscuity, alcoholism and drug abuse. The British don't have any Bernard Bergmans but they find demand for "free" health care outstrips their resources. Moreover, Washington's efforts these past two years to push health maintenance organizations as a cheaper form of medical care have had rather disappointing results so far for those who pushed this solution.

There can, of course, be economies and improvements in American medicine but there is growing realization among American health care specialists that the gains from these sources are unlikely to avoid the need for hard, even tragic, choices, if medical care is made "free" for all. A major culprit is medical progress, the advanced technology

that permits today's medicine to do so much more than was ever possible for seriously sick people, but at an ever increasing cost with no end in sight.

The other day a New Jersey father petitioned a court to allow him to have doctors disconnect a respirator that has kept his comatose daughter alive since last April. The father's lawyer said the suit was necessary because the law was never addressed the question of "When is enough enough?" in the use of complex and expensive modern medical technology.

When, as and if we have "free" medical care the problem will be solved very quickly by bureaucratic fiat as part of the rationing system that will inevitably accompany any national health insurance scheme. The machinery for imposing this rationing is already being put into place by the recently enacted laws requiring national planning of medical facilities and imposing utilization controls through the Professional Standards Review Organizations now being formed nationwide. These mechanisms will permit government officials a few years from now to dole out all the national health insurance medical care the budget will allow, a very much smaller amount than the patients of that time will want.

**FACTSHEET: UNITED STATES—
U.S.S.R. GRAIN AGREEMENT**

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include the following factsheet for the further information of the Members:

PROVISIONS

(1) A firm commitment by the U.S.S.R. to purchase for shipment a minimum quantity of 6 million metric tons of U.S. wheat and corn, in approximately equal proportions, each year for 5 years beginning October 1, 1976.

(2) An option for the U.S.S.R. to purchase, without consultations with the U.S. Government, an additional 2 million metric tons of wheat and corn each year if the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates the total supply of U.S. wheat and feed grains for the year is 225 million metric tons or more.

(3) A consultative procedure whereby the U.S.S.R. can purchase more than the 8 million tons of U.S. wheat and corn a year after consultations and agreement between the two governments.

(4) A commitment by the U.S.S.R. to endeavor to space purchases and shipments of U.S. wheat and corn evenly throughout the year.

(5) A U.S. right to reduce U.S.S.R. purchases of U.S. wheat and corn below 6 million tons in a year when the U.S. has a total supply of wheat and feed grains of less than 225 million metric tons.

(6) Purchases of U.S. wheat and corn to be made at prevailing market prices from private sources.

(7) The wheat and corn purchased under the Agreement will be used only for consumption in the U.S.S.R. unless otherwise agreed.

(8) Semiannual consultations between the two governments on matters related to the Agreement.

NOT INCLUDED

(1) Grains other than wheat and corn are not covered by the Agreement. Grain sorghum, barley, oats, rye, soybeans and rice can be traded outside the Agreement.

(2) The Agreement does not provide for

government credit. But it does not preclude the use of credit from private sources.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis in which the city of New York is totally immersed has widespread implications for us all. It is a topic demanding our most careful analysis. Above all, we must be responsive to the problem and responsible in contributing to a solution.

It may well be that after we have examined all of the facts, including the testimony of Mayor Beame and Governor Carey, we will conclude that the Federal Government should not become directly involved. But we must also recognize that a clear case for some sort of Federal intervention might emerge and be clearly proven upon our examination of the facts.

At this critical juncture in our deliberations, it is essential that we remain objective, that we not respond as Republicans or Democrats, as New Yorkers or non-New Yorkers, as urban Representatives or Congressmen from suburban and rural areas. We must not be partisan or parochial but rather responsive and responsible.

In the course of my study of this most serious problem—one that extends beyond the boundaries of New York City—I have continued my search for both fact and opinion. I was particularly impressed with a New York Times editorial of October 16 which, in a very succinct manner, focused attention on the very first step that must be taken in this long journey:

Without sacrifice, widely shared and soberly accepted, there can be no salvation for New York.

I wish to share the thoughtful editorial with my colleagues:

MOMENT OF TRUTH

Mayor Beame's showdown meeting with the state's Emergency Financial Control Board yesterday represented a moment of truth for all New Yorkers as well as for the city administration. Whether the Board accepts the Mayor's plan for spending reductions or decides to impose new economies of its own, it is beyond dispute that this once-profligate city is entering a new era of rigidly enforced austerity from which there is no rational escape.

Before rising in righteous wrath over the announced cutbacks and further painful details that are yet to come, afflicted citizens, civil servants, school committees and others had better consider seriously the city's fiscal predicament and the likely alternative to their failure to accept the disciplines which that predicament imposes.

Simply put, the city is broke and encumbered with a heavy burden of debt that has accumulated as a result of years of living beyond its means. Even after the latest \$200-million reduction in services and personnel, New York will still be spending in excess of \$700 million more than it takes in this year, according to the most conservative estimates. This deficit must be entirely eliminated over the next three years if the city is to be re-

stored to solvency and regain access to the capital market.

To help achieve this essential transition, the city must have massive outside assistance—for this year alone more than \$8 billion in borrowing, of which the state's Municipal Assistance Corporation has been able to raise only \$2.4 billion so far.

If the infusion of new money is cut off, as it could be at any moment, chaos could ensue. Payrolls would not be met. Vendors would not be paid. Some \$1.2 billion in capital projects—the principal source of employment for the construction trades—would grind to a halt. Bond and note holders would not be paid and New York's access to capital markets could be closed off for years.

Whatever the wider repercussions of such a disaster, there can be no question that every one who lives or works in this city would be deeply affected. The only way out that anyone can see at this late hour is through some form of Federal intervention to help the state—now in trouble on its own account—help the city. Such help will not be forthcoming from a skeptical Washington unless all New Yorkers pitch in to make the new austerity program a credible, working reality. Without sacrifice, widely shared and soberly accepted, there can be no salvation for New York.

CONTROL CRIMINALS, NOT GUNS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Altoona Mirror in my congressional district, carried an excellent editorial on September 25, concerning the gun control issue. I commend it to my colleagues:

CONTROL CRIMINALS, NOT GUNS

Within a few hours of the latest assassination attempt on the President, a national television network presented two gun control advocates in interviews, implied conclusion of which was that the crimes would not have been committed had the nation had "gun control."

A TV announcer, mixing, as usual, news with editorial opinion, recites the list of assassinations committed with handguns and suggests, "Think about it."

What we really should be thinking about are the causes for this type of society.

Control, utter ban on handguns, will not alter the course of crime, or assassinations, as a close look at the record and the facts could indicate.

Almost every assassin or would-be assassin, has been emotionally or mentally deranged. These psychotics and those verging on derangement, are activated, as psychologists tell us, by suggestion impelled by the society in which they live.

As for control of guns, this is a political cause, not a cure for anything. A vast criminal black market in guns for crimes would then develop.

Some 35 years ago the king of Bulgaria was shot to death on a visit to France, by an assassin with an automatic pistol, outlawed for civilians in France and most European countries.

As for the latest attempt to shoot Mr. Ford, the first woman would-be assassin, Lynette Fromme, got her gun from a man friend, who said it was a "souvenir of World War I."

Mrs. Sarah Moore, latest to try to kill Mr. Ford, got her pistol from a gun shop run by a man "suspected of selling weapons illegally to radical groups."

The Sunday before the shooting, San Francisco police, acting on a tip, arrested Mrs. Moore and confiscated a pistol from her, but she was not arrested.

The "climate for gun crime and violence is induced in a great degree by the news announcers, newspaper reporters and editors, and the politicians, who eagerly emphasize, in every such crime, the gun instead of the criminal."

Under the prodding of this hysteria on guns by the anti-gun crowd, a House subcommittee studying gun control (why not a committee to study crime control?) has introduced a bill to ban manufacture, sale, importation and possession of handguns, except to police and the military.

There is a disappointing superficiality about this that contributes greatly to the doubts about the men and women entrusted with our government.

A total gun ban in Ireland has done nothing to keep guns, including machineguns, from the Irish revolutionaries. A total ban on guns in Britain has not affected crime; to the contrary, the number of crimes committed with firearms has been rising, recent Scotland Yard figures show.

The New York Times, as usual, follows up the assassination attempts with another editorial entitled, "The Gun Culture," another bit of its continuing propaganda to deprive law-abiding Americans of their right to possess guns, a right that, once abrogated, would not deprive criminals of one.

In a recent interview, a criminal serving time in the Southern Michigan State Prison told an interviewer, "Criminals get their guns by knocking off National Guard armories, 'creeping a cop,' or through the black market. Gun ban laws won't bother me. Illegal or not, I know where my next gun is coming from."

The "gun culture" the New York Times refers to repeatedly is a culture created by its own publicity, its own spotlight on the gun.

Everywhere, today, the gun is stressed by the anti-gun people.

They have done more than anyone else to bring the gun so prominently into focus. This increases our problem.

We must make crime the focus, and criminals—not their tools.

The distortion of the gun picture has distorted our total approach to controlling the criminal.

For example, this headline in a Philadelphia newspaper, "Two in Brutal Murder End Up With Light Sentences."

And this from the same newspaper, "Boy, 14, Slain, Killer Gets Only 7 to 20 Years."

And this, "Convicted Burglar, on Parole in Murder, Kills Again."

A NEW ATTITUDE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report of October 15, 1975, entitled, "A New Attitude":

A NEW ATTITUDE

There is a new attitude toward the federal government developing in Washington which is of importance to you.

Since the early days of the nation a central political issue has always been how much responsibility the government has to protect the social welfare of individuals. The roots of this issue run all the way back to the clashes between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, but this classic dispute

is gaining new emphasis with some recent developments.

In the recent past the prevalent mood in Washington, if not in the nation, has been in favor of extending federal programs and federal influence in American life.

As a result, government aid to individuals has increased very rapidly. Social Security and railroad retirement benefits went from \$22½ billion to \$62.3 billion in the past eight years and comparably dramatic increases have occurred in other social programs. Since 1969 Veterans benefits have risen from \$5½ billion to \$12 billion, unemployment compensation from \$3 to \$20 billion, welfare from \$4 to \$15½ billion, and medical care for the elderly and the poor from \$9 to \$24 billion. If we take these trends out to the year 2000, as President Ford is fond of noting, the government at all levels would consume, not ½ of the gross national product, as it does now, but 58% of that sum.

Supporters of this trend, and they have been the clear majorities of both political parties, tend to view government programs as a necessary investment in the nation's most important resources—people. They point out that the rapid growth in government programs stems from a situation of historic neglect, that there has been no overall growth in the federal government's share of the gross national product in the past 20 years, and that overall the burden of government in this country has not grown enough to alarm anyone.

But today many Members of Congress and other political leaders are becoming increasingly uneasy about this trend and the inefficiency, inequity, and unpopularity of the federal government. They are less sanguine generally about the efficacy of federal government programs, more persuaded of the value of local initiative and the diffusion of power into local hands, and less confident that we should look to the government for a solution to all problems. They recognize that there are limits to what Congress can and should do, that people want bureaucracies curtailed and less intervention by the government. Their concern is to restore government to the role of public servant, and to insist that government be accountable and austere.

All of this is more a matter of mood than specifics, but there are some signs that this attitude is increasing: The new Congressional budget mechanism, the absence of proposals for new federal programs, the popularity of some Governors, like Brown of California, who seek to project images of frugality (no living in the governor's mansion or using his limousine).

No one sees clearly the alternatives to the social programs of the past, or ways to deal with the problems that everyone acknowledges still exist. But apparently what is happening is a serious kind of re-thinking as to the best way to meet the problems of our country.

This thinking is expressed in various ways: the power of government should be improved, but not expanded; emphasis should be on reorganization and management, with efforts made to rationalize the crazy quilt of federal agencies and to evaluate rigorously federal programs and agencies; more concern should be placed on what government can deliver, not on what it can promise; tough questions should be asked to determine whether agencies really carry their weight; bureaucracies and regulatory agencies should be overhauled and limited; more power should flow to state and local government through block grants for broad purpose; and welfare should be reformed, substituting cash payments to the poor to reduce the enormous welfare bureaucracy.

It's hard to say how this new attitude will develop. Obviously, it is not universally accepted. There are, after all, powerful, built-

in pressures for the expansion of government bureaucracies, and it is not easy to shake off decades-old political habits. There is a natural reaction to pass a program for every problem, and powerful lobbies continue to demand more for their interests. Most lobbyists who come to me want to cut government spending but get more federal money for their own interests.

At the very least, Members of the Congress are beginning to modify, or at least to question, some of the conventional approaches that have been used in the past several decades, at least since the beginning of the New Deal.

It is not clear to me where this new attitude will take us in specific terms, but I suspect we may be at a watershed in the political life of the nation.

BYE, BYE, NEW YORK CITY BONDS

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal crisis in New York City has been the subject of a great deal of recent discussion. Most people seem to feel that it is not their problem; that the city is just getting what it deserves. President Ford has chosen to deal with the problem by making it a political issue, rather than looking for realistic solutions.

What is easily forgotten in all the arguments is that what happens to New York City will seriously affect the lives of millions of citizens. I would like to bring to your attention a letter written to the New York Times by one of my constituents, who has invested in New York City bonds.

To the Editor:

My wife and I live in an old Clapboard house in a rural town of 1,000 inhabitants in upstate New York. We both work, and we both drive Volkswagens. Mine, a 1968, is now on its second engine. Our thermostat is set at 65 degrees during the hours we are at home and awake, and 60 all other times. We burn wood when we want to be warmer. Our bread, vegetables and beer are home-made or home-grown and excellent. Our steaks are chuck, and infrequent. We have chosen our style of life, and I think we live well.

I am not a bank, and I am hardly a millionaire. The New York City bonds I own represent a considerable portion of my savings. I purchased the bonds because they provided an excellent tax-free return, and like others I thought them secure.

I am now well aware of New York City's fiscal woes. And although I feel that a number of New York City's burdens should rightfully be borne by New York State or the United States, I agree that the fiscal practices which have led to the current crisis are inexcusable.

Nonetheless, it galls me to see President Ford making political capital from the precarious situations of my savings and the savings of others like me. In his junkets around the country and elsewhere, the President has fanned the flames of hysteria for political support. Apparently he feels that disparaging New York City is good politics; and if the savings of thousands of individuals plummet in value as a result, that's just too bad.

Well, I don't feel that way. I resent the perpetrator of a \$75 billion annual Federal

deficit pointing his finger at New York City's accumulated \$3 billion deficit. If New York City could print money, its bondholders could laugh too.

Fiscal irresponsibility is fiscal irresponsibility, and to the extent that my New York City bonds are thereby worthless, I will take my lumps. Nobody forced the bonds down my throat. But in so far as the squeeze on my savings is exacerbated by the actions of one who should know better, who repeatedly and gratuitously disparages New York City to provide the glee of his political audiences, I am appalled.

Mr. President, your self-righteousness is a hummer. If you have nothing constructive to add to the situation, then please get off our backs.

WILLIAM M. BURSTEIN.

ILLEGAL ALIEN CRISIS—
EMERGENCY ACTION NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the flood of illegal immigration into the United States has reached critical proportions. In fiscal 1974, Congress set a limit on immigration at 300,000 persons. Yet, the Immigration and Naturalization Service—INS—in the same year located 788,000 deportable aliens—probably less than one-fourth the number of aliens who entered the country illegally that year and more than 10 times the number apprehended 10 years ago. The Justice Department estimates that 4 to 12 million illegal aliens reside in the United States, of which 1 to 1.5 million may be found in the New York area alone.

IMPACT OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

The impact of these aliens on jobs, housing, schools, transportation, and other local services is devastating. The AFL-CIO has testified before Congress that, in its judgment, the annual wage loss to legitimate U.S. workers from the competition of illegal aliens is \$10 billion. In the 3-month period in 1974, for example, Chicago-based immigration personnel apprehended 2,067 illegals of whom 1,913 or 93 percent were employed. Sixty-one of those were earning over \$6.50 per hour.

Governments also are great losers. Many, if not most, illegals pay no income tax, while others swell the rolls of welfare agencies. The California Social Welfare Board has estimated the cost to California of public assistance payments to illegals at more than \$100 million per year. One family of illegals in New York City reportedly collected \$7,140 in welfare payments in 2 years and used their public assistance card to arrange an additional medicaid payment of \$328 for treatment at a city hospital. To add insult to injury, the husband was working during the entire period as a well-paid security guard.

The costs to the Federal Government in lost taxes also are extreme. In a pilot project in 1974, the INS referred to the Internal Revenue Service a sample of 1,700 illegals who were working when ap-

prehended. Ultimately, they were assessed over \$25 million in back taxes and \$168,000 was collected. Fraud also abounds. In the first 10 days of a Dallas investigation, 87 illegals were apprehended claiming a total of 429 dependents, including 18 dependents claimed by 1 18-year-old boy.

PROBLEMS ARE PARTICULARLY SEVERE IN
NEW YORK

While no part of the country is immune from the illegal crisis, its greatest impact is in urban areas such as New York. According to the local regional director of INS, more than 100,000 jobs in the New York area alone are held by illegal aliens, and the average pay of the illegal aliens apprehended in New York last year was about \$150 a week.

But these persons not only tend to have higher paying jobs in urban areas, they also assimilate much more easily into the population at large and are more difficult to detect and more expensive to detain and expel. Because of these factors, the INS generally assigns proportionately fewer agents to urban areas than to the Southwest, where they can be used more efficiently. The combination of insufficient agents and difficult detection has meant that for every illegal alien apprehended in the Northeast during fiscal year 1974, 23 more were caught in the Southwest—30,000 versus 690,000—although the same number are estimated to be in both areas.

OUTLAWING EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS

Obviously, one fruitful method of attacking the problems of illegal aliens would be to deny all aliens access to jobs. Employment opportunities in the United States are the principal magnet for illegal immigrants. When there are no jobs, the flow dries up. This was the experience in California, which adopted legislation outlawing the employment of aliens. Until this law was declared unconstitutional as infringing on Federal Government rights, the law had the effect of seriously curtailing the number of illegal aliens moving into the State. I, therefore, support Federal legislative initiatives to penalize employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens.

But such legislation cannot be fully effective by itself. There will always be unscrupulous employers who will hire illegals regardless of the consequences; they are the same employers who will work illegals under inhumane conditions and who will not pay Federal withholding, unemployment compensation, and social security taxes on behalf of such employees. More importantly, many employers will not know they are hiring illegals, many of whom get fraudulent social security and other identity cards.

The problem of illegal aliens will not, therefore, be solved solely by legislation to forbid the hiring of such persons. It is essential that the flow of illegals be stopped at its source and that vigorous steps be taken to apprehend the illegals who are already present.

NEW AGENCY IS NEEDED

Unlike the illegal aliens who enter the Southwest United States from Mexico, the illegals found in New York typically

entered the country legally on tourist and student visas, took jobs in violation of their visas, and remained in the United States after their visas expired. Of the 6 million foreigners who enter the United States on tourist visas each year, about 10 percent or 600,000 persons become illegal aliens. While this type of illegal alien accounts for at least a quarter of the illegals presently in the United States—it is much higher in New York—only 12 percent of the illegals caught in fiscal year 1974 were of this source. Clearly the problem of aliens violating their visas cannot be met wholly by more effective detection methods.

The solution must lie in seeing that these illegals do not get tourist visas in the first place. These visas are issued by State Department personnel at American consular offices around the globe. Subject to local political pressures and living far from the places where the impact of illegal aliens is felt, these consular officials tend to be lax in their issuance of visas. They rarely investigate a visa applicant thoroughly.

To compound the problem, these consular officials never learn what becomes of those people whose applications they approve. This is largely a result of a woeful lack of cooperation between INS, the Justice Department agency which enforces the visas, and the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, the State Department division which issues the visas. The former does not let the latter know, for example, which visa holders violated the terms of their visas nor does it appear to play any role in training consular officials in detecting potential visa violators. Symbolic of this lack of coordination is the fact that the two agencies use incompatible computer systems.

This confused and disturbing situation can best be solved by having one independent agency assume full responsibility for the problems of aliens—from the issuance of visas to entry into and departure from the United States. Such an agency would have the uniform and consistent perspective, policies and procedures necessary to halt the flow of illegal aliens at its source in the foreign countries.

I am the author of a bill to establish such an agency. This bill, the Visa and Naturalization Administration Act of 1975 (H.R. 10182), would establish one Government entity, independent of the Justice and State Departments, to assume all the burdens of dealing with aliens. This agency would have the resources and the mandate to restrict the issuance of visas only to bona fide students and tourists who will not remain behind in the United States in violation of their visas to compete for scarce jobs and community services.

STRONGER ENFORCEMENT MEASURES REQUIRED

The personnel and facilities which the Federal Government devotes to immigration work must be vastly increased. In District 3, the INS area encompassing New York, there were, as of March 1975, 28 agents to detect 1 to 1.5 million illegal aliens.

The insanity of such manpower figures

speaks for itself. In the last 5 years, District 3 officials have deported about 5,300 persons and verified the departure of 55,000 others who were allowed to leave voluntarily.

But the service does not know whether another 48,000 illegal aliens who were ordered to leave actually went home. It has no record of their departure and is not even trying to find them. More than 18,000 complaints from the public of suspected illegal aliens are piling up awaiting investigation—the number was 44,000 before “unpromising leads” were pulled from the files in the last 2 years. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of cases of fraudulent or criminal activity by aliens, ranging from drug trafficking to prostitution to driving without a license, are also unassigned. It should be noted that of 210 persons arrested in October 1974 in New York City on cocaine-smuggling charges, half were illegal aliens.

The INS has asked for 2,000, or 25 percent, more trained personnel. This is the minimum required, and I am doing all in my power to see that these needs are met.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE CALLED FOR

Finally, urgent steps must be taken to alleviate the burdens on select communities, such as north-central Queens, which bear the brunt of Federal neglect of the problems posed by illegal aliens. Funds must be infused into these communities to relieve the stress placed on inadequate transportation, medical, housing, and educational facilities. Congress currently allocates money to businesses hard hit by foreign imports of goods. It is only proper that this same protection be afforded to areas impacted not by foreign merchandise but by individuals who have violated our law in entering and remaining in this country.

I will shortly introduce a bill providing Federal impact aid to communities which are shown to have a high concentration of illegal aliens. Passage of this bill will not eliminate the presence of illegals but it would place more of the burden of that presence where it belongs, on the shoulders of the Federal Government.

SUMMARY

The problems posed by illegal aliens in the United States are at a crisis stage. Scarce jobs are made yet scarcer, and overextended transportation, educational, housing, medical, and other community facilities are being pressed to the limits of their endurance.

Massive Government intervention is required. This should, in part, take the form of outlawing the hiring of illegal aliens. But this will not solve all of the problems. The flow of illegals must be cut off at its source, and this requires the establishment of a new Federal agency with complete responsibility for aliens. Additionally, illegal aliens already present must be apprehended, a task requiring a greatly expanded network of immigration agency investigators.

Finally, communities hard hit by illegal aliens need assistance, and a Federal impact aid program should rapidly be adopted to funnel desperately needed funds to those areas which find their facilities strained to the breaking point.

THE DISPLACED HOMEMAKER

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1975, I introduced the Equal Opportunity for Displaced Homemakers Act (H.R. 7003). Since that time, this legislation has gained nationwide attention and support and has generated a tremendous response, particularly from those people it would most benefit—the displaced homemakers.

I am reintroducing H.R. 7003 today with a few changes which are the result of suggestions I received when I circulated the bill for comment. While these changes improve the bill, they do not change its basic premise, which is to provide counseling, information and services to displaced homemakers so that they may eventually become self-sufficient. I plan to reintroduce the bill with cosponsors shortly.

My office has received many inquiries from throughout the country about this legislation. I would like to take this opportunity to insert the text of the revised bill and a comprehensive factsheet detailing the extent of the problem and the need for the multipurpose service programs; I am also including an excellent article by Marlene Címmons of the Los Angeles Times describing the legislation and the plight of the displaced homemaker:

H.R. 7003

A bill to provide for the establishment of multipurpose service programs for displaced homemakers, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the “Equal Opportunity for Displaced Homemakers Act”.

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) homemakers are an unrecognized and unpaid part of the national work force who make an invaluable contribution to the welfare and economic stability of the Nation but who receive no health, retirement, or unemployment benefits as a result of their labor;

(2) an increasing number of homemakers are displaced in their middle years from their family role and left without any source of financial security through divorce, the death of their spouse, or the loss of family income;

(3) displaced homemakers often are subject to discrimination in employment because of age, sex, and lack of any recent paid work experience; and

(4) displaced homemakers often are without any source of income because—

(A) they are ineligible for social security benefits because they are too young, or because they are divorced from the family wage earner;

(B) they are ineligible for Federal welfare assistance if they are not physically disabled and their children are past a certain age;

(C) they are ineligible for unemployment insurance because they have been engaged in unpaid labor in the home.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to require the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish multipurpose service programs to provide necessary training, counseling, and services for displaced homemakers so that they may enjoy the independence and economic security vital to a productive life.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term “displaced homemaker” means an individual who—

(A) has worked in the home for a substantial number of years providing unpaid household services for family members;

(B) is not gainfully employed;

(C) has had, or would have, difficulty in securing employment; and

(D) has been dependent on the income of another family member but is no longer supported by such income, or has been dependent on Federal assistance but is no longer eligible for such assistance; and

(2) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

MULTIPURPOSE SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall establish multipurpose service programs for displaced homemakers which shall include—

(1) job counseling services which shall—

(A) be specifically designed for a person entering the job market after a number of years as a homemaker; and

(B) operate to counsel displaced homemakers with respect to appropriate job opportunities;

(2) job training and job placement services which shall—

(A) develop, by working with State and local government agencies and private employers, training and placement programs for jobs in the public and private sectors;

(B) assist displaced homemakers in gaining admission to existing public and private job training programs and opportunities; and

(C) assist in identifying community needs and seeking funding for new public sector jobs;

(3) health education and counseling services with respect to—

(A) general principles of preventative health care;

(B) health care consumer education, particularly selection of physicians and health care services, including, but not limited to, Health Maintenance Organizations and health insurance;

(C) family health care and nutrition education;

(D) alcohol and drug addiction; and

(E) other related health care matters;

(4) financial management services which provide information and assistance with respect to insurance, taxes, estate and probate problems, mortgages, loans, and other related financial matters;

(5) educational services, including—

(A) outreach and information about courses offering credit through secondary or post-secondary education programs, including bilingual programming where appropriate; and

(B) information about such other programs which are determined to be of interest and benefit to displaced homemakers by the Secretary;

(6) legal counseling services which provide information and referral with respect to prepaid legal services plans, civil rights law, lawyer referral services, paralegal assistance, and other forms of legal assistance; and

(7) outreach and information services with respect to Federal employment, education, health, and unemployment assistance programs which the Secretary determines would

be of interest and benefit to displaced homemakers.

(b) Supervisory, technical, and administrative positions relating to multipurpose service programs established under this Act shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be filled by displaced homemakers.

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary may enter into contracts with and make grants to public and nonprofit private entities for purposes of establishing multipurpose service programs under this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging, and such other persons in the executive branch of the Federal Government as the Secretary considers appropriate to facilitate the coordination of multipurpose service programs established under this Act with existing Federal programs of a similar nature.

STUDY OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary shall—
(1) through coordination with the Secretary of Labor, conduct a study to determine the feasibility of and appropriate procedures for allowing displaced homemakers to participate in—

(A) programs established under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

(B) work incentive programs established under section 432(b)(1) of the Social Security Act; and

(C) related Federal employment, education, and health assistance programs; and

(2) through coordination with the Secretary of Labor, conduct a study to determine the feasibility of and appropriate procedures for allowing displaced homemakers to participate in programs established for benefits provided under—

(A) the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-373; 87 Stat. 708);

(B) title II of the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-567; 88 Stat. 1850);

(C) the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-572; 88 Stat. 1869); and

(D) related Federal unemployment assistance programs.

REPORT

Sec. 7. The Secretary shall submit a final report to each House of the Congress not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the studies conducted under section 6, together with such recommendations for legislative or other action as the Secretary may consider appropriate.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 8. The Secretary may, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, accept, use, and dispose of contributions of money, services, and property.

NONDISCRIMINATION

Sec. 9. No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex, age, race, color, religion, or national origin be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 10. Effective beginning with the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1976, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

FACT SHEET ON H.R. 7003—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS ACT

1. What is the purpose of this bill?

The purpose of H.R. 7003 is to provide for establishment of multipurpose service programs for displaced homemakers to help them through a readjustment period and become self-sufficient. The contribution of homemakers to society and the economy goes virtually unrecognized. Homemakers are among the few groups of workers who lack the protections of Social Security, unemployment insurance, or workmen's compensation. When their job responsibilities are terminated by divorce, separation, or widowhood in their middle years, they are often left without any source of financial security and little or no marketable work experience.

This legislation seeks to deal with the predicament of displaced homemakers by providing counseling and services so that they can enjoy the independence and security vital to a productive life.

2. Who are the "displaced homemakers"?

A displaced homemaker is an individual who has been doing unpaid labor in the home, who is not gainfully employed, who has had, or would have, difficulty in securing employment; and who has been dependent on the income of another family member but is no longer supported by that income.

These individuals, most often women in their middle years, have contributed years of maintaining a home and family and suddenly find themselves "displaced" through divorce, separation, widowhood, or other loss of family income.

A "displaced homemaker" could be a woman who has been dependent on her husband's income throughout their marriage and loses that financial support because of divorce or the death of her husband. Or it could be a man who has stayed at home to take care of his parents and loses his income because of their death. Or it could be a mother who is no longer eligible for federal welfare assistance because her children are past a certain age.

3. What are the problems facing the "displaced homemaker"?

This is a group that "falls between the crack" in terms of federal income security programs. They are frequently ineligible for social security benefits because they are too young, and for many, they will never qualify for Social Security because they have been divorced from the family wage earner. They are ineligible for Federal welfare assistance if they are not physically disabled and their children are over 18.

They are ineligible for unemployment insurance because they have been engaged in unpaid labor in the home, while at the same time they are often subject to discrimination in seeking employment because of age, sex, and lack of any recent paid work experience. They are subject to the highest unemployment rate of any sector of the workforce.

Often they have lost their rights as beneficiaries under employers' pension and health plans through divorce or widowhood and they are generally unacceptable to private health insurance plans because of their sex and age.

4. How extensive is the problem?

It is difficult to pinpoint exactly how many people would qualify as displaced homemakers because homemakers don't often appear in government statistics and their contribution to the economy is not recognized. However, the Alliance for Displaced Homemakers of Oakland, California has estimated, through careful research, that over 2.2 million women fell into the displaced homemaker category as of March, 1973.

They also point out that a large number of people are potential displaced homemakers:

Married women between the ages of 34 and 64 who are not in the labor force and have no children under 18 totalled 7.5 million in March, 1973. Moreover, 15 million women out of the labor force who currently have minor children will be without benefits when their children reach 18 years of age.

5. Why does this problem exist?

The changing status of the family has caught older women unprotected. The divorce rate has nearly doubled over the last decade and a half. In 1960, there were 35 divorces per 1000 and by 1974 this figure increased to 63 per 1000. One fourth of the divorces filed are after more than 15 years of marriage. The trend is toward no-fault dissolution of marriage and spousal support for limited periods, if at all.

Increasing number of older women live without men. There has been an increase of 46% in the number of households headed by women in the last decade. In 1973, 1 in every 8 families was headed by a woman, 40% of poor families had a woman as its head. Furthermore, there are more than four times as many widows as widowers. The older women become, the more likely they are to be on their own.

6. What does HR 7003 provide?

The bill provides for the establishment of multi-purpose service programs to offer training, counseling and services for displaced homemakers. The programs would be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

These programs include: job counseling, job training and placement services, health education and counseling, financial management services, legal referral and counseling services, education referral and counseling services and outreach and information services relating to already existing Federal programs.

The bill also calls for a one-year study and report to Congress on the feasibility of and appropriate procedures for including displaced homemakers under unemployment compensation programs. While homemakers make an invaluable contribution to the welfare and economic stability of this country, there is no unemployment insurance for a homemaker who is "laid off".

7. What can people do to assure passage of this bill?

HR 7003 is presently pending before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity of the House Education and Labor Committee. You and/or your organization can support this legislation by writing to the Chairman, the Hon. Augustus Hawkins, asking for hearings to be held on the bill.

Individuals should also write to their own Representative to urge their support and co-sponsorship of H.R. 7003, and to their Senators to urge support of the Senate counterpart, S. 2353, introduced by Senator John Tunney.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ASKS COMMERCE FOR DETAILS ON THE ENFORCEMENT OF ANTI-BOYCOTT POLICY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, while the Arab boycott continues to exert intense pressure upon American companies and violates our country's espoused doctrine of free trade, the Ford administration

resists all proposed legislation to counteract the insidious effects of the boycott and to protect American firms from this form of economic coercion. The administration has claimed consistently that new legislation is unnecessary since existing law enables executive departments to act against the boycott. Yet, the Departments of Commerce, State, Treasury, and Justice have not used their discretionary authority to take effective steps to combat the boycott. Given the administration's apparent unwillingness to take the initiative in this regard, it is incumbent upon Congress to mandate enforcement of our antiboycott policy through appropriate amendments to the Export Administration Act of 1969.

It is somewhat unfortunate that recent congressional involvement in this subject area has focused almost exclusively on the Commerce Department's refusal to disclose certain boycott-related information to the Congress and the public. While this issue is important and warrants prompt remedial action by the Congress or the courts, it has had the effect of deflecting attention from the fundamental issue—the administration's failure to exercise its existing discretionary powers and the resulting necessity of new legislation to combat the boycott.

I am pleased to report that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs, while still involved with its own dispute with the Commerce Department over the disclosure of boycott-related documents, is moving toward an investigation of the substance, or lack thereof, of the Department's enforcement of the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices. On October 17, Subcommittee Chairman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL sent a letter to Commerce Secretary Rogers Morton requesting detailed information on the Commerce Department's antiboycott program. I hope that Secretary Morton will reply expeditiously to Chairman ROSENTHAL's letter so that the subcommittee can move forward with public oversight hearings of the Department of Commerce and confirm the need for legislative action.

The text of the letter follows:

COMMERCE, CONSUMER, AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., October 17, 1975.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY:

The Export Administration Act of 1969, Public Law No. 91-184, 83 Stat. 841, provides:

"It is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States, and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States . . ." [Section 3(5), 50 App. U.S.C. § 2402(5)]

In carrying out its congressional responsi-

bility to oversee the Department of Commerce, the Subcommittee desires to know:

(1) What specific steps has the Department taken since the enactment of the Export Administration Act of 1969 to implement the section quoted above?

(2) Has the Department sought to deny or threatened to deny export licenses to U.S. companies that participate in or support such restrictive trade practices or boycotts? Specify all such instances.

(3) Has the Department sought to deny or threatened to deny benefits of Government programs, including subsidies and contracts, to companies which participate in or support such restrictive trade practices or boycotts? Specify all such instances.

(4) Has the Department sought to deny or threatened to deny export licenses to U.S. companies which violate Section 369.2 of the Export Administration Regulations detailing boycott reporting requirements? Please specify all such instances.

(5) If the answers to questions 2, 3 and/or 4 are in the negative, does the Department have the authority under existing law to take such actions?

(6) Under the Department's boycott reporting requirements, are foreign subsidiaries of American companies which receive requests for the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements to further or support a restrictive trade practice or boycott, required to report that fact to the Department?

(7) According to data supplied June 25, 1975, by Undersecretary John K. Tabor to Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., the total dollar value of goods involved in reported boycott-related transactions increased from less than \$10 million in 1974 to more than \$200 million in 1975 to date.

a. How do you explain this dramatic increase?

b. Could it be inferred from these statistics that the boycott reporting requirements were not adequately enforced prior to 1975?

c. To what extent do you believe the boycott reporting requirements are still violated or ignored?

(8) Please explain how the practice of the Department to distribute and disseminate bid invitations or "tenders" containing restrictive trade and boycott provisions directed against nations friendly to the United States is consistent with Section 3(5) of the Export Administration Act of 1969.

(9) Is the practice referred to in question 8 above carried out at public expense? If so, what is the approximate annual cost of distributing tenders containing boycott provisions to American firms?

(10) Section 369.2 of the Export Administration Regulations details the reports required of U.S. exporters subjected to boycott-related requests.

a. Describe in detail the Department's program to enforce said regulations from the date of promulgation to the present.

b. What is the approximate annual cost of this enforcement effort from 1969 to date? List manpower and budget allocated by year.

c. What evidence is gathered by the Department to warrant the issuance of warning letters? How is that evidence gathered?

d. Explain how the present reporting requirements serve to enforce our Nation's anti-boycott policy as stated in Section 3(5) of the Export Administration Act.

(11) On February 26, 1975, President Ford spoke out against restrictive trade practices and announced that your Department, among others, would conduct an investigation and make suitable recommendations for action.

a. Describe the investigation conducted by your Department.

b. Relate the findings and recommendations submitted to the President.

(12) Is there currently a Commerce Department Boycott Task Force? If so, who serves

on this task force? What are its responsibilities? What has it accomplished?

(13) It is required by existing law that data submitted in fulfillment of boycott reporting requirements be kept confidential from committees of the Congress with jurisdiction over your agency? If so, please cite the statute which guarantees confidentiality to this particular information.

(14) If the Commerce Department used its own discretion in deciding to collect boycott information under a promise of confidentiality, what were its reasons for such secrecy? Could the Department disclose all such information collected in the future? If not, why not?

(15) In your opinion, does current legislation give your Department adequate authority to enforce the anti-boycott policy contained within the Export Administration Act of 1969?

(16) Would new legislation be necessary to prohibit American companies from complying with boycott-related demands or is existing legislation adequate for that purpose?

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Chairman.

THE NATION SALUTES ALL WAGS A.C., INC. OF PATERSON, N.J. ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PUBLIC SERVICE TO OUR YOUNG PEOPLE IN COMPETITIVE SPORTS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 25, residents of my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey will gather together at the Westmount Country Club, West Paterson, N.J. in celebration of the 50th golden anniversary of All Wags A.C., Inc. of Paterson, N.J., esteemed sponsors of one of the most outstanding athletic youth programs of our Nation. It will be my honor and privilege to address this assemblage and I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest greetings and felicitations to the officers and members of All Wags A.C., Inc. on this most auspicious occasion in appreciation of the excellence of their public service to the youth of America in building strength of character, fair play, and sportsmanship through recreation in athletic and social activities for the youngsters of the Greater Paterson area between the ages of 7 and 18 years of age.

At the outset let me commend to you its current officers, trustees and past presidents who serve, and have served with distinction in bringing the highest standards of excellence to the sports world of baseball and football in the northeastern metropolitan area of our country, as follows:

THE HONORABLE OFFICERS—1975

Sam Sibillo, President.

Rich Perrotta, 1st Vice President.

Fred Calvetti, 2d Vice President.

Richard Marotta, Financial Secretary.

John A. Pasquale III, Recording Secretary.

Charles Tolomeo, Treasurer.
James Ferraro, Sergeant-at-Arms.
Robert J. Passero, Counsel.

TRUSTEES

Bob Wyder, Chairman.
Ray Guarino, Sr.
Tony Pasquale.
Rocco Merlino.
Ralph Tolomeo, Sr.
John J. Pasquale.
Steve Scillieri.

PAST PRESIDENTS

* William "Wee" Menler.
Tony Pasquale.
Charles Baratta.
John J. Pasquale.
Charles Trombetta.
Henry Sgrosso.
*Ed Bastady.
*Joe Passero.
Mort Rittenberg.
*Phil Ross.
Ralph Tolomeo, Jr.
Dom Dinardo.
Tony Mariconda.
Tom Church.
John A. Pasquale, III.
Robert J. Passero.
Tom Piccoli.
Nick De Nova.
Tom Maselli.
Robert Wyder.
*Deceased.

In reflecting on the history of All Wags, Inc., we recall the quality of leadership and sincerity of purpose of distinguished community leaders throughout the years who were responsible for perpetuating its sterling principles and achieving the preeminence of its athletic and social endeavors that brought joy and refreshment of spirit to our people during these past 50 years.

The initial fundraising and founding of All Wags, Inc., was led by William "Wee" Menler, Harold Greider, Nick Pandolfi, Charles Baratta, Tony Martone, Augie Feura, Mike Grego, Joe and Tony Ianozzi, Mike Feura, Pete Sheridan, Paul Loffredo, and Tony Pasquale. It is interesting to note that in 1930 through the outstanding contribution of Mike Parella, Dom Mele, Louis and Emil Sgrosso, Sam La Cava, Carmen LePore, Emil Schmidt, Russ Pagaon, Fred DeFeo and Doc Naples All Wags A.C. attained blue ribbon performances in baseball participating in the playoffs with a 25 to 8 record, facing the Emblems in the finals. In 1933 they won the City Championship and with a 22 to 2 record went on to win the State Championship in 1934 behind the "major league" pitching arm of Nick Swetz, one of the most heralded southpaws of Paterson, N.J.; and second baseman Joe Passero, who later served as Recreation Commissioner of the City of Paterson. Other members of this championship squad were: infielders Sammy Matchett, Cubby Matchett, and Johnny De Maria; outfielders Ralph Knight, Al Cozzalino and Casey DeSist; pitchers Doc Naples, Kreger De Young, Jackie Eelman and Mike DeVita; catchers Fred DeFeo and Ralph "Corp" Delullo, who later served as area scout for the Chicago Cubs; assisted by Johnny McToskie, Jim Pagano, Joe Ivanicki, Lucky McKee and Stan Piela; and manager Tony Pasquale, who

is still an active officer and trustee in the All Wags today.

All Wags A.C. expanded and added football honors to their success in baseball. In 1932 and 1934 they had two championship football teams under the leadership of Adam "Oatsie" Reiser, who is held in the highest esteem as our present Chief of Passaic County Detectives. Members of these championship squads were Lou LePera, Mike Parelli, Harold Greider, Carmen Spagnola, Ed Bastady, Ralph Pagano, Al Saccomano, Art Passaro, Charles Baratta, George LePera, Charles Salvatore, Charlie Tolomeo, Carmen Cuccinello, Phil Mangarelli, Al Faragalli, Ralph Tolomeo, Pete Ferraro, Jim Ferraro, Joe DeMaria, Morris Barone, Fred DeFeo, Al Lepore, Frank LePore, Nick Paone, Charles Martone, Jim Raymond, Lembo Perrone, Sam Silverstri, Tom Silvestri, Mike LaGreca, George Maiella, Johnny Belcastro.

On its 25th anniversary, following the end of World War II, All Wags A.C. reorganized under the expertise and direction of community leader John J. Pasquale, and other distinguished citizens, including charter member, Tony Pasquale, the late Fred DeFeo, the late Ed Bastady, Charles Trombetta, Henry Sgrosso, Louis Sgrosso, Emil Sgrosso, Charles Tolomeo, Ralph Tolomeo, Rocco Merlino, Jim Ferraro, Sam and Tom Silvestri, Harold Greider, Paul Loffredo, George Maiella, Lou Pezzuti, Dominice Mele, John Belcastro, Wee Menler, Carmen Cuccinello, Dan DeCando, Gus DeSantis, George Furey, Ralph Knight, Nick LaGreca, Joe Mele, Oatsie Reiser, Pete Sheridan, Carmen Spagnola, the late Jerry Maiella, John DeMaria, Doc Naples, the late Joe Passero, and Jim Pagano.

In their sponsorship of young people in the Paterson Midget League and the Junior Development League, the members of All Wags A.C. have made a lasting contribution to the future preeminence of America's society in training and developing, through sportsmanship, fair play and recreation, the industriousness and leadership qualities of our youth.

The Midget League program was launched under the direction of Ed Bastady, Fred DeFeo, and Dominice Mele who brought Midget League baseball to Hawthorne, N.J., when he sponsored a team called the Mele's All Wags in a league which is known today as the Hawthorne Little League. A perfect 16 to 0 score that won them the 1962 Midget League championship under the direction of John Ciogoli is still a record of great pride to all.

Under the direction of Joe Passero, Mort Rittenberg, and Tony Pasquale, the junior development program expanded with some of the members of the team continuing to develop their outstanding expertise as members of the Paterson Development League and, in some instances, going on to achieve distinction in the major leagues including such notables as the late Danny O'Connell, Larry Doby, and Butch Sawatski. Some of the distinguished players on the Junior Development teams included Joe Russo, Bob Passero, Joe Vitale, Ralph Tolomeo, Jr.,

John A. Pasquale, III, Charlie Linfante, Ray Delarme, Dan DeCando, Frank LaSala, Gabe Maletta, Ron Barbaris, Henry Sgrosso, Don Silvestri, Tony DeGrazia, Tony "Lefty" Pallotta, Frank Petrucelli, Joe Petrucelli, Pat DiLemmo, Frank Gilabert, and Rich Sales. They posted a championship in 1969 under the direction of Lou Iozia.

The Ladies Auxiliary of All Wags A.C. was organized in May 1957 consisting of approximately 12 charter members, including President Jean Pezzutti, Vice President Adelle Trombetta, Secretary Elda Pasquale, Rose DeFeo, Emily Merlino, Josephine Ross, and a board of trustees comprised of Mary DeNova, Mary LaSala, Phil Pasquale, Marie Tolomeo, Rose Passero, Loretta Notorgiacomo and Ann Tolomeo. Throughout the years the ladies auxiliary has been an integral part of All Wags A.C.'s successful endeavors and, among their many significant achievements, was the establishment of the Joe Passero Memorial Pee Wee League during the 1958 baseball season which, in the early years, featured Mort Rittenberg and Joe Passero as its directors and an exemplary group of women coaches and assistants, including Dea Mitchell, Angie Forte, Doris Serviss, Millie Giglio, Mary Iandoli, Lorraine Wassmer, June Turner, Emma Schamble, Mary Richardson, Pauline Church, Eleanor Marmo, Marie Wassmer, Marie Tolomeo, Anna Mae Recchione, Rose DeFeo, Jean Pezzutti, Elda Pasquale, Mary Giarusso, Violet McNamara, Pauline Babitz, Jean Sibillo, Pat Ross and Michelle Tolomeo. In 1964, after the death of Joe Passero, the league was renamed the Joe Passero Memorial Pee Wee League.

The ladies auxiliary was responsible for introducing many young girls of the Paterson area to the sport of softball and recruited some of them as coaching assistants in the Pee Wee League.

In 1961 All Wags A.C. ventured into Connie Mack baseball under the direction of Tony Stumpo, Ralph Tolomeo, Jr., Bob Passero, and John A. Pasquale III. The following year they expanded into American Legion baseball under the direction of Ralph Tolomeo, Jr. and Jim LaBagnaro. The American Legion/Connie Mack combined record under LaBagnaro and Tolomeo was 60 wins, 9 losses and they won the 1962 State championship and 10 years later the 1972 State championship. Some of their alumni team members included Milwaukee Brewers outfielder John Briggs, Boston Red Sox minor leaguer Roger Nelson, San Francisco Giant Bill Benitz and New York Mets' Jim Didioco. Team member Mike Rosenfelt still holds the NCAA stolen base record which he attained while attending Hofstra University.

It is interesting to note that in addition to baseball and football records of distinction All Wags A.C. counted up championship basketball records in junior lightweight, lightweight and middleweight league competition from 1959 through 1964. Coach Tyrone Barnes was especially lauded for the blue ribbon performance of the middleweight league teams.

The introduction of tackle football for high school students in the City of Pater-

son was achieved through the efforts of All Wags A.C. in conjunction with other Paterson civic groups under the Presidency of Tom Piccoli, who represented the Wags and the Old Timers. The Old Timers Junior Football League has completed its 6th year of competition, and continues to uphold the standards of excellence established by the founders of this athletic endeavor and prowess in tackle football. Only last year All Wags A.C. finally captured the elusive city championship under head coach Bob Giarusso in a thrilling game against the Junior State Colts.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take a few moments to look through the hour glass and reflect on some of the highlights of the past half century of All Wags A.C. and seek national recognition of the many achievements that have been attained by this esteemed organization in their outstanding and unselfish efforts on behalf of our people. They have combined their recreational, social and athletic endeavors in helping young and adults alike. I particularly commend to you their many fund raising activities and charitable deeds for God's children, the disadvantaged, underprivileged and retarded children, the Elks Cerebral Palsy Center, Cancer Crusade, Heart Association, Easter and Christmas Seal programs for the handicapped. I know you will want to join with me in saluting All Wags A.C. Inc. for 50 Golden Years of good works which have truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

ECHOES IN FORD'S TAX PLAN

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Ford's recent tax proposal has caused widespread comment and concern. An editorial in *Newsday* points out certain weaknesses in the plan. I would like to share *Newsday's* views with my colleagues:

ECHOES IN FORD'S TAX PLAN

"It is time to get big government off your back and out of your pocket."—Richard Nixon, January, 1973.

"... Only by getting the government off your back and out of your pocket will we achieve our goals of stable prices and more jobs."—Gerald Ford, Monday night.

President Ford's audacious tax-cut plan, in which he offers to sponsor what he calls a "dollar-for-dollar" reduction in both federal taxes and spending up to the munificent total of \$28 billion, seems to have left many congressional leaders speechless. Here are some questions they should be asking:

Would Ford's plan really be "the biggest single tax cut in our history," as he put it on television Monday night—or a modest addition to tax cuts already in effect? The White House's arithmetic compares proposed 1976 tax rates with 1974 rates. It ignores the antirecession tax cuts enacted last March, which Congress in any case was certain to extend next year. For individuals, the President's new proposal would mean an additional \$4 billion in tax relief—provided Congress is willing and able to cut \$28 billion from the next fiscal year's federal budget.

Where would the budget cuts be made? About all Ford has to say about that is, "I will not permit reductions in our military budget," which is the federal government's single biggest expense item. He promises to have a list of proposed budget cuts ready in January, but that's too late. The current tax-cut law expires in December and must be extended before then if the nation is to escape a damaging tax increase next year.

Who would benefit the most from Ford's proposed tax package? According to Ford, "the chief benefits will be concentrated where they belong: among working people." But while this year's tax-cut bill was weighted heavily in favor of low-income workers, tables issued by the White House indicate that a family of four earning \$5,000 would get no additional tax relief at all next year under the Ford plan, while a family of four earning \$50,000 would save an additional \$390.

There are other questions that need answers, too. What of the President's plan, announced only last week, to pump \$100 billion into energy development? And what are Ford's views on tax reform? The President was strangely silent on that issue, although there's no more efficient way of achieving his highly desirable goal of cutting the budget deficit. Finally, how can Congress possibly agree to a budget ceiling even before the Ford administration has submitted its budget? Richard Nixon also demanded a blank check from Congress; he didn't get it.

Ford's plan borrows heavily from the Nixon program not only in language and ideology but, sadly, in technique as well. It is deliberately obscure in detail. It makes promises that even the President must know he cannot keep. It includes a built-in scapegoat—Congress—in the case of failure. If Ford had deliberately set out to confuse the critical issue of whether this year's tax cuts should be extended in 1976 as a vital antirecessionary measure, he could not have done a better job. His performance on television Monday night was not worthy of the honest and forthright man who, as he replaced a disgraced Richard Nixon, promised the nation "openness and candor" and who until now has fulfilled that promise.

GAS CUSTOMERS PAYING SPECIAL SURCHARGE

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this fall over 2 million Southern California Gas customers will begin paying a special monthly surcharge, totaling \$640 million over the next 7 years.

The funds will be used by Atlantic Richfield to pay back huge bank insurance loans secured for the development of natural gas supplies. In exchange for this interest-free money, Southern California Gas will have first option on part of the developed reserves. This customer-to-producer aid scheme is unique. Traditionally, oil and gas companies have relied exclusively on investors, with the customer paying the investor for taking risks.

Similar proposals have been filed with the New York Public Service Commission.

Tom Hayden, candidate for the U.S. Senate in California, recently addressed the subject in an August 20 speech to

the Committee on Energy and Diminishing Materials of the California State Assembly. His remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY TOM HAYDEN

I am here today to associate myself with those protesting the present and projected giveaway of billions of consumer dollars to two of the wealthiest corporations in California: Atlantic Richfield (ARCO) and EXXON. I am here to ask: Who will represent the desperate consumers who are essentially being held ransom by the private oil and energy corporations?

The questions before us are fundamentally political, not technical or narrowly economic. A careful reading of the recent Public Utilities Commission (PUC) decision on the ARCO deal reveals that what is at question is power, not economic logic. The ARCO and EXXON deals symbolize the primordial issue of our time: whether the many or the few will control and profit from our resources.

The PUC, mandated to protect the interest of millions of Californians, has found the ARCO deal "ill-defined", "unfair" and "unconscionable". Because ARCO threatens to sell the gas elsewhere, however, the PUC "with great reluctance" has accepted the deal "for one reason only: necessity". We are now being asked to accept the notion that a few private men are more powerful than a governmental body.

We cannot accept this. We cannot continue to see a handful of private executives control the lives of millions of Californians, protecting profit-oriented privilege while the rest of us find it increasingly hard just to get by. I am tired of driving slower and paying more for gas; tired of eating less and paying more for food; tired of calling information operators less but paying higher phone bills. And, most emphatically, I am tired of turning down my lights only to see utility rates climb.

While a majority of our people continue to bear an almost unbearable burden of sacrifice, the few are having their unnecessary and immoral power protected by the decisions of politicians and their appointees.

We are living in a new international context which has sharpened this conflict between the many and the few. Multinational corporations like EXXON are losing their profit base as the Middle East oil-producers can demand more than the slave wages and prices of the past generation. These companies are returning home in a period when the choicest exploration targets have already been exhausted, and federal price controls make refining and marketing less profitable than the giants are accustomed to.

As the oil companies come home, the battle is joined. The companies project spending some \$300 billion on oil and gas production over the next decade. Their total energy package over the next fifteen years, moreover, exceeds one trillion dollars.

Where is this unprecedented flow of capital to the energy giants to come from? If it is to come from direct consumer financing as in the ARCO deal, millions of Californians and tens of millions of Americans will know poverty we have not seen since the Great Depression.

The view of the economic royalists running our oil companies is clear. The power and opulent living standards to which they are habituated is to be maintained by consumers. And so, the economic screw must tighten on our ratepayers.

But who are these giants whom the ratepayer-consumer must help to bring energy supplies to California? While they appear as paupers before utility commissions, they boast of incredible economic success to their investors.

"Atlantic Richfield Corporation in 1974 earned \$474,605,000 or \$8.35 per share compared to \$270,185,000 or \$4.76 per share in 1973," begins the ARCO annual report in

a year in which millions of Californians had to tighten their belts as never before because of skyrocketing energy costs.

The May, 1975 issue of Fortune magazine tells us that in 1974 EXXON was the most profitable corporation in the entire country, with profits of \$3.1 billion. Although their profits have fallen for the first quarter of 1975 from the all-time highs of 1974, ARCO and EXXON are still among the most profitable corporations in the entire country and are making far more than in the past. From 1965-1972, for example, ARCO's highest average quarterly earning was \$57.2 million in 1969. In the first three months of 1975, they made \$67.5 million; even as they decided to blackmail the consumers of California into paying for their gas production in Alaska.

And what do they do with these profits? They tell us that they are used to develop new energy sources. Reading Business Week of July 14, 1975, however, we find that "the big multinational companies are, in fact, beginning to diversify outside energy". Mobil buys a controlling interest in Marcor, a department store and packaging conglomerate. Standard Oil of California buys 20% of Amax, a metal mining company. Gulf is considering a merger with Rockwell International. Congressman John D. Dingell of Michigan reports that: "Oilmen have told us that they have a desperate need for money to develop new energy sources, but instead they're putting their profits into dividends, salaries and bonuses, and investing in totally different industries."

The ARCO Towers themselves in downtown Los Angeles are a symbol of the different standards that apply for the many and the few. ARCO spends millions on a huge advertising campaign telling the public to save energy. Meanwhile, ARCO Towers consumes each month as much energy as 6,500 single-family homes housing some 25,000 people in Los Angeles.

If we look at the Boards of Directors of the banks and utility companies, we find a pattern of corporate and financial incest, not a pattern of separate parties negotiating for the most economical loan arrangements. The boards of both ARCO and Pacific Lighting, the parent of SoCal, are full of bankers:

Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the board of ARCO, is a director of Chase Manhattan Bank and the Security Pacific Bank;

Thornton F. Bradshaw, ARCO President, is a director of Security Pacific Bank;

Gaylord Freeman, ARCO Director, is Chairman of the Board of First Chicago Corporation, the holding company which owns First National Bank of Chicago;

Paul Miller, Chairman of the Board of Pacific Lighting, is a Director of Wells Fargo Bank;

Joseph Rensch, President of Pacific Lighting, is a Director of the Union Bank;

John V. Vaughn, Director of Pacific Lighting, is a Director of Crocker National Bank, and Chairman of the Iran-American Chamber of Commerce and Industry;

William French Smith, Director of Pacific Lighting, is a Director of Crocker National Bank;

Not only are banks interlocked with the oil giants through their directors and management executives, they increasingly control enormous stock in the corporations. Given this trend, it should come as no surprise to find that ARCO officials have asked the First National City Bank of New York to put together the loan for the SoCal deal. The First National City Bank controls the largest block of stock in ARCO! According to a 1974 report by Senator Lee Metcalf, which lists ARCO's 30 largest stockholders of record, First National City Bank controls the largest single block of stock through two nominee names—Stuart and Company, and King and Company. Thus the ratepayers are giving millions to ARCO, which is dominated by a major New York bank, in order to pay the loan interest to the same bank.

If there ever was a case of crime in the suites, the ARCO deal is it. We, the consumers and voters of California, have been robbed—and without proper protection from the authorities we elected to protect our interests. It is a fact that:

1. The private energy corporations are getting around and over the regulated price of natural gas by obtaining "advance payments" from ratepayers for their interest on loans to finance exploration—without any guarantee that a single cubic foot of gas will ever be delivered. (As the PUC order notes, "the real effect, in our opinion, has been to provide an extra bonus on top of the price of natural gas.")

2. The same private interests know that the "advance payments" system will end this year by FPC or court order, and so they are forcing this rip-off just under the wire.

In approving this utility increase, the PUC has caved in to what it clearly perceives as blackmail by ARCO.

By so doing, it has established the most dangerous possible precedent. Next month EXXON will be demanding its similar deal with Pacific Gas and Electric. What will the PUC do then? And then? And then?

Instead, we need public officials who will stand up against these energy monopolists and assert the public interest. The principle must be established here and now that the public interest will prevail over private privilege. It is not too late for this showdown between our public servants and those economic royalists who would bring us into the "Rollerball" nightmare portrayed in a recent movie.

The blackmail must stop.

1. I call upon the legislature to strike down this giveaway by declaring that it is not permissible under the State statutes authorizing the PUC.

2. I call upon the PUC to issue an order to put representatives of consumer groups on the Board of Directors of Southern California Gas Corporation and other electric and gas utility corporations. If we the consumers are going to be asked to pay for the classic risk-taking function of the entrepreneur, then we ought to share the benefits or even go into business for ourselves. Gaining seats on the Board of SoCal Gas would be the first step in this direction.

I urge you to act now to establish the principle that the public interest will control energy production in the decades to come—before it is too late.

Right now, for example, these same special-privilege corporations are waging a manipulative advertising campaign to de-regulate the price of natural gas. I am pleased that the PUC had the sanity and courage to oppose such an inflationary step, and I am hopeful that the United States Congress will concur. But the PUC approval of the current ARCO requests more than cancels out their applaudable stand on de-regulation. Where the pinch is most severe the PUC has failed to help suffering people. If this pattern continues, they will not only eventually cave in on de-regulation of natural gas, they will ultimately commit consumers to subsidizing the cost of transporting natural gas brought from Alaska by pipeline and/or super-tanker.

The blackmail must and can stop now. We are not simply talking about saving ratepayers from a \$588 to \$987 million gouging on this ARCO deal. We are considering the tens of billions more dollars consumers will be forced to pay unless this precedent is stopped.

We elect politicians to protect us against such calamities, and I believe they should begin now. A political showdown between our elected officials and profit-seeking oil executives is what we need; and it can be won. California, our largest state, simply cannot be strangled or ignored in a showdown with the large oil blackmailers.

It is a question of political commitment

and political will. We can make these arrogant giants back down from profit and begin serving the people. It can start here, it can start today, it can start with you.

If you act, you will have the good will and support of a majority of Californians. If you do not act, you will not only have helped the energy monopolies, but you will have guaranteed a deepening of public cynicism toward all politicians. You will only have postponed crises which cry out for solutions rather than delay.

I implore you to act with courage and principle. You can change the history of this state. Thank you.

QUARTERLY ADJUSTMENT RESOLUTION

HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, today the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee unanimously recommended to the full Committee a resolution that would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust quarterly the price support level for milk in order to provide the stability in this industry that the law clearly intends it to have.

In 1949, the Congress passed legislation establishing the dairy price support program. The basic goals of that program were to assure the production of an adequate supply of milk at stable prices high enough to encourage dairy farmers to stay in business.

In 1973, that legislation was reviewed and an additional goal assigned: To assure the maintenance of adequate productivity within the dairy industry to meet future anticipated needs.

In order to fulfill the goals of this legislation dating back to 1949, the Secretary of Agriculture has been given authority to adjust milk support prices to meet changes in the costs of production and parity. If he would use that authority, the resolution before us today would not be necessary. In recent years, milk support prices have been adjusted annually. The best evidence of the inadequacy of that policy is the fate of dairymen themselves.

Wisconsin lost 60 percent of its dairy farms in the last 20 years, an average of 3,500 per year. This represents the loss of over one-half million milking cows. In this year to date, 1,195 dairy farmers have gone out of business in Wisconsin. Milk shortages will drive prices up, as they have recently, making the consumer an added victim. An assurance that prices for milk will be kept current with rising costs of production and parity levels would give farmers some small cause for hope. It would give them a base price they could rely on. In the end, it might in some small way slow down the exodus from dairying and encourage farmers to stay on the farm.

At least two Congresses, the 93d and the 94th, have noted these developments and determined that quarterly adjustment of the milk support price would be a stabilizing factor—for the farmer and the consumer. Both of those bodies have

passed comprehensive legislation designed to encourage dairy farmers by including quarterly adjustments. The bills were vetoed by the President.

The resolution before us today would call for a simple administrative adjustment of the price four times a year. It does not add any new authority to present law. It will merely cause the Secretary of Agriculture to pay attention to what is going on in the dairy industry and take the kind of action two Congresses have thought necessary.

Commonsense would dictate that this action is indeed necessary. In a period of rapid inflation such as we are and have been experiencing, the farmer cannot wait an entire year for the Department of Agriculture to readjust support prices and match them against rising costs. Asking farmers to wait a year for the needed adjustment is akin to giving a starving man seed corn, telling him to plant it and feast on the harvest months later.

Even the Secretary of Agriculture has come to the conclusion that annual adjustments are not enough. He has said he will consider semiannual adjustments of the support price. I consider this an inadequate measure, and I am happy to see that Senator HUMPHREY, whose companion bill in the Senate has just been passed, agrees.

I would like to note for the record the significant contribution of the subcommittee, under its able Chairman Ed JONES, in conducting field hearings across the country on the present status of the dairy situation, and documenting the problems firsthand. Those hearings—held in Connecticut, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and Tennessee—are now nearly complete. I had the privilege of attending hearings in three States and would conclude, based on my experience at those hearings, that while the administrative change called for by this bill is a modest one, it is desperately needed by dairy producers.

Because of USDA opposition to this measure, and because of Earl Butz' tendency to supply this committee information freely, whether it is factually accurate, or not, I would like to note for the record the following:

The quoted price support level of \$7.24/cwt. for manufacturing milk was equal to 77.8%—not 80%—of parity last April;

In August 1975 the quoted price support of \$7.24/cwt. was still less than 76% of parity.

Some of this lag can be attributed to a failure on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust make allowances. Recently, under pressure from members of this committee and farmers across the country, the Secretary did make such an adjustment. But make allowance lag is only a small part of the discrepancy. The crux of the matter is the continuing failure by the Secretary to keep quoted support levels current with parity increases.

The price support program has not provided the assurances it intended. I support more than 80-percent parity for the dairy farmers; but if 80 percent is all that they are allowed, then I feel that 80 percent ought to be the very least that is administratively required.

KISSINGER BITES HAND THAT FED HIM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, every so often we come across an article that does not require elaboration or commentary in that it quite effectively speaks for itself.

Therefore, I insert in the RECORD an article by Bob Wiedrich which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Monday, October 20, 1975:

KISSINGER BITES HAND THAT FED HIM
(By Bob Wiedrich)

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger may well be the world's foremost diplomat. But his personal diplomacy stinks.

In fact, his deprecating remarks about former President Nixon, uttered in what he obviously believed to be an off-the-cuff moment in Canada last week, were in extremely bad taste.

For the man about whom he confided snide remarks, at a dinner staged in his honor in Ottawa, was the one person most responsible for Kissinger getting that distinguished free meal as the guest of Canadian External Affairs Minister Allan MacEachen.

Without Nixon in his life, Kissinger might still be brown bagging it at Harvard University.

As the whole world knows, Dr. Kissinger was a mere Harvard professor and adviser to then New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, when Nixon plucked him from relative obscurity to make him his senior foreign affairs adviser.

In virtually no time, Kissinger emerged as the cock of the White House walk, overshadowing William Rogers, who was then secretary of state. And in the years that followed, Kissinger was permitted to carve his personal niche in the history books only through the good offices of Richard M. Nixon.

Otherwise, the world might never have heard of Henry Kissinger.

Yet, that background of personal advancement because of Nixon had no leveling effect on Kissinger's tongue when he chose to become a back fence gossip while breaking bread with the high and mighty of the Canadian capital.

Nixon, Kissinger confided to his no doubt titillated dinner companions, was "a very odd man," "an unpleasant man," and "an artificial man."

Nixon had "barely governed" during the last 18 months of his presidency as the Watergate scandal crashed down about him, Kissinger continued. He lacked spontaneity in meeting people. He hated to meet new people. He didn't like crowds. People sensed he was uncomfortable with them. He couldn't understand why Nixon had even become a politician, Kissinger concluded.

Granted, the secretary of state, also offered a few gratuitous remarks about his former boss and sponsor.

Nixon had been very good at foreign policy. He was decisive in his own way. And Kissinger lumped Nixon with Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower as among the great post war Presidents.

But in the final analysis, Kissinger would have been better advised sticking to polite cocktail talk or keeping his mouth shut.

Because unbeknownst to Kissinger, his in-temperate and indiscreet remarks were being inadvertently transmitted to a lounge in the Canadian National Press Club where a radio reporter was faithfully recording them for broadcast to 42 Canadian stations.

And Kissinger, always the bon vivant ladies man of global diplomacy, couldn't resist indulging in a moment of idle chamber chatter for the entertainment of several women present who had inquired about the quality of American Presidents.

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis was "sexy," but her late first husband, John F. Kennedy, had been a disaster in Kissinger's judgment during the first two years of his presidency.

And, on the eve of his eighth trip to Red China, Kissinger was sufficiently lacking in poise to observe to his probably spellbound audience that Premier Chou En-lai was "very ill and I think he's dying."

That may have furnished the ladies present with enough fodder for their own back yards for a month. However, his last remark may have proved disconcerting to the man who is hosting the egg rolls during Henry's visit to Peking this week.

In our judgment, it was a cheap shot for Kissinger to deal in petty, derogatory locker room comments about Richard Nixon, the man who gave him the free rein and forum to become an international diplomat privy to the intimate facts of public figures.

Even if he had never known Nixon, it would still have been distasteful for the secretary of state to discuss in detail the personal idiosyncrasies of a deposed President with foreign government officials.

Thruout his tenure in the Nixon administration, Kissinger was never denied the right to bask in the glory of his accomplishments. Nixon went out of his way to praise Kissinger as he rose as the super star of the international scene and won for himself a Nobel Peace Prize for the Viet Nam Peace Accords of 1973.

And Nixon always kept him on center stage in the negotiations that led to the opening of detente with Red China and Soviet Russia. Not once did Nixon publicly ruffle a feather on Kissinger's diplomatic cloak.

Thus, Kissinger's conduct reeks of bad taste, bad manners, and boorishness. It displays an arrogant insensitivity and a disgraceful lack of appreciation for what Nixon did for Kissinger.

BROKERAGE INDUSTRY CONTEM- PLATING LEAVING NEW YORK CITY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as if New York City did not have enough problems, the brokerage industry is contemplating leaving in one of the biggest business exoduses from that troubled municipality.

Recent improvements in stock transfers and consolidation of so-called "back-room" activity in the stock industry has made decentralization of the industry possible.

New York City and State have not made Gotham a friendly place for stockbrokers to do business either. Sizable stock transfer and corporate bond transfer taxes have added to the already high costs of the brokerage business.

An article in the September 29, 1975, edition of the Money Manager details the conditions now being laid for the possible departure of the stock industry from New York. Since the Congress will be dealing with New York City's financial crisis in

the near future, I am inserting the article at this point in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

CONSOLIDATED CLEARING IS THE KEY TO EXODUS IF BROKERAGE HOUSES WANT TO LEAVE NEW YORK

(By Charles Koshetz)

The joke about putting the broker-dealers of Wall Street aboard the Queen Mary and floating the whole operation to wherever the chance for transfer taxes was least was repeated here last week. At the time, it was meant to be dismissed as a one-laugh. But a little probing indicates it may be more of a spectre, for New York, than a joke.

The securities industry has been striving for centralized processing. Only last week the New York and American stock exchanges, together with the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD), announced the formation of a Special Clearing Advisory Committee.

It will work on rather detailed plans to consolidate the clearing corporations which they operate. This process is already well advanced. The Big Board and Amex, through the jointly owned Securities Industry Automation Corp. (SIAC), have already automated and meshed much of the delivery and transfer of the stock on their respective lists.

The NASD, which is the self-regulatory agency of the over-the-counter traders, has automated its clearing with the National Clearing Corp. (NCC), which now remains to be somehow combined with SIAC.

Another element in the system is Depository Trust Co. (DTC), which will be spun-off from NYSE control through the sale of stock to DTC participants. It was created to help banks and brokers immobilize stock certificates by having them stored in DTC's vaults or the vaults of participants while handling stock and bond accounts through electronic bookkeeping.

DTC is officially a separate entity from SIAC. But both were largely organized by the NYSE, and share computers. They are located

on the same block of floors at 55 Water Street in Manhattan.

Now one of the key factors in keeping the broker-dealers in New York City, aside from inertia, and pride in the location, has been the need for the physical proximity so that securities can be exchanged or deposited overnight in banks as collateral. SIAC, DTC, NCC, and all the other initials will spell the end of the lockbox and the messengers of Wall Street.

They could also spell mobility. The age of Terminal Man is fast dawning, as banks and bank regulators are finding out. Many see the black box as the end product in the securities industry also, or at least for the transfer and delivery "back office" processes. Automated trading will be another matter.

Add the Statewide New York stock transfer tax (with its recent 25% surcharge) to the equation, and the new secondary market corporate bond transfer tax (a Citywide liability), which have nettled the New York securities industry, and one can see some motivation for a mass exodus.

A few years ago, the idea of a securities industry "industrial park" in New Jersey was being considered. At the same time the Big Board was threatening to move to Jersey City. Nothing happened.

Now, however, the prospect of consolidated clearing may change the situation.

For brokers, the change can be for the better or for the worse. Consolidated clearing can have the effect of drawing more turnover under the New York tax umbrella. Or, it could provide the way for all the turnover to escape the taxes.

Another factor to watch are the New York banks. They do a lot of clearing for the big, institutional customers. And it has been reported that at least some of them would like to unload these functions, with SIAC very happy to take up the business.

The DTC, of course, has already relieved the banks of much of this burden. And it should be noted that DTC has been moving in the direction of having the actual custody of bank-owned securities kept in vaults other than its own.

Again, this is making it easier for the securities industry to cut loose from New York.

Well, suppose there is a big exodus from New York. Where will everybody go. If the move comes about because of the reasons speculated upon above, proximity to Wall Street will not be an important factor.

Up to now, it has. Indeed, Weeden & Co., which shook up the industry with its plans to move its traders over to Jersey City, is only moving this part of its operations to a location which is a few minutes away from Downtown Manhattan via the Port Authority's Trans-Hudson rapid transit line.

Weeden is moving these operations to an area known as Exchange Place, which is on the Hudson River and already houses smaller over-the-counter houses which don't like transfer taxes either. But there is not much space available in Exchange Place, and certainly not for all the firms, such as Morgan Stanley or Drexel Burnham, which are reportedly considering moving part of their operations out of New York also.

Exchange Plaza is an urban renewal area which has seen more demolition than construction. The Ukrainian National Association has a 15-story office building which houses small transfer operations, the Jersey City Board of Education, and if the deal goes through, Weeden.

This would leave only two 19,000-square-foot floors free in the building. Perhaps encouraged by the importance of its prospective tenants, the owner was asking \$8 per square foot as the rental for the uncommitted space.

Space in the hard-hit Downtown New York real estate market, at least in office buildings, is said to go for considerably less.

In any event, broker-dealers may not like the view of the parking lots, the railroad embankment, the Colgate-Palmolive soap plant, the cold storage warehouses, and the abandoned waterfront which can be enjoyed from the sleepy location in Jersey City.

The view of the Financial District, however, is great. But, it could be a case of out-of-sight, out-of-mind.

SENATE—Wednesday, October 22, 1975

The Senate met at 9 a.m. 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:

O Thou who art from age to age the same, the Creator of all that is good, we thank Thee for the energy implanted in the universe, revealed in nature, discovered and used by man. Show us now Thy plan for the better use of Thy great gifts. And inspire us again by the vision of the higher energies of the spirit, the strength of the mind, the power of personality, the dynamism of the Gospel. Impart Thy wisdom and Thy grace to all who serve in this body, and keep us faithful to the end when Thy perfect kingdom comes and Thy will is done.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. 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 second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., October 22, 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 reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 21, 1975, be dispensed with.

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.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator withhold that request temporarily?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withhold that request, Mr. President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations under New Reports.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Byron Crawford Leddy, of Virginia, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.