

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:10 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 21, 1975, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 20, 1975:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Donald G. Brotzman, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice M. David Lowe, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William B. Cummings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Brian P. Gettings, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Andrew W. O'Donnell Arthur J. Pollon
Adolph G. Schwenk Kenneth McLennan
Herbert L. Wilkerson Joseph Koler, Jr.
Clarence H. Schmid

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Francis W. Tief William B. Fleming
Calhoun J. Killeen Charles G. Cooper
Edwardy J. Megarr John K. Davis

Darrel E. Bjorklund William R. Maloney
George L. Bartlett Charles D. Roberts, Jr.
Richard C. Schulze

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of section 593(a), title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Kenneth D. Anderson, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Ronald L. Beyers, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Douglas D. Bright, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Vincent D. Brown, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Andrew Call III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Vondell Carter, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Peter B. Cascio, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Hartwell F. Coke IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Joseph J. Doyle, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Clement F. Dubie, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. John W. Easton, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Paul A. Ebner, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Robert A. Flick, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Dewey D. Foster, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. William D. Coddard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Alan J. Goldman, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. James F. Hanaway, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Bruce G. Hansen, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Robert J. Hodges, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Russell L. Hopf, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Stanley L. Hopperstead, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Raymond M. Leonard, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Maj. Joseph N. Lessard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Erle Martin III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Henry E. McKay, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Dean A. Meucci, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Henry J. Myers, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Joseph A. Ah New, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. David P. Otten, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Ernest C. Park, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. John W. Piplow, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. John M. Robb, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. James H. Sams III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Julius S. Schweich, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. John L. Smith, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Charles J. Sullivan, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Charles N. Teach, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Robert L. Trella, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. William A. Treu, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Richard A. Vaux, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Joseph A. Washington, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. John W. Watts, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Norman J. Weeks, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. James A. Weston, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Donald R. Whitman, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Donald M. Wilson, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Dell R. Wightman, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Herbert E. Williams III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Frederick R. Wylie, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Robert C. Bone, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maj. Samuel L. Cooper, xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

Maj. Thomas L. Winans, xxx-xx-xxxx

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMERGENCY HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1975—HEALTH INSURANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED WORKERS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, today's unemployment rate stands at 8.2 percent, meaning that more than 7.5 million American men and women are now out of work. Increasingly, it appears that unemployment may go to 9 percent—or beyond—before economic recovery begins and joblessness declines.

The cost of unemployment is usually measured in macroeconomic terms such as millions of people out of work, decline in total work force, declining GNP, and sliding industrial production. But it is the personal human toll with which each unemployed worker must live and it is this personal toll which, though already staggering, still grows. What I refer to is the unemployed worker struggling with the fear and insecurity of not knowing when—or whether—work will again be available; scraping by on less than \$70 per week; living with the certainty that in less than 26 or 52 weeks unemployment compensation benefits will end.

But there is also one more frightening cost of loss of work. Mr. Speaker, absurd as it may seem, in America loss of a job usually means loss of health insurance protection as well. When a worker loses his or her job, he or she must then decide whether to gamble with the family's health and economic security or to purchase individual family protection—if available—at monthly rates up to \$100 per month.

At 8 percent unemployment, the estimate is that at least 3 million American workers with prior health insurance protection have lost or are in danger of losing coverage. We in Congress will be striving in the weeks and months ahead to bolster our sagging economy and to get workers back on the job. But in the meantime, we cannot allow the personal economic crisis of the newly unemployed worker to be compounded by a personal or family health crisis just because loss of job means loss of health insurance.

If we are to reduce the human suffering and insecurity from recession and unemployment while we struggle to right the economy, we must act now.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 3166, the Emergency Health Protection Act of 1975, to continue basic health insurance coverage of unemployed workers. The means and extent of coverage provided by my legislation would be exactly that which the person and his or her family had in effect previous to being laid off. Benefits would be provided through the program and insurance carrier under which the person was covered prior to being laid off.

Eligibility for coverage under my Emergency Health Protection Act of 1975 is simple and straight forward. First, the individual worker must be eligible for unemployment compensation benefits. Second, he or she must have been eligible for health benefits in the job just lost. Third, the unemployed worker must not be eligible for health insurance, because of previous employment or through the plan of an employed spouse or other family member.

Certainly we should not for a moment believe this program is a permanent problem. It is not national health insurance. Nor does it address the pressing

need to control soaring health care costs or assure high quality health care to all Americans. Rather, it is an emergency, stopgap measure that will allow us to guard against additional human and economic suffering among those who are already casualties of recession and inflation. If we delay until we enact and implement national health insurance, it will be simply too late to avert tens of thousands of cases of needless additional human suffering at a time of serious economic dislocation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in pushing for immediate congressional enactment of my Emergency Health Protection Act of 1975.

JUSTICE FOR VETERAN WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill for the relief of Mr. Thomas Warren Ralston of El Dorado, Kans. This bill would provide that under chapter 11, title 38 of the United State Code relating to payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, the multiple sclerosis of Mr. Ralston shall be deemed to be a service-connected disability incurred while he was serving on active duty in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that Thomas Warren Ralston is clearly entitled to service-connected disability by reason of the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis within 7 years of his discharge.

I am so persuaded by the merits of this case that for the first time in my 12 years in Congress, I have introduced a private bill. Inasmuch as Mr. Ralston has exhausted all administrative remedies in this matter it is his only hope.

In my years on Capitol Hill, I have worked with hundreds of veterans' claims, and I know that frequently hard-core evidence such as medical records, cannot be found. It becomes necessary in these cases to weigh recollections of medical examiners who were present at the time of diagnosis. Warren Ralston's case turns on the credibility of such a recollection. His doctor clearly recalls diagnosing multiple sclerosis in October of 1953, which falls within the statutory 7-year period. Unfortunately, medical records which would support this recollection have been lost.

The Veterans' Administration has held that in the absence of such records, it will not allow Mr. Ralston's claim. This strict interpretation of the language of the law rules out commonsense judgments and practical consideration of the case circumstances. It is a simple fact of life that small town doctors cannot take the time to keep extensive written records. But they know their patients. And when a disease as serious as multiple sclerosis is diagnosed, it is remembered. Because there is no other remedy available to Thomas Warren Ralston, I am introducing this bill so that an injustice to him may be corrected.

ILLINOIS RESIDENTS SADDENED BY REPRESENTATIVE JUCKETT'S DEATH

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, residents of my district were saddened this past week with the untimely death of Illinois State Representative Robert S. Juckett.

Mr. Juckett had served his constituents excellently during his four terms in the Illinois Legislature and he was overwhelmingly reelected this past November. Although his illness prevented him from reporting to Springfield, it did not keep him from his responsibilities and he worked from his hospital bed while listening to legislative debate on the telephone.

Mr. Juckett's philosophy of government was one that should be followed by all legislators. He said last fall:

Government should only do for those people who under normal circumstances cannot do for themselves, and then only when that activity is deemed to be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Crane and I wish to join his many friends and constituents in extending our deepest sympathies to Janet Juckett and the four Juckett children, Linda, Robert, William, and Pamela.

I also would like to include two very fitting news articles concerning Mr. Juckett:

ROBERT JUCKETT

The residents of the 4th Legislative District of Illinois will miss the services of Robert S. Juckett, who served eight years as a Republican legislator in the Illinois House of Representatives.

His untimely death, at the age of 42, deprives advocates of many worthy causes of an able champion in the state Capitol. The causes to which Mr. Juckett found himself drawn in his four terms as a state legislator included mental health, proper treatment of the elderly, ethics in government and strengthening of local government.

He was a tireless worker and a determined fighter for those causes which he considered just. Those qualities brought him into conflict on occasion with his fellow legislators. But they also earned him, properly, the respect of his fellow legislators and his constituents. In a too brief life, he left a proud legacy.

REPRESENTATIVE JUCKETT REMEMBERED FOR INTEGRITY

(By Anita Clark)

State Rep. Robert S. Juckett (R-4th, Park Ridge) is remembered as a man of strong opinions and unquestioned integrity by his friends and fellow legislators.

Mr. Juckett, 42, died Sunday morning of leukemia in Lutheran General Hospital, Park Ridge.

He was elected to his fifth term in the legislature last fall, but had been hospitalized since Dec. 2 and unable to travel to Springfield.

Throughout his hospitalization, he said he was being treated for a swollen knee caused by an old football injury.

He jokingly insisted that he got more than usual done in the hospital because he had fewer distractions, and he was in constant telephone contact with Springfield.

House debates were broadcast in his sixth floor hospital room when he didn't have a roommate. He took his oath of office from Cook County Circuit Judge Reginald Holzer on the same day his colleagues were sworn in in Springfield.

Mr. Juckett was an articulate, vigorous debater who was proud of being a conservative. His first question when a new bill was introduced was whether its subject was "truly a governmental function."

"Government should only do for those people who under normal circumstances cannot do for themselves, and then only when that activity is deemed to be necessary," he said last fall.

He was well-known in the legislature for his expertise in the areas of special education, mental health, and legislative rules.

"He was listened to and respected by every member of the house," State Rep. Donald L. Totten (R-3d, Hoffman Estates) said Monday.

Mr. Juckett was chairman of the mental health fund advisory commission and the mental health visitation commission, vice chairman of the motor vehicles committee, and a member of the regulation and registration committee during the term of the 78th General Assembly. His committee assignments weren't determined for this session.

"He was always considered Mr. Special Education in terms of legislation," said Gaydon Brandt, director of special education for Maine Township High School District 207.

Mr. Juckett's most recent triumph was the override in both houses of Gov. Walker's veto of his special education bill. The law will increase state reimbursement to school districts for teachers of "the children who need extra education in order to become active, self-sufficient, productive citizens," Mr. Juckett had said.

He always emphasized a legislator's responsibility to his constituents, and often

surprised his most vehement critics by telephoning them to explain his position.

"The voter should look for legislators who still consider the dollar they're voting to be their own, and not 'the government dollar,'" he said during the 1974 campaign.

"He was a great credit to the legislature and our entire political system," said State Rep. Aaron Jaffe (D-4th, Skokie).

The legislature postponed this week's session in honor of Mr. Juckett. Gov. Walker's state of the state message, scheduled for today will be given next week.

Mr. Juckett was extremely popular with his Park Ridge constituents, and he and his assistant, Penny Pullen, were often enlisted to plead a local cause on the state level.

Many senior citizens dropped into his office at 26 Main, Park Ridge, for help from his staff in unraveling the red tape to apply for property tax relief.

He was a Cook County assistant state's attorney from 1959 to 1961, and served as a Park Ridge alderman from 1966 to 1968.

He was an organizer of the Park Ridge blood donation program in November, 1972, and donated blood himself before he learned he had leukemia.

He received more than 40 units of blood which hospitalized and recently discussed ways to encourage the Park Ridge program.

Mr. Juckett's funeral is at 11 a.m. today in St. Mary's Episcopal Church, 306 Prospect, Park Ridge.

He is survived by his wife, Janet, and four children, Linda, 19; Robert, 18; William, 16; and Pamela, 6.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, 22 of my distinguished colleagues are joining me today in introducing legislation to provide an unrestricted pension system for our World War I veterans. My World War I pension bill, which was first introduced in the 93d Congress, would grant veterans of World War I and their survivors a monthly pension regardless of other incomes such as social security or other retirement incomes. A single veteran or widow without dependents would receive \$135 per month and a married veteran or widow with dependents would receive \$150 per month.

Many of these individuals who served so honorably in the First World War are being forced onto welfare rolls due to low pensions they are receiving or cuts in VA pensions due to increases in social security. In fact, many of these veterans receive no veterans' pension whatsoever. Our World War I veterans did not have the advantages available to them that other returning veterans had such as educational benefits, veterans hospitals, or job help. These individuals are now approximately 79 years of age with an average sixth-grade education. There are approximately 1,200,000 of these veterans, whose numbers are continually decreasing, and they need our help now. It is time for our country to answer the call of our World War I veterans and their survivors. These individuals should receive help now, before we give any more money away overseas.

Another bill I am introducing would correct inequities many, many veterans are experiencing with the start of 1975; that is, increases in social security and other retirement incomes are reducing veterans' pensions because they are exceeding the income limitation. Before the close of the 93d Congress, the Veterans Survivors Pension Adjustment Act, Public Law 93-527, was enacted. This bill was designed to increase the earnings limitation for veterans and their widows by \$400 in order to compensate for recent social security increases. It also granted a 12-percent increase in veterans benefits. Unfortunately, the \$400 increase in the earnings limitation was not sufficient to prevent many veterans, not just World War I veterans, from losing all or part of their veterans pensions. I have received numerous letters from veterans or their widows across the country who have suffered a pension reduction. With today's twin problems of inflation and recession the loss of one penny of a pension is catastrophic. The legislation I am introducing would excluded any increases in social security or other Federal retirement programs from reducing a veteran's VA pension.

FOOD STAMPS

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an editorial in the Columbus Citizen-Journal dated February 10, entitled "Food Stamps." This editorial is generally reflective of my own views but more than that the editorial is well written and provides some food for thought. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues because the statement makes suggestions which I feel should be implemented by congressional action.

FOOD STAMPS

Congress showed admirable compassion for the poor this past week by freezing the price of food stamps, at least until the end of 1975.

It then showed some overdue compassion for the taxpayers by agreeing to take a much-needed look at where the food-stamp program is headed.

Unless eligibility rules are tightened, food stamps are well on their way to becoming a budgetary monstrosity.

Seven years ago food stamps were costing the U.S. government \$200,000 a year. Now they're costing \$4 billion and the price tag may jump to \$10 billion in the near future.

If this trend continues, it won't be long before food stamps—which are sold to the poor at a discount—replace relief checks as the nation's most expensive welfare program.

Researchers report that as many as 30 million Americans could qualify for food stamps under current rules—more than double the 17 million actually taking part in the program now.

This country cannot afford—indeed, should not want—a situation in which one family out of every five is getting a federal subsidy to buy food at the neighborhood grocery.

Raising the price of food stamps 30 percent, as President Ford proposed, was not a good approach to the problem.

The Ford plan, which Congress rejected, might have saved \$650 million a year. But it would have hurt the elderly poor, many of whom would have been forced to pay almost face value for their food stamps.

It's clear, though, that under present rules too many families with incomes well beyond the poverty level—some earning as much as \$8,500 or \$9,000 a year (which is close to \$175 a week)—are eligible for food stamps.

And some who aren't eligible are getting stamps anyway through deceit or fraud.

Abuse of the program by college students forced the government to rule recently that no student can qualify for food stamps if his parents have adequate income and claim him as a tax dependent. This is a welcome development but it's incredible that it took the bureaucrats so long to discover common sense.

All stamp programs, however, are vulnerable to ripoffs. That's why an income-supplement program, providing poor families with enough cash to buy food without stamps, would be preferable.

But as long as we're budgeting billions for food stamps each year, Congress should insist the money be spent only for those who are in real need.

THE ASSAULT ON INTELLIGENCE GATHERING: WHO BENEFITS?

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years there has been a sustained effort to destroy America's security and intelligence services. In recent months these efforts have escalated to weaken and dilute our loyalty and security programs to such an extent that small cabals of malcontents can, with apparent immunity, scheme and conspire to create a climate where espionage, treason, sedition and revolutionary violence can develop and flourish.

Both locally and nationally, the intelligence community is being pilloried by Marxists and their willing liberal dupes for having exercised their missions of maintaining our national security and preserving public order and safety.

Daily in the news media, we learn of the near total preoccupation of many elected officials with witchhunting among the files of police departments from Baltimore to Houston. Inspired by complaints and leaks for alienated and disgruntled employees, Members of our 94th Congress have tabled bills seeking to rigorously curtail the legitimate activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

And while the target of these attacks are our security services, little or nothing is said about those groups who, historically, have proclaimed their intention to destroy the American system of free enterprise and democracy and who have the most to benefit from these attacks.

Doubtless my colleagues will seek to play down my concerns by saying that this is the era of détente, of peaceful coexistence. To them I would quote the

general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—Gus Hall, who in December, 1973, told his Central Committee:

There is no peaceful coexistence in the field of ideology—in domestic affairs there is no peaceful coexistence, in the fields of economics, politics or ideology. There is no peaceful coexistence with the ruling class. Anything that softens up that idea is a serious mistake. We have nothing but the class struggle.

While it is only too apparent that the Communist Party and the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party—SWP—have much to gain from a weakening of the intelligence community and have been taking a strenuously vocal role in the general attack, there are other less-well-known organizations with the specific intent of "spying on Big Brother, the American intelligence community," with the hope that by so-doing legitimate law enforcement activities can be curtailed.

It is time that some of these organizations were brought into sharp focus: they include the Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate, the Committee for Public Justice, and the Center for National Security Studies.

The Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate—OC-5—which operates from Room 523, the Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036 (202-785-8330), originated as the Committee for Action/Research on the Intelligence Community—CARIC—at a November 1972, gathering of the Communist Party-dominated People's Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Developed with the active assistance of Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization—VVAW/WSO—a violence-prone organization which follows principles of "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung thought" and attempts to subvert active-duty GI's and veterans, CARIC organizers realized the "legitimizing" potential of association with liberals and linked themselves to an embryonic organization formed by writer Norman Mailer, the Committee for the Fifth Estate.

Among those who take an active role in OC-5 are Perry Douglas Fellwock, who in a July 1972, Ramparts article, "U.S. Electronic Espionage: A Memoir," claimed that "for love of the Indochinese people," he was revealing classified information he had obtained while a member of the military attached to the National Security Agency.

Fellwock, who prefers to use the name Winslow Peck, did not make a sudden decision to "tell all." During 1971 he was a familiar figure in the Washington area, spending his time with one or more radical groups, "moping and doping," and being compulsive with his confessions. In fact, Fellwock/Peck had planned to reveal the secrets of NSA, if not the universe, at an October 1971, antiwar gathering, but was prevented from speaking by Rennie Davis—not because Mr. Davis was then working for a Government agency himself, but because Peck was so obviously "tripping" on LSD that he might not have been taken seriously. Un-

fortunately, neither the New York Times nor Ramparts editors shared Davis' perceptions.

And in the context of the ill-informed criticism directed against law enforcement for "spying" on innocuous groups, it should be noted that in 1972, Fellwock/Peck joined the staff of the National Welfare Rights Organization as a paid staff member to work on coordinating a mass demonstration, the Children's March for Survival.

Working with Fellwock/Peck are several people who also claim a prior involvement with intelligence gathering groups. They include Timothy Charles Butz, a former SDS activist at Kent State and one-time Washington organizer for VVAW/WSO who was employed by a funded offshot of the American Friends Service Committee; and Douglas Porter.

Recently Douglas Porter spoke to a California underground newspaper about OC-5 and stated that the OC-5 Washington offices contained "not only books, but files—press clippings, debriefings we have done, Government reports, corporate reports, and stolen documents."

OC-5's advisory board includes former high-ranking CIA official Victor Marchetti; former FBI agent William Turner who is once again being employed by a Federal agency; Tony Russo of Pentagon Papers notoriety; and Marcus Rasquin of the Institute for Policy Studies—IPS. Hopefully these advisers will now exercise their responsibility and repudiate their ties with an organization that boasts of its stolen property.

The Center for National Security Studies—CNSS—a project of the Fund for Peace which operates from 122 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002—202/544-2380—made its public debut in September 1974, sponsoring a 2-day Capitol Hill conference, "The Central Intelligence Agency and Covert Activities." Sponsored by Senators Brooke and Hart, the CNSS conference was opened by Senator Hart saying that Congress should be "indebted to them * * * for their serious efforts to unravel problems."

Among those at the conference making "serious efforts to unravel problems," to whom the Michigan Senator says we should be grateful, were Robert Borosage, CNSS's director, an active member of the National Lawyers Guild and a former employee of the Institute for Policy Studies; thrice-identified Communist Party, U.S.A., member and now head of the American Civil Liberties Union's antisurveillance project, Frank Donner; Bart Osborn of OC-5; CNSS staffer John Marks, a former State Department intelligence analyst; Ivanhoe Donaldson, a former leader of the violence-prone Student Non-Violent—now National—Coordinating Committee—SNCC—and an IPS employee; Daniel Ellsberg; and Fellwock/Peck of OC-5.

Naturally the CNSS meetings provided participants with the opportunity to denigrate the activities of the CIA. Using this platform, IPS founder Richard Barnet asserted that all U.S. covert action and clandestine collection of information, except by satellite, "could be abandoned unilaterally with a net gain in security for the American people."

Barnet paid special attention to détente, arguing that the monitoring of détente was unnecessary because "spies in the Kremlin are unlikely to produce reliable information and the effort to gain it only jeopardizes the détente." "Monitoring," he continued, "is a mission for diplomats with analytical skills, not spies."

It is of particular interest that the Center for National Security Studies was set up by the Fund for Peace, formerly the Fund for Education in World Order, which numbers among its trustees a Louise R. Berman of San Francisco. Louise R. Berman was the subject of intense congressional investigation in the 1940's and 1950's. Summing up the record, Combat of December 15, 1969, wrote:

Mrs. Louise Berman, who is also known as Louise Bransten was born Oct. 10, 1908. She is the former wife of Richard Bransten, also known as Bruce Minton, former owner of New Masses. During the water-front strike in San Francisco, Louise and Richard Bransten carried out assignments for the Communist Party, working with Earl Browder and Gerhart Eisler. In 1944 Louise Bransten made a loan of \$50,000 to the People's World, which is the west coast organ of the Communist Party.

Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities carry much more information, and testimony implicates her in activities of several known Soviet espionage agents. She was, for instance, in contact in Hollywood with J. Peters (also known as Alexander Stevens and half a dozen other names), a leading figure in the underground American CP and in Soviet intelligence work; she was an associate of Steve Nelson, long time Communist organizer and ring leader of a group that penetrated the research facilities of America's atomic bomb laboratory at Berkeley.

Mrs. Berman (Bransten) has been named as a CP member in Congressional testimony; her husband has been named as a CP official. She invoked her 5th Amendment privilege in two appearances before Congress.

I would also note that the name of Mrs. Louise R. Berman of San Francisco appeared as a sponsor of the recent Second National Conference in Solidarity with Chile, a Communist Party operation, in Chicago.

Doubtless during the coming weeks the Center for National Security Studies will be in the forefront of those attacking our security services. And I trust we will examine their public activities in light of the records of those who are in positions of influence with them. While the CNSS appears to be concentrating on discrediting the CIA, the Committee for Public Justice—CPJ—has singled out the FBI as its main target since 1970.

The Committee for Public Justice, with offices at 22 E. 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016—212-686-1245—according to a Washington Post article, was formed in November 1970, with playwright Lillian Hellman being the "principal organizer of the group." The Post did not remind its readers that Hellman had been identified in sworn congressional testimony as a member of the CPUSA in the 1930's and had used her fifth amendment privilege when questioned about this membership by HCUA in 1952. Neither did the Post inform its readers that in 1956 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee included her name in its list of the 82 most active and typical sponsors of Communist fronts.

The Committee for Public Justice, in its book, "Investigating the FBI," an account of a 1971 conference it held at Princeton University, calls for the creation of a board of overseers for the FBI "composed of public and private persons with power to review Bureau policymaking, guard against threats to civil liberties, and keep the public informed."

The CPJ also indicates it supports removing the responsibility for counter-espionage activities from the FBI, and in the loyalty-security area has stated:

The Bureau's responsibilities here must be narrowly defined and carefully weighed against competing societal interests in privacy and freedom.

In May 1974, several officials of the CPJ met with FBI Director Clarence Kelley to present their views to him and to some of his assistants. Reporting on this meeting in the New York Review of Books, the CPJ representatives concluded that "the FBI's leading officials appear to be zealous advocates of the cold war ideology of the 1950's." CPJ's criticisms continue.

The groups I have identified have a common goal of diminishing and curtailing the functions of the intelligence community. For the future of the country, I hope they will not succeed. Nevertheless, there are many indications that there will be major changes in current operations and structure; especially in that the executive branch of Government seems to be prepared to dismantle the intelligence services.

For example, it is possible that the CIA's role will be diminished to that of evaluation of information obtained overseas by diplomats and embassy military attachés—a turning back of the clock to pre-OSS days of World War II.

There are also proposals to open the files of the FBI to all comers, a practice which would jeopardize our entire internal security program; and a "freedom from surveillance" bill before this Congress would make illegal the governmental maintenance of files on any political activist, as well as prohibiting surveillance of any citizen unless he or she were the subject of a criminal investigation or a Government job application check.

A climate is being created which will enable the enemies of America both foreign and domestic, to operate with immunity from investigation. Indeed, those who seek to hinder their activities will be penalized.

It is high time that responsible elected officials recalled the words of former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg that—

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

ACCELERATED CAPITAL FORMATION ACT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the Accelerated Capital

tal Formation Act with additional authorship. I have previously entered remarks on it in this RECORD. I especially appreciate my cosponsoring colleagues interest and enthusiasm for the ESOT concept.

Because ESOT financing is being heavily promoted on a nationwide basis, there may now be some danger that the concept will be overenthusiastically merchandised. The concept is simple, but the execution of an ESOT is terribly complex, and the rights of all parties must be carefully protected.

To insure such protection, it may be necessary for me to introduce some amendments to the original bill.

It is my hope that hearings on ESOT's will be held this year, so both the Congress and the public can be better informed about this newly popular technique of capital accumulation and expanded capitalism.

J. MASON BREWER DIES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the internationally acclaimed black folklorist J. Mason Brewer died last month in Dallas at the age of 78. Mr. Brewer, born the son of a rancher in Goliad, Tex., was buried in Austin, where he had lived for many years.

At the time of his death, Mr. Brewer was serving as distinguished professor of English at East Texas State University, Commerce, Tex.

He attended public schools in Austin and was graduated from Wiley College in Marshall, Tex. He served with the AEF in World War I.

After the war, Brewer began his career as a teacher and writer. He received a master's degree from Indiana University and was also granted an honorary doctorate from Quinn College, Waco.

Brewer was widely acknowledged by scholars as the finest writer of Negro folklore. He published numerous collections of folktales and his work appeared in 14 national and regional journals. His most famous book, "Word on the Brazos," published by the University of Texas, is now in its fourth printing.

Professor Brewer was the first black to join the Texas Institute of Letters. He was a vice president of the American Folklore Society.

While teaching at Huston-Tillotson College in Austin in the 1950's, Brewer published a pamphlet entitled, "The History of Negroes in Travis County."

Besides his interest in folklore, Brewer also taught French and published several books of poetry and prose.

The late J. Frank Dobie, former folklorist at the University of Texas, said Brewer was the greatest storyteller of Negro folklore in America.

Though he was a prolific writer, Brewer was probably even a better raconteur. He was a guest lecturer at Yale, UT, University of Southern California, and also on an international basis.

One of his last lectures was in Austin last October 11. I enclose an account of that lecture:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Oct. 14, 1974]

STORYTELLER SPINS YARNS—FOLKLORIST VIEWS ART AS CREATING LITERATURE

(By Jim Lewis)

With halting progress, Dr. J. Mason Brewer, America's most distinguished Negro folklorist, seemed to move slower than integration as he took the stage.

Some 150 persons stilled in anticipation of old words from the slight man whose appearance was as aged as the stories he tells.

A slight man, Brewer leaned cautiously up toward the microphone.

Suddenly a full, vibrant voice recited a bouncing rhyme about the evening's entertainment: "Sit back and relax, dear listeners and let the joy bells ring in your receptive mind, as I attempt to do my thing."

Brewer's tales pleased his admirers recently at Chapel auditorium at Huston-Tillotson College.

"The art of storytelling is actually a gift, and it isn't something you learn in drama school," said Brewer, Distinguished Visiting Professor at East Texas State University at Commerce.

"You are gifted with the ability to tell a story, or you're not."

Brewer is. But his interest in folklore has also led to the publication of more Negro folktales than any other author, 336.

Brewer, 78, has enjoyed spinning yarns since his grandfather, a wagoner; Goliad, first related the adventures of hauling produce from Goliad to Victoria.

But it first became serious business in 1932, when Brewer, working as a school teacher in Austin, learned to appreciate the stories of writer J. Frank Dobie.

"Actually, Mr. Dobie was the one who inspired me, because I saw the value of his folktales, so I decided there should be something on black life like that," he said.

Since then, Brewer's studies have paid his way to lectures as far away as Yale, Toronto, and California.

"Folklore is being created every day; every age creates its own," he said. "It's oral literature."

He pointed out that elderly blacks receiving Social Security checks currently like to say, "I used to work for myself where I am, but now I work for Uncle Sam."

And blacks bearing the burden of income tax comment, "The more we makes, the more they takes."

Brewer said the stories he performs are as fluid in the telling as they were when the making.

"I may tell a story a different way every time I tell it," he said. "Whatever is revealed for me to say at a particular moment is just whatever comes out of my consciousness."

And his enjoyment in relating a story comes from the story itself, he said.

"I don't pay much attention to the audience," he said, "I just go on and, what you say, do my thing."

HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Justice Subcommittee of the

House Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on Wednesday, February 26, 1975, at 10 a.m. in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building on the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which were transmitted to Congress by the Chief Justice on April 23, 1974. Unless the Congress completes action on these rules by August 1, 1975, they will become effective with no congressional input. Therefore, every effort will be made to expedite the subcommittee's work.

Those wishing to testify will please contact the subcommittee staff in room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building—telephone number 225-0406. The subcommittee hopes to conclude its hearings on these rules by March 25, 1975.

VIETNAM: MR. KISSINGER'S WAR

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the New York Times by columnist Anthony Lewis examines "Mr. Kissinger's War" and finds that only the U.S. Government and President Thieu deem continued support for the Thieu regime a vital military and diplomatic objective. The people of South Vietnam are tired of war. They are tired of seeing their children made homeless or killed. It is peace that they want more than anything else and support for the dictatorial Thieu regime has all but dwindled to the point where, as Mr. Lewis puts it—

Even "rightists" in South Vietnam want Thieu out of office so a deal can be negotiated with the Communists and the fighting ended.

For the benefit of my colleagues and their constituents, I am inserting in the RECORD the Times article by Mr. Lewis: [From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1975]

MR. KISSINGER'S WAR: I

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—A letter from Saigon: The writer says he is amazed at the American debate on aid to Vietnam. The argument seems to be all about war, he says—about arms to help President Thieu fight the Communists for years more. Does no one in America think of politics instead of war? Does no one realize that even "rightists" in South Vietnam now want Thieu out of office so a deal can be negotiated with the Communists and the fighting ended?

"Why isn't Kissinger doing anything toward a political solution?" he asks. "Is this his 'decent interval'—a useless massacre?"

There is a short answer to those anguished questions. American policy focuses on war in Vietnam, and feeds it, because Henry Kissinger would rather have war than any visible political alternative. That is why the policy is to sustain President Thieu in his intransigent, increasingly isolated resistance to any political accommodation.

It is a surprising and a serious thing to say: that an American Secretary of State is deliberately holding back a process that might lead to the end of a gruesome war. But the evidence is there. Exploring it throws some light on why Mr. Kissinger, against logic and the odds, is pressing for additional military aid to Saigon.

The peace agreement signed in Paris two years ago called for a new phase of politics in South Vietnam. It promised political rights to all parties, freedom of movement between the military zones, release of political prisoners and the establishment of a national council of reconciliation. The idea of all that was to open up a process—a process of political competition and accommodation instead of war.

But President Thieu prevented that process from starting. He prohibited movement between zones, reclassified political prisoners as common criminals to keep them in jail and effectively banned all parties but his own. He not only refused to carry out the terms of the Paris agreement; he made it a crime to publish them in South Vietnam. And at the moment the cease-fire was to come into effect, he launched aggressive military operations.

In all this General Thieu needed at least tacit American support, and he got it. There was no criticism from Washington of his military offensive, which relied on \$1 billion in new U.S. arms rushed over before the truce, or of his refusal to carry out the Paris agreement's provisions.

Just the other day General Thieu told Peter Kann of *The Wall Street Journal* that since the signing in Paris the United States had never put any pressure on him to make political concessions to the Communists—that is, to carry out the peace terms. The reason is plain. Secretary Kissinger, like Mr. Thieu, is uncertain where a political process might lead once it starts. He prefers the devil he knows in Vietnam: war.

But lately, the strategy of military aggressiveness and political intransigence has unraveled. The tide of battle has shifted, and inevitably doubts have grown in South Vietnam about the wisdom of relying on war instead of politics.

Communist military successes have brought angry American talks about a massive offensive by North Vietnam. Given the failure to say anything about Saigon's actions after the truce, that outcry is almost comic in its hypocrisy. But it is also factually doubtful. So far, at least, the Communists' campaign seems limited in aim. They say their purpose is pressure to carry out the Paris agreement, and that could be the case.

In South Vietnam, many former Thieu supporters have now turned against him. A Catholic movement leads the criticism. The militantly anti-Communist Cao Dai sect, with two million members, has called for negotiations and reconciliation with the Communists. Even right-wing newspaper criticized Mr. Thieu as an obstacle to peace—until he closed them.

The political setting explains the mystery of Mr. Kissinger's demand for \$300 million more in military aid now. The Pentagon is having difficulty justifying that figure; privately, defense officials say the object is not so much military as "psychological." In short, the aim is to demonstrate the American commitment to Nguyen Van Thieu.

For that purpose, any amount that gets through Congress will serve. Just \$75 million, say, would enable Mr. Thieu to tell doubters that he still has America's support. Any amount would be a symbol of American willingness to go on with the policy of war, not politics—go on, as General Fred C. Weyand, the Army Chief of Staff, had the candor to say, for another five to ten years.

"Do American policy-makers have no concern for the Vietnamese people?" the letter from Saigon asks. In the case of Henry Kissinger, the answer is certainly no. He has no affection for Nguyen Van Thieu either. Why, then, is he so determined to keep Mr. Thieu in power and to block any movement toward political accommodation in Saigon? The answer to that lies beyond Vietnam.

ECONOMIC WOES ARE GROWING

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have visited 10 of the 17 counties in the Second District of Oklahoma and participated in 35 meetings with our people. Mine was not a time of recess or vacation, but a period of communications with troubled people in Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the economic woes of this Nation are growing. Adding to the problems are the heartless, insensitive attitudes of some people in Government and particularly the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A good share of my time was spent battling with Federal officials who, for their own various reasons, seem to be causing more problems than they are solving.

As a new Congressman, perhaps my understanding of their responsibilities is not complete. But beyond question, many of the problems besetting our people—and particularly the poor—are laid on the doorstep of Federal Government bureaucrats.

Two public housing projects in my district, I have recently learned, are in the process of being prepared for sale to the highest bidder.

One of these, Shawnee Heights in Muskogee, would be an ideal place for people to live if the Department of Housing and Urban Development would clear away an adjacent, blighted area. Instead, that low-rent housing complex is decaying for two reasons: First, because the people are losing their jobs to recession or their fixed incomes to inflation; and, second, because the adjacent, blighted area has not been cleared of debris, and deteriorated housing.

The other public housing project, Okmulgee Terrace in Okmulgee, is hard hit by the economics of our time. It needs to be repaired. In the process of divesting itself of what HUD apparently believes is a bad investment, rent rates are being increased. HUD officials say they are forced by law to end subsidies during this interim period. I say to you—there should be no foreclosure, no divestiture and the Federal Government should find a new public-spirited landlord to operate that housing.

Just yesterday, I sent a letter to Roy Gardner of the Federal Housing Administration in Tulsa where I said:

During this period of economic downturn, when welfare families are being hit by rampant inflation and lower income families are being laid off their jobs, it seems preposterous that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development would assume a posture of foreclosure, rent-raising and disregard for human values and family security. Therefore, I respectfully request that you withhold any rent increases at Shawnee Heights in Muskogee and Okmulgee Terrace projects. Also, I would suggest that you hold in abeyance any plans to sell these projects to private sources. The thought of private speculators making huge profits at a loss to the federal government is certainly contrary to

my belief and I will oppose such abuse with all the power and authority of this office.

In my travels, I also met with tenants and officials who are involved in Indian housing. I met with the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma—the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles.

These leaders—B. Bob Stopp, W. W. Keeler, Overton James, Claude Cox, Edwin Tanyan, and Harry J. W. Belvin—are concerned about the poor housing occupied by the good Indian families of Oklahoma.

Some believe there should be a Federal second mortgage source of money to help Indians repair their homes—and apparently there is no such fund available.

The tribes which have become involved in housing tell me that about 15 percent of the residents—many who have up to 500 hours of "sweat equity" in their homes—are falling behind in their rent. They admit that some of this is caused by a general misunderstanding about their responsibilities. While their rent is low because of subsidies—somehow many have come to believe that they did not have to make payments. The Indians are determined to educate their brothers, but that takes time. Eviction is too stark to contemplate and is too cruel for families.

Particularly in the case of the Cherokees, I have asked for a 30-day period to find other alternatives.

But, I learn, the pressure from HUD is heavy. They are told that "management problems must be rectified" in existing housing or no new allocations will be made to the Indian housing authorities. That means—in simple terms—that families in arrears must be evicted or other families on the Indian Housing waiting list must suffer.

In writing the letter with that stern warning, the area office director, Robert H. Breeden, does not cite the law. Instead, he makes reference to a "requirement of the Department's Housing Management Section." That is bureaucratic law—made by regulations—I presume.

I insert in the RECORD the full text of Breeden's letter.

Mr. THOMAS M. CROSSLAND,
Executive Director, Housing Authority of the
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, Tahlequah, Okla.

DEAR MR. CROSSLAND: Using the best data available, and in an effort to keep the Indian Housing Program progressing in all sections of Oklahoma, this office has allocated its recent assignment of Program Reservations for units for the Indian Housing Program. All allocations are made subject to the management record of the Authority, its percentage of delinquencies, totals of accounts receivable and general operating history. This is a requirement of the Department's Housing Management Section.

Since there is a limited amount of quantitative data which could be used to determine housing need in Indian areas, these allocations were based essentially on estimates.

It should be noted that the U.S. Office of Management and Budget has convened an Inter-Departmental task force to compile quantitative data for the Indian population which will be used to make any future Indian housing allocations.

Based upon the foregoing this office is prepared to issue a Program Reservation for 200 units of Indian housing from its 1975 allocation for the Housing Authority of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. Fifty of these shall be for the smaller tribes in northeastern Oklahoma, those being: Quapaw, Peoria, Modoc, Ottawa, Eastern Shawnee, Wyandotte, and Seneca, all of which are located in Ottawa County. These are the tribes for which your Authority has built previously.

At your earliest convenience you may submit applications for the above units on HUD Form 52470, along with the necessary supporting data as instructed in the attached list. Our records indicate that your Authority has management problems which must be rectified prior to our issuing a Program Reservation for these latest allocated units.

As you were previously notified, you received 150 units under our 1974 allocation.

It should be remembered that it is the intent of the Indian Housing Program that these units be built exclusively for Indians. Such selectivity is in keeping with the Indian Civil Rights Act.

If further clarification is needed, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BREEDEN,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me from actions taken and contemplated by HUD that the officials charged with administering badly-needed new housing projects, and making reasonable repairs on existing projects, are instead trying administratively to kill those programs despite the mandate given them by Congress.

In another meeting during that so-called "recess," I met with about 200 folks who own docks on the beautiful lakes of northeast Oklahoma. These are man-made bodies of water—controlled by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Heavy rains in recent months have kept the waters high—as the corps has flood control responsibilities; must keep reserves of water for power generation, and store water to keep the magnificent Arkansas River Waterway at a constant level. We certainly understand and support the corps for its dedication and professionalism in these respects. They do their job well.

But, because of fluxuations in pool levels—varying more than 30 feet—the docks are often wrecked. Buildings are inundated. Shorelines are left muddy, slippery and dangerous.

The dock and resort owners complain about the Corps of Engineers arbitrary and harsh enforcement of leases—often wiping out a lifetime of investment, toil and sweat. The owners are being deprived of their livelihood—at a time when jobs are scarce and opportunity is limited.

In a public meeting at Wagoner, Okla., I warned the engineers about developing militaristic attitudes and bureaucratic callousness. We are, I remind all employes and officers of the government, a "government for the people."

Mr. Speaker, the problems of our national economy are severe. It is a time when we should review laws of the past which are botching our economy and could lead to a deep depression. But, more, the administrators of the laws—the day-by-day keepers of the public trust—must be sensitive and sensible in

dealing with the people. We must solve our problems without trampling on those who need their Government most.

DÉTENTE, EMIGRATION AND SOVIET TRADE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which I hope will reverse the circumstances which caused the collapse of the trade and emigration agreement last month between the United States and the Soviet Union. Members may recall that the Soviets' rejection of the agreement was accompanied by a statement expressing concerns over discriminatory actions by the Congress. Many of us who participated in the drafting and passage of the Export-Import Bank Act amendments last year believe that the Soviets were directing their comments at the \$300 million ceiling which was placed on credits for the Soviet Union. I hold this point of view and have expressed it in several statements on this floor.

This problem began last December when House-Senate conferees on the Export-Import Bank bill were subjected to three separate conferences and much delay caused by the whimsies of a handful of Senators. Each time we thought the Senators were satisfied, they returned and asked us for more. Only after accepting the \$300 million ceiling and the sub-ceiling on energy, were the House conferees finally rewarded with a bill and continued operation of the bank. Unfortunately, we robbed Peter to pay Paul, and so the title IV agreement was lost.

Supporters of the \$300 million ceiling maintain that it is a necessary check on the Soviets; a signal to them not to waltz on their agreement. However, the restrictions, and the senatorial chest-beating that accompanied them, appeared to have forced the Soviets' rejection instead of encouraging their compliance. The senatorial rhetoric which characterized the Soviets as unworthy trading partners were especially damaging. It is even more ironic that the House conferees, including myself, repeatedly warned that credit ceilings of \$300 million would seriously jeopardize the emigration agreement. The fact that the prediction came true is no cause for joy.

Mr. Speaker, my support for title IV and the Jackson-Vanik amendment is undiminished by the rejection of the agreement. I believe even more strongly in free emigration for Soviet Jews, in détente, and in the possibility for achieving both through reasonable actions.

In my judgment, it is unreasonable to expect the Soviets to agree to easier emigration without something in return. A \$300 million ceiling on credits has all the markings of U.S. recalcitrance. I think it should be corrected. Correction is necessary if we are to have the proper amount of leverage for restructuring an

agreement on title IV of the Trade Act, and it is also good trade policy. In fact, our failure to maintain momentum in Soviet trade matters is already being capitalized on by others. The recent British-Soviet trade protocol could provide up to \$2.4 billion in export credits. There is no doubt in my mind that Great Britain's economy will benefit from that kind of trade stimulus. Our own economy could use some of the same stimulus.

Basically, my bill would amend the Export-Import Bank Act to eliminate the provisions relating to credit ceilings and subceilings. It would also amend the Trade Reform Act of 1974 to repeal the section that * * *. It would also repeal the conforming section of the Trade Reform Act. This bill introduction is somewhat symbolic of my dismay over the failure of the emigration agreement and the shortsighted senatorial actions which contributed to it. Nevertheless, I hope that it will be taken seriously by those who still believe that we can implement the title IV agreement, and are willing to take the necessary actions.

H.R. 1811 TO DESIGNATE THE BIRTHDAY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in cosponsoring legislation to honor the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., by setting aside the date of his birth, January 15, as a national holiday.

Dr. King was a noble and compassionate man who dedicated his life to the struggle for social justice and human rights. He had a dream of equality and equal opportunity. His goal was to remove bigotry and hatred from American life. He envisioned a nation where Americans could live together in peace.

He was a man of peace. He espoused the philosophy of Gandhi; he taught the principles of love and nonviolence. In his campaigns, he used the tools of non-violent protest and peaceful assembly. His activities were largely responsible for the landmark civil rights legislation of the 1960's: The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968. For his great efforts he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964.

He gave tremendous hope to black people, to poor people, and to white people who were committed to ending discrimination and segregation. Looking back, people were so hopeful of achieving a unified country. The civil rights movement, under Dr. King's leadership, swept across our country and captured the American conscience.

Today, in 1975, 6 years after Dr. King's death, we must ask ourselves, "How far have we come and where are we going?" We have made significant progress. However, the problems of segregation, discrimination, hunger, poverty, and crime

still exist. Dr. King's dream has not been fully realized.

We must keep Martin Luther King's memory alive. We must reflect on his life and work. And finally, we must reaffirm our national commitment to achieving the ideals for which Dr. King worked and symbolized.

I urge my colleagues to take action on this legislation. To make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday is a fitting tribute to a great American.

HONORING LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, after enjoying the blessings of freedom for nearly 200 years, we Americans can well understand why our colonial patriots were willing to pay such a high price to win those blessings. And we can well understand the determination and fiery dedication of a small Baltic State which still struggles for freedom against one of the largest and most powerful nations in the world, which has denied them their freedom for 34 years.

Fifty-seven years ago, on February 16, 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was established as a free and independent nation. However, freedom was theirs for only 22 short years. In 1940 Lithuania, as well as two other Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia, were invaded and forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. Since then, they have been abused, and their basic human freedoms denied.

But the spirit of the freedom-loving Lithuanians lives on.

In 1970, a young Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirk, captured the attention of the world by leaping from a Soviet ship to an American ship, in his quest for freedom. Another Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, focused attention on the continuing Lithuanian struggle through self-immolation, in 1972. Following his tragic, but heroic death, thousands of young Lithuanians demonstrated, amplifying Romas Kalanta's call for freedom for Lithuania and an end to Soviet religious persecution. In the United Nations a petition bearing the signatures of over 17,000 Lithuanians has been delivered to Kurt Waldheim, asking for that organization's support for their struggle for freedom.

Even today, the arrest and imprisonment of untold numbers of Lithuanian and Russian dissidents continues. Their crime? They have published "The Chronical of the Lithuanian Catholic Church."

The Russians have employed the techniques of deportation, execution, colonization, and sheer power to diminish the chances of Lithuania's survival as a people with a distinctive culture. It is remarkable what the Lithuanians have endured, and have been able to give their courageous and increasing signs that their desire for freedom remains as strong as ever.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker. The Lithuanian people love freedom with all their hearts. For although their nation has not enjoyed the precious taste of freedom for over 24 years, they fight on.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to reassert my support for this courageous nation. And as we prepare to celebrate the struggle of 200 years ago of our own Nation to win our freedom, we should remember we were only able to win it through the help and support of other stronger nations.

We should remember another nation, today, which is still struggling down that same path. The U.S. Congress should again urge the President to direct the question of the status of the Baltic States in the United Nations and other international forums as it did during the 2d session of the 90th Congress, when House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted.

Lithuania and her people cannot be forgotten. They can no longer be ignored. They are a people who have struggled longer and against greater odds for freedom than perhaps any nation on Earth, and they deserve our strong support.

THE VOICE OF COMMONSENSE

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, in these times when we see government at all levels getting more and more deeply involved in regulating and directing one segment of the economy or another, it is truly refreshing to come across a defense of plain, old-fashioned free enterprise. I want to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial heard recently on Radio Station KLEY in Wellington, Kans. I believe we could all afford to pay some attention to the voice of commonsense. The editorial follows:

THE VOICE OF COMMONSENSE

Isn't the free enterprise system the dog-gonest thing you ever saw? If we didn't know better, we'd call it the most fantastic of the modern day miracles. It's so simple, it's almost ridiculous. It's been used in this country for almost 200 years without showing signs of wear. And, it works for everybody, and everything. Even the name has a good ring to it . . . the free enterprise system!

Take the recent automobile surplus dilemma for example. It wasn't normally a thing that an industry would make a big thing about, but, the facts were becoming so evident, there wasn't any use in not coming out with a full-fledged confession. The facts were, as they pointed out, that people just didn't have as much money in their bank accounts as they had been used to, so they had started to put-off buying new cars.

Soon . . . the supply far exceeded the demand. That's the basic ingredient to the free enterprise system. When the supply gets too big, the price is lowered, the supply dwindles, and, in time, the two are in balance again.

Isn't that just exactly what happened in the recent automobile surplus problem? They cut the price of new autos. They offered some real bargains. And, sure enough,

people started buying cars again. It's going to be some time before the situation is in balance again, but (if you'll excuse the pun), we're "on the road."

We wouldn't give you one percent of the free enterprise system for all the Federal Government . . . "disaster" . . . and "emergency" . . . and "aid" programs you could put in a book.

It's greatest enemy is the individual, or group, or committee, that feels that it knows a better "governmental" approach.

The free enterprise system has worked, it is working, and it will continue to work if we just give it a chance.

COIN WORLD TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress who is interested in the hobby of numismatics, or who has constituents who have written in on numismatic issues, or who has introduced a bill in the past 12 years to strike a national commemorative medal honoring some historical event of national significance, will be interested, I am sure, in the laudatory editorial in the February 19 issue of Coin World newspaper about our colleague from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.

From the 88th through the 93d Congresses, Mrs. SULLIVAN, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, handled all coinage and related matters in that subcommittee as well as legislation on consumer issues within the jurisdiction of the committee. Those of us who served with her on the subcommittee were impressed by the outstanding leadership and conscientious hard work she devoted to this assignment, and were deeply gratified by the great cooperation she extended to our bills and to those of other colleagues in the House.

But most of all we were impressed by the responsible manner in which Mrs. SULLIVAN handled the legislation in our jurisdiction, from the landmark Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968—which contains the Truth in Lending Act—the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970, and equal credit opportunity legislation, to the question of changing the composition of the 1-cent coin, or authorizing the striking of Bicentennial coins and medallions and other national medals by the Bureau of the Mint.

In order to provide more subcommittee chairmanships in the 94th Congress, the Democratic Caucus of the Banking Committee voted on January 28 to separate the coinage and related issues from the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, so even if Mrs. SULLIVAN had continued as chairman of the subcommittee she would no longer have retained the primary responsibility for coinage legislation. It is to this aspect of the Banking Committee's reorganization that the editorial in Coin World addresses itself.

LEGISLATION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Written by Margo Russell, editor of *Coin World*, who testified on numerous occasions before the Sullivan subcommittee in behalf of the numismatic hobby, the editorial provides a rare insight into the care which goes into the preparation of legislation by a conscientious subcommittee chairman interested only in the public interest in handling legislation, and who has conducted "oversight" responsibilities with great effectiveness.

The editorial also refers to the fine work done by the subcommittee's professional staff member during the past 12 years, Charles B. Holstein, who resigned from the committee staff on January 28. He has been, without doubt, the most knowledgeable person on numismatic legislation on Capitol Hill, as well as acting as the committee's staff expert on all consumer issues, and particularly consumer credit.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for inclusion in the *RECORD* the highly laudatory editorial about Congresswoman SULLIVAN, as follows:

A FRIEND MOVES ON

we can count upon her excellent judgment we can count upon her excellent judgment when it comes to voting upon future numismatic affairs, but we will miss Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, D., Mo., who is leaving behind 12 years of numismatic experience as she vacates the chairmanship of the House Banking subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.

We always thought this was an improbable Congressional niche for minting and coining legislation, although consumers handle more coins than anybody. But it was a great day for the coin collectors 12 years ago when Congressman Wright Patman created the subcommittee, and Mrs. Sullivan took her post as chairman.

It has been our privilege to observe firsthand Mrs. Sullivan's wisdom at work, her show of strength, one degree removed from the term, tough, because she is such a lady; her sincerity, her courage, her no-nonsense approach to a succession of numismatic problems. The two most recent Mint directors, incumbent Mary Brooks, and her predecessor, Eva Adams, found Mrs. Sullivan their astute and understanding champion.

We remember Mrs. Sullivan gave the hobby the courtesy of a hearing on the feasibility of reviving commemorative coinage shortly after she assumed her new duties. She expedited legislation to produce the memorial John F. Kennedy half dollar; she studied the problems surrounding the melting and exporting of silver coins, she introduced an amendment to make certain everyone could order Proof coin sets.

She went on record as approving a Bicentennial commemorative coin issue; she joined coin collectors at their convention; she did battle over the Eisenhower dollar profits going to the college, she shepherded the Bicentennial medal legislation, and investigated the medals which went to the moon. She saw that private enterprise in the hobby had fair shake.

Mrs. Sullivan guarded the hobby against misrepresentation, sought a full report on silver coin capers, and arranged to listen to the Mint's cent problems.

Her door was always open to numismatic delegations. Her staff, headed by Charles Holstein, was readily available for consultation. Holstein is a veritable wellspring of intelligence and procedure, with total recall and ability to give facts and summation faster than television's instant replay. He is going to be missed greatly by all of us who

depended upon him for the straight of the story. Fortunately for Mrs. Sullivan, he will remain on her staff.

Mrs. Sullivan will be spared the extra work caused by the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, so now she will have more time to devote to her chairmanship of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. She is also a senior member of the House Banking Committee, and of the Housing subcommittee. Her St. Louis constituents share our esteem—they returned Mrs. Sullivan to Congress for the 12th consecutive term last fall.

We trust our working relations with Rep. Robert G. Stephens Jr., of Georgia will be equally as pleasant as he assumes the duties as chairman of a new House Banking subcommittee, Historic Preservation and Coinage. We hope we can count upon a long friendship, and not be subject to another congressional reorganization in two years. Although this possibility exists, it does not make for efficient legislative performance, in our estimation. Comprehension of the complexities of coinage takes time. And we treasure and respect congressional friendships as they develop for mutual benefit, understanding and confidence.

PROVIDE PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS TO EASE UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the opening moments of the 94th Congress, the Democratic majority issued a formidable and sensible plan of action for dealing with the problem economy. One of the most important points made concerned a program to cope with rising unemployment. The plan called for the establishment of additional and necessary public service jobs, instead of merely providing "economically non-productive and personally unsatisfying" unemployment compensation. Also, the program sought immediate relief from excessive administrative paperwork which has held up billions of dollars earmarked for congressionally approved civil works projects.

At a time when unemployment statistics are approaching 9 percent nationally and 10 percent in Rhode Island, the implementation of the majority proposals for creating more public service jobs must be swiftly accomplished. In further evidence of the need for immediate attention to this grave problem, I would like to present a resolution introduced by Rhode Island State Senator John Hawkins and passed in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island on the 11th day of February 1975, memorializing Congress, the Rhode Island delegation in Congress, the President of the United States, and the legislatures of the various States to support legislation to grant funds to the various States for the purpose of public works projects:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Because of the state of the economy in the State of Rhode Island and throughout the nation there is a high rate of unemployment, which condition is projected to become more severe; and

Whereas, Funds available for such projects would create employment, and provide neces-

sary public works projects for the State of Rhode Island and the various states of the nation; and

Whereas, There is a need for hospitals, schools, playgrounds, conservation projects, wildlife protection, preservation of natural resources, playgrounds, highways, roads, streets, bridges, prisons, public buildings, and other public works projects in the State of Rhode Island and the various states of the nation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress, the Rhode Island delegation in Congress, the President of the United States, and the legislatures of the various states be memorialized and respectfully requested to support legislation to grant funds to the various states for the purpose of public works projects; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby respectfully requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the presiding officer of the United States House of Representatives, to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the presiding officers of the legislatures of the various states.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, one of my primary concerns during my time in Congress has been the plight of the captive nations, those countries who were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. The stories of torture and oppression that come from those countries are truly horrifying.

In a continuing attempt to bring this situation to the public's attention, I would like to do my part in commemorating the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania by sharing with my colleagues an article entitled "An Invisible Nation—A Forgotten People":

AN INVISIBLE NATION—A FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

Fifty-seven years ago, on February 16, 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was established as a free and independent state. On February 16, 1975, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent . . . commemorate that anniversary, as well as the 724th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State.

Lithuania had enjoyed her independence for only twenty-two years when, in 1940, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and forcibly annexed these Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Today, only old maps of Europe show Lithuania as a distinct entity, newer ones display her territory as part of the Soviet Union. However, the United States Government and other great Western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of non-recognition of the forcible annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This gives succor to the Lithuanian people and reinforces their determination to await national independence while it also discourages the Soviet policies of Russification and effective absorption of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

The determined spirit of the Lithuanian people is still unbroken but their continuing daily struggle for religious freedom and

basic human rights receives little notice and even less support from the free world.

Only the more dramatic episodes are noted. The Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka's aborted leap to freedom in 1970 and subsequent release to America this past year; the Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta's self-immolation in 1972 for freedom for Lithuania and an end to Soviet religious persecution, and the subsequent demonstrations by thousands of young Lithuanians for the same cause; the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations; and now the arrest and imprisonment of untold numbers of Lithuanian and Russian dissidents for publishing or distributing "The Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church."

These last violations of human rights by the Soviet Union are directly opposed to the spirit of Detente, which should foster a relaxation of the iron fist of Communist regimes, providing for the beginning of real religious and personal freedom within the Soviet Union.

There has never been a more opportune moment in recent history than the present (spirit of detente) in which to give visible support to the Lithuanian people.

The United States Congress should again urge the President to direct the question of the status of the Baltic States in the United Nations and other international forums as it did during the second session of the 89th Congress when House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted.

Lithuania and her people should no longer be forgotten and ignored.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with so many of my colleagues in this observance of the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania.

Although the Soviet Government seized that small nation by force in 1940 and compelled it to become one of the Soviet Socialist Republics, Lithuania has never ceased to be independent in spirit. The Russians realize this fact. For them, it has become quite vexing. For us, Lithuania's tremendous reservoir of patriotism has served as a constant reminder of the grossness of the Soviet repression.

We, in the United States, frequently, and most often on the occasion of Lithuania's Independence Day, remark upon the injustice that has been visited on that small country on the shores of the Baltic and her two equally maltreated neighbors, Estonia and Latvia. We recognize the aspirations of the Balts to determine their own lives, worship as they please, and preserve their ancient and unique cultures. The populations of these three countries are small as is their land area. The fact that they have maintained their linguistic and cultural identities through the severest of travails indeed is testimony to their viability as separate, individual nations.

Détente is the word that underlies present United States-Soviet relations. Perhaps one day the Russians can extend

it to those who are not Russians and who have no wish to be.

SIX DANGERS IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who shoulder the tremendous responsibility of assuring the survival of our Nation's political and economic systems would benefit from reading the following article from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns.

He sets out six problems we must cope with plus both immediate and long-range solutions.

Key to the whole package is the scope of problems—both fiscal and psychological—which are created by our huge national indebtedness, that is, big spending programs.

As I read this article in U.S. News & World Report, I thought that the Chairman expressed reason, careful thought, historical and economic perspectives—a good understanding of the complex problems confronting us.

It is my hope that my colleagues in the Congress will set aside their personal prejudices and look at this article for what it is: A reminder that individual pride and individual productivity are prerequisites for increased production, elimination of product shortages and an economic stimulant.

The article follows:

WARNING FROM BURNS: SIX DANGERS IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

The latest from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns:

The U.S. must solve six problems if it is to have lasting prosperity.

In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, Mr. Burns pointed to these persistent weaknesses as standing in the way of achieving a steady rate of economic growth once this recession is over.

Problem No. 1: Corporation debt, which was only about half as large as stockholders' investments in the nation's business in 1950, is today roughly equal to those investments.

A great deal of the additional debt is of short-term variety, which comes due in a matter of months and therefore needs to be refinanced over and over. Mr. Burns declared: "The liquidity position of nonfinancial businesses has thus been weakened."

A slumping stock market in 1973 and 1974 was one of the reasons for that pileup of debt. It was difficult, if not impossible, for many companies to raise funds through the sale of new shares of stock. That left them with no alternative to heavy borrowing.

Problem No. 2: A decline in the earnings of the corporations in "real" terms contributed to the increase in debt by depriving the companies of funds needed for new supplies, construction and equipment.

While corporations generally reported higher profits in 1974, Mr. Burns said this apparent increase came from a rise in the value of inventories as a result of inflation. When this "illusory" element is eliminated, he estimated, the companies' earnings actually went down 20 per cent last year and were smaller than they had been 8 or 10 years ago.

Profits were also distorted by the fact that

industry is charging for the use of plant and equipment on the basis of prices paid for them years ago, instead of at the much higher prices that will have to be paid for replacements when the present equipment wears out or becomes obsolete.

Adjust for that factor, Mr. Burns said, and profits were actually not even large enough to cover the dividends being paid to stockholders—let alone to provide for building up the business.

Problem No. 3: The double-digit inflation of the past year. The Federal Reserve Chairman explained:

"There can be little doubt that inflation is the principal cause of the decline in economic activity in which we now find ourselves. . . . Because of its capricious incidence on income and wealth, inflation has caused disillusionment and discontent among our citizens. And because of its distorting effects on business decisions, inflation has brought into question the liquidity of some major business and financial institutions."

On that score, Mr. Burns was taking issue with George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, and also with some economists who say the Federal Reserve brought on the recession by keeping money and credit too tight for too long.

Mr. Burns takes the position that the Federal Reserve had to clamp down on the growth of the money supply and let interest rates soar to record levels to check inflation, which he traces in large measure to two of the six problems in his list.

Problem No. 4: Shrinking gains in productivity—what is otherwise known as output per man-hour—in recent years. Gains here reflect the technological improvements that can be brought about through new machines and methods and the increasing education of the labor force.

The trouble is, Mr. Burns suggested, that industry has not had the incentives needed to invest enough in new plant and equipment or in advanced research. And at the same time, productivity has been hampered by unfavorable changes in "the attitude of the labor force and some laxity in management."

Said the Federal Reserve Chairman:

"Workers nowadays are well trained, but many of them work with less energy than they should, and absenteeism has become a more serious problem."

Problem No. 5: The mounting tax burden. Mr. Burns pointed out:

"Taxes have progressively reduced the rewards for working, while Government at the same time has increased the share of the national output going to persons who are not productively employed. Twenty-five years ago, a typical worker with three dependents gave up 1 per cent of his gross weekly earnings in federal income and Social Security taxes. Since then, that fraction has risen steadily and reached 13 per cent in 1974."

Mr. Burns contended that the mounting tax burden has taken away some of the worker's incentive and thus tends to reduce productivity. And he blamed the rise in taxes largely on the way federal outlays for "public welfare, Social Security benefits, unemployment insurance, and other public assistance" have grown. These payments, he estimated, have increased about twice as fast as wages and salaries. He warned:

"A society as affluent as ours can ill afford to neglect the poor, the elderly, the unemployed or other disadvantaged persons, but neither can it afford to neglect the fundamental precept that there must be adequate rewards to stimulate individual effort."

Problem No. 6: The decline of the U.S. dollar in world markets. On that score, the FRB chief declared:

"A substantially greater degree of exchange-rate stability will not be achieved until underlying economic and financial conditions have been put in better order."

What ought to be done? Mr. Burns divided his prescription into short and long-range remedies.

For the immediate future, he stressed the need to "cushion" the recession with a temporary income-tax cut for individuals, tax relief for business, and "an adequate expansion in supplies of money and bank credit."

For the longer run, he said, Congress must get a firmer grip on federal spending, especially on the so-called transfer payments to people receiving direct assistance of one sort or another from the Government.

Better profits for business and greater incentives for investment also will be needed, Mr. Burns said.

"Above all," he concluded, "ways must be found to bring an end to inflation."

BAILING OUT THE TITANIC

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the utility industry is in the process of collapsing. An enormous increase in the amount of new capital needed for our future powerplants is creating an impossible situation in the industry. Simply put, without either massive rate increases, or massive public subsidies, the powerplants we need to meet future demand will not be built.

The Wall Street Journal of February 18 reports that the White House is currently preparing a plan for a massive bailout of the industry. It is ironic that, while decrying public power as unwarranted Government intervention, our utilities are now lining up behind Lockheed, the Penn Central, and other pillars of our free enterprise system, waiting for a handout.

If the Ford administration does attempt to bail out the utilities, consumers will not benefit, only investors. As an alternative, I am proposing to the Massachusetts Legislature that the State involve itself directly in the utility problem by financing and operating new powerplants through a public nonprofit corporation. In this way, the savings of public financing can be passed on directly to the consumer, not the stockholder.

In the coming months, something must be done to resolve this financing crisis. In my opinion, electricity is a basic necessity which should be made available at reasonable costs. The private sector can no longer meet this challenge. Rather than artificially propping up the industry with public subsidies, Government ought to assume an active role in supplying this basic component of our industrial life.

I commend the Wall Street Journal to my fellow Members who are concerned with the skyrocketing cost of power.

The text follows:

A FRIEND IN NEED? UTILITIES' FINANCIAL ILLS STRIVE WHITE HOUSE TALK OF GOING TO THE RESCUE

(By James P. Gannon)

WASHINGTON.—The White House is urgently studying a batch of far-reaching schemes to bail troubled electrical utilities out of their financial problems.

The search is on for a plan that would help financially ailing power companies obtain the vast amounts of money needed to get their plant-building programs back on track again. The Ford administration is alarmed that widespread cancellations and postponements of utility plant projects not only are worsening the recession but threaten to undermine President Ford's long-range energy plans and could mean power shortages and blackouts in years ahead.

The utility-bailout ideas, which are bubbling up through the bureaucracy toward the President's desk, range from the mundane to the exotic. They include:

Loan guarantees for utility bond issues intended to reassure investors who have grown wary of such securities, and thus enable financially strapped power companies to sell bonds at reasonable interest rates to provide money for plant expansion.

A Utility Finance Corp., patterned after the Depression-era Reconstruction Finance Corp., that would make direct loans or even buy utility stock issues with money from the U.S. Treasury.

A novel scheme under which Uncle Sam would promise to buy, at profitable rates, all the electricity generated by nuclear and coal-fired plants that have been delayed or scrapped due to lack of financing. The government would hope to resell the power to actual users, but the profitable-sales guarantee would enable the utility to borrow the money to finance the now-stalled construction, according to backers of this scheme, which has captured the fancy of White House economic adviser L. William Seidman.

A rebate plan under which the Treasury would reimburse utilities for the higher costs of fuel arising from President Ford's package of oil tariffs, taxes and price increases. This less-ambitious step wouldn't solve the industry's broader financing troubles, but it would offset a cost burden that some utilities claim could be "crippling."

A NEVER-ENDING LINE

A presidentially ordered study of such utility-aid plans is nearing completion within two weeks, officials say, Mr. Ford's top energy and economic advisers will draw up a final list of options for the President, who will have to decide the issue himself. The decision could be difficult, because both Mr. Ford's key advisers and utility-industry leaders appear divided over the wisdom of any new federal intervention in the power industry.

"If we go down this road, it's a never-ending line," frets one Ford Cabinet member in on the planning. "Maybe we'd have to do the same thing for the airlines or other industries," he worries. But he's not sure whether his philosophical opposition to federal bailouts or the urgings of other officials to do something to shore up the shaky utilities will prove more persuasive to Mr. Ford.

Ironically, the President's own energy policy may tip the scales toward some sort of utility-aid measure. Some officials say the decision may hinge on whether Mr. Ford or Congress wins the struggle over energy policy. If Congress succeeds in blocking the White House oil tariff and tax measures, the utilities' immediate financial bind would be less difficult. But if Mr. Ford wins, oil-burning power companies will be hit with added fuel costs that could prove devastating unless the White House rushes to the rescue.

Utilities are relative newcomers to the federal welfare window. For years, they had little trouble raising all the money they needed. Investors considered them profitable monopolies whose regulated earnings and handsome dividends made their stocks and bonds secure and attractive, even to widows and orphans. Then came the 1970s.

THE MOST CAPITAL-HUNGRY

A succession of problems staggered the industry: soaring costs for coal, oil and other fuels; escalating plant-construction costs; record-high interest rates on borrowed money; safety and mechanical delays and foul-ups with new nuclear plants; heavy new outlays for air and water pollution controls. Though electric utilities have raised rates substantially (22%, on average, during 1974 alone), the slowness of the state rate-approval processes and the growing consumer and political backlash against rising electricity bills have many of them in a bind.

Their deteriorating financial condition has made it hard for many utilities to sell bonds or stock to raise money. Unfortunately for them, utilities are the most capital-hungry industry in the U.S. economy. Their capital needs for plant expansion are estimated in an Edison Electric Institute study at \$140 billion for the years 1974 through 1980. About two-thirds of this would have to come from sources outside of the companies' own profits.

Because of their new money woes, utilities have been cutting their plant-expansion plans left and right lately. According to one tally, projects representing more than 60% of the planned nuclear generating capacity and 30% of the non-nuclear capacity were either postponed or canceled by utilities in 1974. Much of the stalled capacity eventually will be built, government specialists say, but the delays in getting such plants in operation could cause power shortages eventually in some areas. Worse yet, they contend the slowdown in nuclear power projects undermines the U.S. drive to reduce imports of costly foreign oil, used to fire boilers in the old plants that the nuclear ones would replace.

Ford administration officials clearly are worried, not only about the long-term repercussions but about more immediate dangers arising from the industry's troubles. All those plant-construction cutbacks are worsening the severe recession in the construction industry and depressing sales of power-plant machinery and supplies. Officials also are closely watching a secret list of the industry's potential Titanics: companies so financially strapped that they're candidates for bankruptcy.

"We have a list of 20 or so companies in varying degrees of financial stress that we're watching," confides the keeper of the list. He won't reveal the companies' names, but the utilities under scrutiny generally are those whose earnings are failing to cover, or are barely covering, interest payments on their debt and preferred dividend requirements. The monitoring is intended to give advance warning of any looming financial crisis that might trigger bankruptcy. Officials fear that kind of confidence-shattering event could send severe shock waves all through today's troubled economy.

The Titanic-list watcher notes that many electric utilities are in sound financial condition. "The problems appear to be somewhat regional," he says. This complicates the decision on whether any federal aid plan is needed. "Why in the world should we develop a policy for the entire industry in order to bail out this or that company?" asks one skeptical Treasury official. Some critics contend the troubled utilities suffer from bad management or poor state regulatory policies—problems that can be solved without federal aid.

Another complicating factor is that the industry itself is divided on whether it wants emergency federal help. Support for the bailout schemes is "fragmented," says one industry source. "There is great concern among the elder statesmen on the industry," he adds, "that they shouldn't let the nose of the government camel under the tent."

But those whose tents are nearly collapsing have abandoned philosophical reflection on the proper federal role in utility affairs. Executives of such concerns as Ohio Edison Co. in Akron and Consumers Power Co. in Jackson, Mich., have openly appealed for a federal bailout.

New federal aid is needed right now "or the nation may soon find itself grappling with these problems while freezing in the dark," contends one of the most outspoken aid-seekers, William G. Rosenberg, chairman of the Michigan Public Service Commission; he wants federal loan guarantees for utilities. The electric companies that Mr. Rosenberg's commission regulates are among the most troubled in the nation. The SOS from Michigan clearly is being heard in the White House by such Michiganders as economic adviser Seidman, not to mention the President.

Mr. Seidman, who seems to favor some utility-aid plan, has been calling attention to the industry's troubles lately. "Most private utilities aren't in good financial shape," he told a Teamsters union conference in Washington last week. More than one-third of them, he said, "aren't in a position to build new plants."

But other officials appear wary. Officials at the Treasury and Council of Economic Advisers aren't eager to launch any bailout scheme. Federal energy officials don't sound enthusiastic but concede some further steps to aid the industry may be needed.

President Ford already has submitted to Congress a number of proposals to improve the long-range health of the utility industry. These include new tax benefits such as an enlarged credit for power-plant outlays and a federally mandated overhaul of state utility regulation, intended to help utilities recover increased costs more fully and more speedily in rate hikes.

But even if Congress passes these long-range measures, some more immediate help may be needed for at least a while, officials concede. "We are looking very hard at additional alternatives" to ease the industry's financing problems, says Eric Zausner, acting deputy director of the Federal Energy Administration. Similarly, a White House economist declares that higher rates are the basic solution to the industry's problems, but "political pressures" won't permit a fast-enough increase. "The question then is what can be done in the interim to get financing in motion and get construction in motion," he says.

Probably the most novel idea under study is a power-purchase guarantee plan. This idea was suggested to the White House recently by former Congressman Craig Hosmer, long a champion of the nuclear power industry. White House adviser Seidman is attracted to the Hosmer scheme because it would both stimulate the sagging economy and support administration energy objectives by spurring immediate construction of stalled nuclear and coal-fired generating plants.

Under the Hosmer plan, the government would contract to buy all the electricity produced by any presently delayed or canceled power plant that a utility puts back on its construction schedule. The theory is that the government's commitment to purchase the power at profitable rates would make it easier for the utility to raise the money for construction. Uncle Sam would resell the power, at cost, to users or utilities depending on oil-fired plants. The scheme is promoted as one that would generate jobs, help cut oil imports and avert power shortages.

Another idea is to establish an RFC-type agency that would become a lender to or stockholder in private utilities. Such a Utility Finance Corp. has been proposed by some industry executives having trouble selling stocks and bonds to ordinary investors. Officials say any such agency would lend or buy

stock only under certain conditions, perhaps including promises of future rate hikes that would permit the utility to retire the debt or repurchase the stock held by Uncle Sam. But some officials fear any such plan would smack of government takeover. Furthermore, if an RFC were proposed for utilities, other shaky businesses probably would demand to get equal treatment.

Another plan under study would have the government guarantee utility bonds, which presumably would make them easier to sell and at a lower interest rate. Uncle Sam has guaranteed loans to troubled companies before, as in the case of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. But Treasury officials are opposed to the spread of this practice, which they feel doesn't really solve the industry's basic problems and may make it harder for other borrowers, lacking guarantees, to obtain funds.

The least ambitious step would be for the government to compensate the utilities for higher fuel costs stemming from Mr. Ford's energy proposals. Those costs would be high for many power companies.

Ten New England utilities that have sued to block the Ford-proclaimed oil tariff contend the import fees will cost them an extra \$125 million in 1975. The utilities claim in their suit that this will cause "an immediate and critical cash shortage." The effect could be "crippling" because of lags in raising rates, they assert.

The President may be sympathetic to such problems. Just last week, in his trip to Kansas, he disclosed that he's ordered his energy advisers to draft a plan to compensate farmers for their extra fuel costs arising from his program. Some officials worry, though, that this could be a never-ending process because everyone from airline executives to school administrators can make a case for fuel-cost compensation.

LITHUANIA WAS FREE

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson sent a message to Congress which electrified the peoples of the world. On that day, Europe had been engaged in a life-or-death struggle for almost 3½ years; and the United States had entered World War I about 9 months earlier.

President Wilson's message included the 14 points on which he proposed that peace might be established.

One of his points was the self-determination of small nations.

Many peoples were encouraged to strive for independence and the first result of this striving was only 39 days in coming. Lithuania, one of the small Baltic countries, became a free and independent nation on February 16, 1918. That was 57 years ago last Sunday, a day which is observed with reverence by people of Lithuanian ancestry who live in the United States.

They might observe February 16 with exuberance, such as we associate with the Fourth of July, except that Lithuanian independence was short-lived. Together with its neighbors on the Baltic Sea, Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940.

To our credit, we and most of our free world allies have refused to recognize that conquest. Our refusal helps to keep alive the hope that Lithuanian people may one day be free again.

WHAT I REALLY WANT FROM MY CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress began its now-concluded 10-day recess, the Nation has received a variety of grim reports on the health of the economy. Unemployment has climbed to the highest total since the Great Depression. An article in the New York Times has documented cases of actual starvation among our elderly, many of whom are no longer able to make ends meet in inflationary times. And a variety of economists and other experts have predicted a still further deepening of the current recession.

How has the Congress dealt with this situation? In my opinion, it has still not faced up to its responsibility to meet the emergency. Our reaction to the President's proposed levy on imported oil provides a case in point. Early in February, we passed legislation suspending for a period of 90 days President Ford's authority to increase the tax on imported petroleum. Sponsors and supporters of the legislation, who were nearly unanimous that conservation measures of a sort are needed, agreed on this period, which was designed to give Congress time to develop an energy policy of its own. On its face, this represented a wise and responsible approach to the energy problem. Yet the face is deceiving, since the House promptly chose to utilize 10 of its allotted 90 days by taking an effective recess. As we return to the Capitol today, I am sure many of my colleagues will agree that we could have used our time more productively here in Washington.

Sadly, however, our behavior with regard to the Lincoln Day recess is typical of the way the Congress has approached its responsibilities during the current session. Despite the demonstrated severity of our problems, there seems to be little sense of urgency in the Halls of Congress. Political posturing continues to dominate the debate on issues of grave importance. And the congressional recess schedule, which has already been completed for the entire year, reveals that we have allotted ourselves more than 100 days of recess time.

With the abiding commonsense for which they are noted, the American people have sensed far better than many of their leaders that this is no time for politics-as-usual. This sentiment has registered increasingly in my correspondence with constituents, many of whom express befuddlement and dismay that Congress has not devoted itself more diligently to the search for solutions to our

pressing economic and energy problems. The issue of congressional responsibility was very forcefully stated in a recent newspaper column by a Maine State senator, Bennett D. Katz, of Augusta. Senator Katz' argument is not original; it is exceptional primarily for the force and eloquence with which he makes it. What is original, I think, is the chord that his remarks have struck with Maine people, many of whom have written me in praise of his position.

Mr. Speaker, there is a message for all Members of the Congress in Senator Katz' article "What I Really Want From My Congress," which appeared in the Maine Sunday Telegram of February 9. In the sincere hope that my colleagues will take time to read and ponder his remarks, I enter a copy of that article in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT I REALLY WANT FROM MY CONGRESS
(By State Senator Bennett Katz)

At a time when we need action so much, I perplex about the wide gulf between our nation's needs and Congressional inaction. I chafe at the high disparity between campaign rhetoric (in the even years) and legislative output (in the odd years).

Last month I listened for two hours to Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) as he gave a speech at Bates College. He was good—an accomplished speaker. He used all the proper pauses, the changes in voice speed and inflections.

I cannot recall that he assumed any responsibility for congressional shortcomings, nor did he give one ray of positive hope of the emergence of congressional leadership which might lead to a comprehensive attack on our dreadful problems.

Yet it was Congress which appropriated every blessed dollar to underwrite the cost of our Viet Nam inanity.

It was Congress which created and funded the CIA—and adequate oversight of its clandestine operations is the responsibility of Congress.

It is Congress which makes endless speeches about the evils of tax loopholes, and then goes home to make more speeches—without enacting tax reform.

It is Congress which has the ultimate responsibility through legislation to face up to this energy mess, the need for more conservation and more domestic independence. And it is Congress, and only Congress which can give us the legislative tools to help us emerge from our growing economic ills.

What do I really want from my Congress?

I want fewer news releases on bills introduced, and more headlines on legislation enacted.

I want a 1975 moratorium on personal 1976 presidential ambitions within the Congress, with an increased dedication to effective committee work in Washington.

I want fewer speeches on national health insurance, and, given a legislative miracle, an enacted program laid on the President's desk for his signature.

I want the enactment of an energy package that leads to reduced consumption and increased U.S. energy independence, with a fair sharing of the attendant burdens.

I want sweeping tax reform. Not next year or next session! Not studies! Not speeches about the evils of tax loopholes! I want comprehensive tax reform at least—NOW!

Above all, I want my Congress to stay on the job in Washington. With an extraordinary lack of concern for speedy answers to our nation's needs, I understand that Congress now plans:

1. An 11 day recess in February.
2. A seventeen day Easter recess.
3. A 13 day Memorial Day vacation.
4. A 10 day 4th of July holiday.

5. 34 session-free days during August and September.

6. A 10 day vacation in October.

7. A 10 day vacation for Thanksgiving.

8. A Christmas—year-end break of undetermined duration.

Maine's four men in Congress are Muskie, Hathaway, Cohen and first term Emery. Collectively and individually, Maine is very well represented. There is every reason to expect that these four talented men will maintain a close and continuing contact with each other, so that Maine's voice will be amplified.

Neither Maine nor the nation needs a Republican program this time—nor a Democratic one. We must have a coalition of Congressional leaders committed to shake off Congress' lamentable moribund performance. Pressing human needs must be translated into congressional action. NOW!

There is too much suffering in the wings to accept less.

DOTTIE COOK, WOMAN IN BUSINESS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, women as high ranking in business as Katherine Graham, Mary Wells, Margaret Scarborough Wilson, Dorothy Schiff are still novelties by some because they are women. The board rooms and executive desks of this Nation chiefly are still "manned"—by men. This is a fact which is often pointed out these days.

But there is another fact concerning employment for women which does not get pointed out—and that is the tremendous loss of talent, brainpower, and general working ability because our job market is reluctant to provide the flexibility which many women need particularly during the years when a family's children are small. One focal point of this inflexibility is the lack of meaningful part-time jobs.

In my view this is not fair. It is like saying to half the population, "We'll give you the right to 'make it' in the business world, but don't expect us to help out with other responsibilities you may have or to reshape that world one whit to account for your existence." In other words, "You can come to our party, but you have to bring your own cake and bake it yourself, too."

A much better solution to many work needs can be found if both the job and the employee are shaped so that they are compatible with each other.

One young Texan decided to do something about breaking down old fears and inhibitions against providing flexibility in job opportunities. For the past 3 years, Mrs. Dottie Cook has been chopping away at such staid stereotypes as the 40-hour week and the practice of looking only for one person to fill the needs of each job.

Sometimes she has convinced employers that a job can really be handled by a part-time person—or has convinced others that it could be handled by two part-time people filling one job slot. She is in reality providing direction and ad-

vice that would be good for every employer to listen to.

I have discovered firsthand that part-time help can be an asset to an office. I have had a part-time secretary-case worker in my district office for over 10 years. In the past several years I have also added a part-time legislative aide and speechwriter as well as part-time secretary to my Washington staff. They are all women, and two of them wanted to work less than full time because they had children at home. I might add that I get full-time service from them, although that was not the motive. They are simply dedicated persons.

I would like at this time to place in the RECORD a recent article from the Washington Post which discusses the challenges and triumphs of Dottie Cook and of other small businesswomen:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1975]

BANK, INSURANCE WOES CITED—WOMAN BUSINESS OWNER FACES EXTRA PROBLEMS

(By Claudia Levy)

Rosemary Reed Miller knew she had one of the better ideas.

It wouldn't take too large a showroom to display the kind of bright, "young look" dresses and accessories she had been wholesaling for several years out of an increasingly heavy suitcase.

The independent craftspeople and dressmakers were already producing saleable items and she told the loan consultant at the Small Business Administration office that little start-up capital would be needed.

"The man couldn't even see what I was talking about," said the now-owner of Toast and Strawberries, a popular boutique above Dupont Circle. "He was very conservative and he discouraged me. Last year I grossed \$108,000. If I had listened to him, I wouldn't have been in business."

"And in the seven years since then, I've seen a lot go out of business who've had 10 shops."

London School of Economics graduate Gillian Nixon was so put off by the prospect of "astronomical paperwork" and the two-month delay involved in an SBA loan that she didn't even bother to apply. The former manager of the Watergate's Saint Lurant boutique had had offers from private investors interested in her plan for a tennis shop, but as a merchandiser with eight years experience opening other people's shops, she hoped to stay independent.

The loan officer at her bank "spent 10 minutes telling me they didn't lend venture capital. He didn't ask my name at all, but he did bother to ask if I had an account." Eventually she got a loan, but the review process only began after she bitterly pressed her case with a vice president of the bank.

Ms. Nixon's Canal Square store in Georgetown, the Tennis Set, open now since May 1973, has been riding the crest of new interest among women in the sport, she says and she began specializing in clothes while some competitors were stocking mainly equipment. Last Christmas, she said, her best-selling item was a \$94 tennis outfit. Sales volume has increased by about 50 per cent.

Miller, Nixon and other women who have recently launched a new Association of Women Business Owners here, see themselves as part of a breed of predominantly young, independent female entrepreneurs who pride themselves in new ways of merchandising, designing services and relating to their colleagues and employees.

As women, they say they share common frustrations in dealing with bankers who lack vision, insurance companies that won't write reasonable disability policies and in the complexities of business twinned with

child-raising. As a group, they hope to deal with some of these problems and to refer business to other women.

As entrepreneurs, they face economic pitfalls common to most owners of small businesses including high interest rates, poor initial cash flows and consumer uncertainty.

"Many of us started businesses because we couldn't find a place to work where we could be happy," public relations consultant Anne Banville said. "Most of us have managed to retain in our businesses characteristics that are different than men's. . . Many of us want to make money and be successful but don't always want to go big. . ."

Dottie Cook says she began her employment service, the Job Market, three years ago largely as the result of her own frustrations in trying to find part-time work.

A former personal secretary to Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.) who had also worked for a consulting firm, Cook found that "short of being in retail sales or a grocery clerk, employers thought you were laughable. A lot of women are excluded from the employment market because they can't work 40 hours a week."

Her agency, which places mostly secretarial and clerical employees, works to encourage firms to be more flexible with their use of women, she said, and has been able to persuade some to allow women to share a single position or work part time.

The 1970s, she said, is going to be a time of change for work ethics and styles, particularly for women. With community development specialist Denise Cavanaugh, Cook is also a partner in Cook-Cavanaugh, a management consulting service that came into being "because employers were asking more in-depth questions about women in the workforce."

Clients tend to be middle-sized associations, institutions and federal agencies concerned with the legal status of their equal employment opportunity programs, and how to best utilize their staffs, Cavanaugh said.

Susan Eisenberg, who picked up knowledge of bookkeeping and accounting while she worked for two CPAs, also places high value on flexible hours. She began to freelance as a bookkeeper after her third child, now nine, was one-and-a-half. That work evolved into a financial consulting business serving largely professional clients and non-profit groups who need to have financial reporting systems designed for them or to have grants administered.

In the past five years, she said income has more than doubled, with the several employees of her firm sharing profits from about \$50,000 a year in revenues.

"Nobody is actually on salary," Eisenberg said. "Everyone is on a percentage of what they bill. It's an incentive program. It kind of seems to me a fair way to do things."

Women in the firm "feel more of a kinship to one another," a feeling she said she perceives in other small, female entrepreneurships. "Employees really aren't employees; they're helping you do a good job. There's very little of that 'You work for me, you're subordinate to me' . . ."

Rosemary Reed Miller, whose husband Paul, former dean of the Howard University Law School, died last summer, Dottie Cook, whose husband is a government economist, and Susan Eisenberg, who was separated from her husband when her children were small, all have had to depend heavily on loyal housekeepers or platoons of babysitters to free them to keep their business going. Unless shared by mates or taken up by outside help, family responsibilities can be overwhelming for a woman starting a full-time business, they said.

And partly for that reason, many women begin their commercial enterprises at home, transferring the work to other facilities later if they were able to swing it.

Census figures for this area, in 1970, figures

which do not represent a complete tally of business owners, indicate that there are perhaps 14,000 self-employed women here.

As of that year, however, they appeared to be heavily concentrated in enterprises characteristic of the rest of the nation's businessmen—beauty shops and other personal services, retail stores, and "private educational services."

The association founders, who drew about 50 people to their first meeting last week, hope to spark a national network of progressive business women that can command more government attention and strengthen individual businesses.

"I've always felt women have had to be time-and-a-half better to get ahead in anything," PR consultant Anne Banville said. "All things being equal, I'll give work to a woman."

TAXES TOP INFLATIONARY RISES— AGAIN

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Baltimore Sun for February 10 highlights the great responsibility which the Federal Government must bear for the inflation which afflicts every American. The article, reporting on a study conducted by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, reports that in 1974, a year of sustained inflation, the one item in an average family's budget which rose most sharply was—you guessed it—taxes.

Different economists estimate 1974's inflation rate, measured by various indices, at anywhere from 10 percent to 15 percent. But during this period, social security taxes rose 21.6 percent and personal income taxes rose 26.5 percent. Surely this is more than a little bit out of line.

When you reflect that inflationary rises in other portions of the average family's budget are also attributable in large measure, either directly or indirectly, to policies of the Federal Government, particularly Congress insistence on deficit spending, it becomes clear just how much of a burden the Government is laying on the working citizens of this country.

The proposed budget for 1976, with the largest peacetime deficit in U.S. history, offers little hope of any relief for the average American. Some of us are wondering, Mr. Speaker, how long the American people will endure what has become, by any reasonable definition, a sustained policy of confiscatory taxation.

The Sun article follows:

TYPICAL FAMILY'S TAX TOPS ALL '74 INFLATIONARY RISES

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—For the second year in a row, taxes paid by a typical American family topped all other inflationary increases in its 1974 budget, according to a congressional staff study released yesterday.

While food prices rose nearly 12 percent and housing more than 13 percent, the taxes—including state, local and federal—rose by more than 26 percent.

This is largely due to the fact that the typical family's income rose, pushing it into a higher tax bracket.

These findings are in a survey prepared by Lucy Falcone, an economist on the staff of the Joint Economic Committee of the House and Senate.

"Higher tax payments outstripped all other price increases in the consumer's budget in 1974," the survey report said.

"For the family at an intermediate income level of \$14,466, Social Security taxes rose 21.6 percent in 1974, from \$647 in 1973 to \$787 in 1974. Personal income taxes rose even more—by 26.5 percent.

The increase in personal income taxes from 1972 to 1973 was 16.9 percent, Miss Falcone said.

The intermediate budget discussed in the survey is based on Bureau of Labor Statistics hypothetical budgets aimed at measuring consumer's total expenditures in the low, medium and high ranges for families of four living in cities.

While the intermediate budget was used as an example in the staff study, the increases in taxes overshadowed the other cost increases in the lower- and higher-income ranges, too.

The staff study went on to say that inflation had increased the income tax burden on low- and middle-income people more than on wealthy people "because it has reduced the value of the standard deduction and exemptions, and because tax brackets are much narrower at low- and middle-income levels.

"While dollar income rises, the deduction remains the same," it said, and thus taxable income rises faster than dollar income. At higher income levels, the value of itemized deductions is likely to keep better pace with dollar incomes so that taxable income doesn't rise faster than dollar incomes."

The current recession, the committee survey continued, is the first in which the overall tax burden has increased for families and for individuals.

In previous economic downturns, the tax burden declined, which, in itself, stimulated demand among the buying public.

THE SPIRIT OF LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, 1975, marked the 57th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

This date also commemorates the 760th year since the first attempts at establishing a Lithuanian state in 1215 A.D., and the 724th year since the establishment of the first permanent Lithuanian nation—but since 1940, Lithuanians have not been free.

But the desire for independence has not abated. The struggle against oppression goes on. From 1944 to 1953, more than 20,000 Lithuanians lost their lives in the fight against totalitarianism.

Recently, more than 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics again jeopardized their lives by signing and sending petitions to the United Nations in an attempt to dramatize the lack of religious freedom in Lithuania today.

These attempts are especially meaningful when we consider that Lithuanian is the oldest living language in Europe and that the entire Lithuanian culture has survived despite the efforts of oppressors. What is doubly ironic is that Lithuania was one of the few places in

Europe where education and religious tolerance were practiced during the middle ages.

I join my colleagues in commemorating the long, proud, and distinguished heritage of all Lithuanians—and their unflinching spirit.

SACREDNESS OF HUMAN LIFE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the sacredness of human life cannot be denied, but few of us stop to consider the many ways, conscious and unconscious, in which its value is downgraded.

For those of us who dissent from the Supreme Court's decision of January 22, 1973, which liberalized the conditions under which abortions may be performed, that is only the most obvious.

Others which do not come to mind as readily include a lack of concern for housing, pollution, poverty and related factors which vitally affect the way our citizens live.

The month of February is being observed in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Louisville as "Appreciation of Life Month" to draw our attention to this situation.

I recommend to my colleagues an editorial from the archdiocesan newspaper, the Record, which explores the problem and should give us pause to think:

SACREDNESS OF HUMAN LIFE TOLERATES NO INDECISION

Our observance of February as "Appreciation of Human Life" month in the Archdiocese may well be the most significant and penetrating project we, as the Church of Louisville, engage in during 1975. Most significant because it demands that we answer the question: "Is human life sacred?" Penetrating because our answer will affect our other actions.

If we should answer "No" to the question, then for us nothing else will be sacred either. Remove the fundamental sacredness, that of life, and the rest of the structure collapses.

Yet, many in our culture seem to be subscribing to a belief in the sanctity of only some human life and the right of one human to decide the fate of another human. The Supreme Court "approved" this negative attitude toward human life when on January 22, 1973, it broke from the Judeo-Christian tradition upon which our country is founded and declared that the life of the unborn is not protected by the U.S. Constitution. Archbishop Thomas J. McDonough reminds us in his pastoral letter, "Appreciation of Human Life," Jan. 23, 1975:

"The Court's action has eroded respect for human life and has encouraged a climate of social permissiveness that has led to an unmerciful increase in the number of abortions in the United States."

With unwanted children out of the way, voices are now being raised "to end the horrible suffering of the aged," in the name of mercy, make euthanasia legal. Meanwhile we shut away the deformed where we don't have to see them or work with them; we fail to provide the mentally retarded with schools where many could be taught to take care of themselves and even to help others. And simultaneously we note that several states recently have established a mandatory death

penalty for certain crimes. The unborn, the aged, the mentally retarded, the prisoner—let's relieve society of persons who are not "fully human."

If, on the other hand, we answer "Yes, human life is sacred," then we are challenged, as Archbishop McDonough stated in his pastoral:

"Admittedly, there are many undue hardships today which militate against the full development of a human life: The high rate of unemployment, the constant rise in the cost of living, divorce, drug addiction, exploitation of the Nation's resources, racism, unacceptable family housing, hunger, and the meager income or support of many of the aged, the handicapped, and neglected children. All of these conditions debase human dignity and constitute a challenge to our respect for human life."

We have the opportunity, especially during the next few weeks, to meet this challenge as a community, hopefully gaining support and encouragement on the parish level. Ways suggested include prayer, study of the Church's teaching on the issues, and appropriate action. We might begin by asking ourselves if our actions reflect a "no" or a "yes" to the question, "Is life sacred?"

A what to get us started:

What is my contribution to the exploitation of the nation's resources? To air-pollution? Am I working to lessen my racial and/or cultural prejudices? How concerned am I that in Jefferson County alone the planning commission found over 24,000 housing units which need rehabilitation? (Add several thousand more to cover the other counties in the Archdiocese.)

Am I petitioning for food stamps to be made more available for the poor and elderly, or do I agree that this program must be cut in order to help the country recover from its economic ills? Do I give assistance to or direct the unwed mother to someone who can help her, or am I pushing her into an abortion? What has been my reaction to the massive hunger problem, both in our own country and in other areas of the world?

Our everyday actions and attitudes do reflect the answer to the basic question, "Is human life sacred?" February is a good and important time to strengthen our participation in "our surpassing ministry of safeguarding life." (Second Vatican Council)

"... I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life; that both thou and thy seed may live; that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey His voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto Him; For He is thy life and the length of thy days." (Deuteronomy 30:19-20)

WORLD WAR I VETS DESERVE BETTER BREAK

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to insure that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued because of increases in monthly social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no group of veterans that have been so badly treated as the veterans of World War I. Most of them now are beyond 70 years of age and, under existing law, each time a social security benefit is granted to them, their veterans benefits are reduced. This

just does not make sense. I am hopeful that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will give immediate consideration to this legislation and do justice to those who fought and gave their all for their country during World War I. I might add that unless the committee does take steps to right this wrong, I will break my longstanding policy and sign a discharge petition to force the legislation from the committee.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR LITHUANIA

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Ms. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 57th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania. On that day in 1918, the brave people of Lithuania threw off the yoke of foreign rule under which they had suffered since 1795. The Lithuanian people have been well acquainted with self-government, however. Following the establishment of a unified Lithuanian state in the 14th century, the country became one of the great forces for freedom in the Baltic region. The Lithuanians also courageously sought ties with Western Europe during the Middle Ages—a time throughout Europe of retrenchment and isolation of ideas and people. One historian, Dr. Clarence Manning, has described the important role of Lithuania during the Middle Ages:

The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tatars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

In 1795, czarist Russia annexed Lithuania. The people made many heroic attempts to free themselves, but each time failed. Following a revolt in 1831, a concerted policy of russification was begun. Still, Lithuanians remained faithful to their language and culture throughout the repressive decades of the 19th century.

With the restoration of independence in 1918, the Lithuanian Republic extracted a pledge from the Soviet Union that it would renounce forever all rights of sovereignty over Lithuania. The treaty stated, in part:

In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact

that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

During the interwar period, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, adopted a constitution which guaranteed freedom of speech, assembly, religion and communication. Industrialization, agriculture and education all advanced under the independent Lithuanian Government.

Unfortunately, German and Russian aggression in World War II suffocated these freedoms. In 1940, Russian occupied Lithuania, held a phony election and incorporated Lithuania into the U.S.S.R.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, we have heard little from Lithuania. Soviet control has been complete over news and immigration. Like her sister Baltic states of Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania has had its sovereignty violated and its freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union. Their domination has been carried even farther than that of other Eastern European nations, for they have been incorporated into the Soviet Union. This tyranny to which the Baltic states fell victim is not in any way compatible with the freedoms on which the American Republic is based.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, it is important that we recall the achievements of this proud people. We should also remember that in the past they survived concerted attempts to eliminate the Lithuanian language and culture. I have no doubt that they will one day again achieve self-government. This should be one of the goals of our discussions of détente with the Soviet Union.

RETURNABLE BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT OF 1975

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today several colleagues and I are introducing the Returnable Beverage Container Act of 1975.

Over the past 2 decades, no-deposit, no-return containers have come to symbolize the wasteful tendencies of Americans. They are an obvious blight on this Nation's landscape. Legislation banning nonreturnable bottles and cans has often been viewed as a means of cleaning up and beautifying America's roadsides and recreation areas. This, I believe, is a worthy goal, and particularly appropriate as this country's 200th birthday approaches.

But elimination of litter is not the reason for introducing this bill, which would require a 5-cent deposit on each beverage container distributed in the United States.

One of the biggest issues now facing the Congress is conservation of energy and other resources. Many proposals are under serious consideration, some of which would require significant sacrifices by the American people. It is ironic that

in a time when our basic heating and transportation needs are being threatened, we continue to allow a substantial drain on energy and other precious resources brought about by the use of throwaway containers. Shifting back to the use of refillable beverage bottles would cause, at worst, a minor inconvenience. Yet the savings would be very great.

It has been reliably estimated that the energy savings would be the equivalent of 150,000 to 279,000 barrels of oil each day. This is not enough to meet the conservation goals set down by President Ford and by several leaders of this Chamber, but it would be a very meaningful step toward those goals. In addition, each year this Nation would save millions of tons of aluminum, steel, and glass. Space would be saved in sanitary landfills, an important consideration in many parts of the country. New jobs would be created, and beverage prices would likely go down; I need not remind you of the importance of these objectives in this time of inflation and recession.

The best information I have been able to compile supports my contention that all these benefits would be attained. I must admit, however, that there is much conflicting information on the subject of nonreturnable containers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is vitally important that congressional hearings be held on this matter, to sort out the facts. Unless we have a hearing, bad and conflicting information will continue to circulate, and legislation which potentially could bring about great benefits to this Nation may die.

I feel it is highly appropriate that the five sponsors of this bill are from the States of Oregon, South Dakota, and Vermont. These are the three States which already have container deposit laws. Our States have encountered some difficulties in attempting to go it alone. In Vermont, for example, some of our merchants near the State border have lost business to their counterparts in neighboring States. And, because of the small scale of our efforts, the great savings of energy and other resources which would be prompted by a Federal law have not been realized by our individual States.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we, as representatives of those three States, have been convinced of the desirability, and indeed the necessity of this legislation. We and our constituents are proud of the container deposit laws our States have enacted. We know we have chosen the right path, despite the difficulty of pursuing it alone. Rather than giving up, the legislatures of both Oregon and Vermont are now struggling with methods of improving and strengthening their deposit laws.

Mr. Speaker, legislation similar to this has been discussed before in this Chamber, and in many other jurisdictions throughout the Nation. It is my strong belief that with adequate hearings and thorough consideration, this Congress will follow the example set by the States of Oregon, South Dakota, and my home State of Vermont. Deposit legislation at the Federal level is an idea whose time has come.

RAILROAD AID IGNORES BASIC PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time since 1970 we have been presented with a request for emergency funds from Penn Central, and each time the request increases. After spending \$82 million of the \$85 million appropriated in 1973, their request is now \$197 million in additional grants alone, not to mention \$150 million extra for loans. The basic problem with these additional requests is that they fail to strike at the heart of the problem; they merely carry Penn Central over into the next crisis. By granting these funds, Congress fails to provide an incentive to get a real solution. Indeed, we are discouraging a solution because we foster a mentality within the industry that the Government will pay all the bills. The denial of a 7-percent rate increase for Penn Central by the ICC is a good indication of that mentality. That rate hike should be put into effect immediately so that Penn Central users pay a portion of their increased costs themselves, not the taxpayers alone.

I believe that Penn Central should not be allowed to cease operation. The effect of such a shutdown would be injurious to an already-shaken economy. Such an action would be unfair to the industries which depend on rail transportation.

However, it is apparent that Penn Central has grown increasingly dependent upon the Government for assistance. This dependence has stifled innovation and encouraged a "crisis" mentality. Such emergency funds fail to attack the basic problems which confront these railroads.

Actually, the poor financial condition of Penn Central is impairing the future of ability of ConRail, the new Government-backed corporation, to survive.

It appears that Penn Central will be forced to use the loans provided in this authorization for operating expenses instead of improvements in their facilities for ConRail's use. Therefore, ConRail will be starting out behind schedule and without much-needed renovations of track and station facilities. Additional Federal funds will be sought as the answer, and the Government will continue to pour money into a deteriorating railroad system. There is no assurance that Penn Central will not be back in October asking for more funds. It appears to be a bottomless pit.

While I have every hope that ConRail will be successful in reorganizing the rail system in the Northeast, it is my belief that it begins with a number of deficiencies carried over from Penn Central, including the same management. ConRail will also have no opportunity to cut costs because of an agreement that provides for payment of full salary until age 65 to all workers with 5 years of experience if they are laid off. Because of these factors and the debt they will assume for loans to maintain and im-

prove the facilities of the bankrupt line, I believe that other viable alternatives should be examined.

One alternative is the sale of lines to profitable railroads which wish to expand their services. There has been considerable interest by such companies as Southern Railway, the Santa Fe, and Norfolk and Western in major portions of Penn Central lines. This alternative would maintain service on these lines and join them to profitable, well-run organizations.

Towards this goal, I have written a letter to the U.S.R.A. requesting that they allow the Southern to acquire Penn Central's line between Cincinnati and Indianapolis. Such a sale would save the use of taxpayer funds to rehabilitate and operate the line. I believe that such acquisitions will be both more economical and efficient in providing and maintaining service and in decreasing the level of Federal subsidies to ConRail.

GRAVE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN ECONOMY

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress are deeply concerned with the way in which the present administration is approaching the grave problems in relation to our economy. Without doubt, a well-defined sense of leadership must be demonstrated by the President in dealing with the economy. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article that was written on this subject by Mr. Art Sugarman, editor of the Republican Watchman News from Monticello, N.Y., which is a town in my district.

THE WATCHMAN ON HIS ROUNDS

(By Art Sugarman)

For one American, I'm fed up with every elected, appointed or anointed expert getting on the boob tube and telling me I have to give up my grand lifestyle; that the world that I knew up until an oil boycott a year ago has come to an end. There isn't a leader in sight who says to me, "Art, pull in your belt for a while and tough it out. Then things will be better than ever." Nope, they only go around wringing their hands and proposing retrogressive steps.

For instance, if our unelected President wanted to be a leader, he might have got up in front of the nation this week and said: "Fellow Americans, we cannot any longer allow the assets of our nation which took us 200 years to hack out and build to the richest best-living enclave in the history of this globe, leave us in a flood tide of excessively priced fossil fuel. We don't want this country owned and controlled lock, stock and barrel by some people wearing bedsheets. Even if they're not the Ku Klux Klan."

The Stars and Stripes would run up and down our spine if Jerry Ford said further: "Americans, our Yankee ingenuity for solving our problem calls for leadership. From this moment on, every imported barrel of oil will be taxed \$3.00. From this moment on, we're gonna take that revenue and start building government owned and operated nuclear power plants. We'll sell the power at cost to our utilities to pass along to you. And

we'll stop using oil to burn our lights, turn our factories and heat our homes. In a couple of years, let the Arabs boil in their own oil, because Americans will be independent from the Barbary Pirates."

Instead, of course, President Ford proposes cutting income taxes and taking that pocket-money right back, plus more, in added fuel prices. The underlying illness remains while we're being Flim-Flammed by a sugar-coated aspirin dispenser in Washington.

Or my leader might have said: "I learned in the last World War that a convoy sails at the speed of the slowest ship. But this point of time calls for a new formula. We are a nation of energetic, resourceful and vibrant people who, shown the direction we want, will forge our way. We've done it to the Moon and to the Planets. We'll get out of this bind. Everybody who wants part of this action, take one step forward."

He could have continued: "I know that there are some low-income, elderly and even some underprivileged young who cannot survive our present crisis of inflation-recession. The rest of us will take care of them, better than ever. If they cannot join the Crusade to rebuild America's pride and leadership, the rest of us will do it for them. We will not desert our less fortunate comrades." And boost welfare, Social Security, etc., to an adequate level!

Maybe our experts ought concentrate on the positive, too. We worry about polluting the air, despoiling the sea and about the huge list of endangered animals. Hell, can't you see the important point is you and me are on top of the Endangered Species list?

It bugs me to hear the other day the Torch of Freedom on the Statue of Liberty was darkened a few hours by an electrical failure . . . It bugs me to hear Russia now has in place massive missiles that dwarf ours, outfitted with MIRV warheads—multi-targetted missiles. And in the same news-cast hear that the next round of SALT talks are now scheduled to talk about arms limitations. Seems like the Russians stole a march on us.

It bugs me to hear our Secretary of State Henry Kissinger being condemned for being "warlike" in truthfully answering an interviewer that America might consider using military intervention to save us, under extreme circumstances, from economic strangulations. What do we have one of the world's strongest, most expensive and extensive muscles for? To lose our way of life?

It took a Canadian disk jockey to compile a list of how great America has been. And put to song, it was a hit record in America. I know that it's no longer good taste to wave the American flag. And, brother, that bugs me the most!

If you agree, don't send a letter to the editor. Maybe send this, or your own thoughts, to Jerry Ford, or your Senator, Representative or Governor. Maybe you can bug them.

FOOD STAMPS AND GAS RATIONING

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing about the problems with the Federal food stamp program and the many abuses that are occurring. Columnist John Lofton, Jr., has made an excellent commentary on this subject and I think my colleagues should have it brought to their attention.

Also, Mr. Lofton, in a separate article, discusses Melvin Laird's proposals for

strict gasoline rationing. His comments on this matter are quite timely. The two columns follow:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Jan. 16, 1975]

UNCLE SAM DOESN'T EVEN KNOW WHO IS GETTING FOOD STAMPS

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

In all the howls of outrage that have greeted President Ford's rather modest proposal to save \$325 million this year by slightly increasing the cost of food stamps, the truly outrageous thing about this program has been totally ignored.

And that is, every year the American taxpayer is ripped off to the tune of several hundred million dollars in food stamps by people who are not needy and, despite the fact that this is known, the Department of Agriculture has taken no steps to find out exactly who and how many people are doing the ripping off.

Typical of those who have denounced the President for proposing that the average food stamp recipients spend an extra 8 percent of their monthly income on stamps, is Sen. Hubert Humphrey.

The Minnesota Democrat says Ford's plan "makes the entire food stamp program a cruel hoax." But there is evidence that much of the program could already be characterized as a hoax.

In an interview with Royal Shipp, director of the Department of Agriculture's Food Stamp Division, I was astounded to learn that it is not known precisely who is getting food stamps.

"You do not know exactly who is getting food stamps?" I asked incredulously. "That's right, we don't," Shipp replied, explaining that the states administer the \$4-billion-a-year program to 15 million people. He said one of the concerns of the federal government is not to impose "onerous" requirements on state welfare agencies.

"An audit is onerous?" I ask, again incredulously. No, No, he responded. They have that kind of information. "But not on a national basis. We do not know the characteristics of those getting stamps. That would be a difficult thing to require," he maintains, although he says it could be done administratively without congressional action.

"A national survey would be costly. We just haven't done it here. We just haven't felt this was required."

When I asked Shipp what percentage of those getting food stamps are not really needy, he says there are no national figures on this. When I press him, he says that he suspects the figure is comparable to the Aid for Families with Dependent Children welfare program. This means an ineligibility rate of about 10 per cent, which would amount to about \$400 million a year in food stamps going to nonneedy people.

Isn't it appalling that the federal government is doling out so much of the taxpayer's money for food stamps, yet there is no precise accounting of where it's going, I ask? Shouldn't we have some idea in round figures, like say to the nearest hundred million bucks?

Shipp laughs nervously, sighs, and says he thinks I'm being "a little unfair" since "these are not easy questions to deal with."

He says this is something they're working very hard to correct and in a few months there will be some data published on the subject. He explains it's just not something "we've dealt with yet."

Not dealt with yet! How long has the food stamp program been in existence? I ask. Over 10 years, he says. To my way of thinking some sort of quality control should have been in the program from the beginning, I suggest.

"Well, okay, that's one thing you can say," he says, "but in fact it just came in

1972, when there was concern over the rapid growth of the program."

The Federal food stamp program has become a fiscal monstrosity and a budgetary nightmare. When President Kennedy launched the program as an experiment in 1961, it cost \$860,000 and involved fewer than 50,000 people in six test areas.

Now, Rep. Martha Griffiths, D-Mich., whose joint economic subcommittee has investigated the program, says the cost could hit \$10 billion a year in two or three years, and 60 million people could become eligible for food stamps.

Sen. Humphrey and others in the Congress who have criticized President Ford's food stamp proposal say they are concerned about food being taken from the mouths of the poor and the elderly.

If they really mean this, they should stop running their mouths and do something to find out who the nonneedy are that are getting the hundreds of millions of dollars annually in food stamps. Then they should put a stop to it.

If they do this, Humphrey and his friends would be performing a real service to both the poor and the needy, and those of us who may soon find ourselves in this category if something is not done soon about out-of-control, government-give-away boondoggles like the food stamp program.

[From the Nashville Banner, Jan. 6, 1974]

SO MEL LAIRD URGES GAS RATIONING

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Opening this month's *Reader's Digest* and seeing an article by Melvin Laird calling for mandatory, federal gas rationing, I felt the same sort of shock I would feel if I turned on the TV and saw a commercial urging me to buy an Edsel. Both are ideas whose time I thought had long since passed.

In his shoddily written, poorly thought out and internally inconsistent piece, the *Digest's* counselor for national and international affairs says rationing is needed despite the fact that it is "completely unattractive," entails "a further surrender of our personal freedom to bureaucracy" and is "inefficient and can never be entirely fair."

The problem, as Laird sees it, is that because our wasteful habits are so ingrained, it is unrealistic to expect Americans to voluntarily cut down on fuel consumption. The former secretary of defense believes only rationing can provide such guarantees. Therefore, he favors giving the President the power to slash oil imports by 50 per cent and the power to enforce savings that will guarantee enough oil for essential national purposes.

Mr. Laird says it is his recollection that gas rationing "did work" in World War II—because the American people understood the crisis and patriotically made it succeed.

Declaring "it's time to end the rhetoric," Laird indulges in some of his own stating his belief that "we have the strength of character and will to temper our consumption until we achieve self-sufficiency in energy."

Now, there are so many things to be said in rebuttal to the advocacy of gas rationing that one hardly knows where to begin. First, there's Laird's rhetoric. He couldn't possibly believe in the strength of character and will of the American people to limit gas usage or he wouldn't be calling for federal laws forcing people to do this. This sort of double-talk is reminiscent of Rep. Edward Hebert's remark that the only way to get a voluntary army is to draft it.

Secondly, Laird seems to be suffering from selective amnesia as regards the workability of World War II rationing. A 1947 Office of Price Administration (OPA) study reveals a record of bureaucratic bungling, dishonesty and organized crime activity.

The OPA needed between 5,000 and 6,000 investigators just to control the black market and during the first six months of 1946, 50,000 violations of the rationing rules were discovered. The report says that because of the "unevenness of compliance and enforcement" the good will of the public was eroded.

It is important to keep in mind here that the aforementioned mess occurred when there were only 23 million cars in the United States and there was a heightened sense of cooperation created by the patriotic fervor caused by a wartime situation.

Now, however, there are 100 million autos and a sizeable portion of the American people don't even believe there is an energy crisis. In addition, all public opinion polls show a majority of Americans opposing mandatory gas rationing.

Melvin Laird is also wrong when he says rationing is the only way to guarantee the limitation of fuel consumption. Another way is to let the free market determine the price and the allocation.

A compelling case for this course of action is made by Dr. Edward Mitchell, director of the American Enterprise Institute's National Energy Project, a project chaired, ironically, by one Melvin Laird.

Dr. Edwards, a professor of economics at the University of Michigan, believes fuel conservation can be achieved far more efficiently and equitably by using the price system and the market.

"One negative thing you'll get from rationing," he points out, "is the same thing as early last year when the federal government was allocating crude oil, and that is allocation on largely a political basis—who comes down to Washington and does the most effective lobbying. This is the same way gas would end up being allocated."

Dr. Edwards also cringes at the thought of once again allowing a government bureaucracy to make choices for individual motorists. Noting that the government's crude oil allocation program last year was itself a rationing program, Edwards says that the data we now have shows that "during the Arab oil embargo we had a hell of a lot less oil available in some areas of the country mainly because of the government-run allocation system."

It is Edwards' guess that "almost half" of the gas problems during the embargo was due to the Federal Energy Office, not the Arabs. "They should share the blame about equally," he says.

In another *Reader's Digest* article, in June of 1974, Melvin Laird defended the use of the Presidential veto as "the sole Constitutional power a President has to prevent hasty or ill-considered laws."

Indeed it is. And this is exactly the power President Ford should use if the Congress is foolish enough to send him any gas rationing.

THE DAIRY FARMERS' COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce a bill which provides for increasing the support price of manufacturing milk to not less than 90 percent of the parity price of milk, to become effective upon enactment of the bill and to remain in effect through March 1, 1977. In addition, this bill provides for quarterly adjustments of

the support price to reflect any change in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items.

This legislation is currently of the utmost importance because the dairy industry during the past 2 years has experienced a devastating cost-price squeeze. The milk-feed ratio—the number of pounds of concentrate feed ration equal in value to 1 pound of whole milk—has gone from a 5-year average prior to 1973 of 1.7 to a low 1.1 in August 1974.

This devastating cost-price squeeze is not only threatening the viability of dairy farmers, it is endangering the future of this Nation's milk supply. Major reductions of dairy herds and cow numbers have already occurred. This has resulted in reduced milk production—down about 1 percent from 1973.

Recent reports from farmers with respect to specific prices they have been paying for some of their production items involved in dairying are alarming. For example, from September 1972, 1 ton of 16 percent feed increased by 111 percent—from \$71.80 to \$134.25. Alfalfa seed increased from \$76 per hundredweight to \$181, an increase of 138 percent. Ammonia nitrate increased from \$59 per ton to \$199, a 222-percent increase. Phosphate has increased by 146 percent; potash by 81 percent; gasoline by 49 percent; fuel oil by 87 percent; antifreeze by 300 percent; bailing wire by 102 percent; wire fencing by 90 percent; wood posts by 238 percent; and baler twine by 282 percent. Nearly all costs have increased, and there is little likelihood that any production item prices will decline in the near future.

In spite of this continuous increase in prices paid by farmers for production items, the average price of milk at the farm as of January 15, 1975, was about 6.8 percent below the January 1974 average price.

Farmers cannot be expected to continue to produce at a loss. Unless some remedial action is taken soon, the Nation's milk supply will be threatened. We can import powdered milk and cheese, but there is no practical way to import fresh milk in quantities needed in the United States at any price.

The current level of imports of dairy products has been a major price depressing factor at the farm level, while affording no benefits to consumers. It should also be noted that many of these products have moved into the United States under subsidies of foreign governments resulting in unfair competition for the farmers of America.

Dairy imports for the period January-September 1974, totaled 2.3 billion pounds milk equivalent, up from 1.3 billion pounds a year earlier. Almost all of this increase occurred during the first quarter of the year, when an increase in the import quota for cheddar cheese was authorized. Since then, imports have slackened to a more normal rate, but are still above year earlier levels.

Mr. Speaker, few if any farm commodities are more widely used and more widely produced than milk. Virtually every family in the United States is a consumer of milk and our current milk supply is produced on more than 260,000

commercial dairy farms throughout the Nation. For many years cash receipts from the sale of dairy products have been the second largest source of farm cash receipts, second only to the sale of meat animals. However, in 1973, dairy products ranked third among all other agricultural products in the value of farm cash receipts, exceeded only by meat animals and soybeans. In 1973, farm cash receipts from the sale of dairy products totaled \$8.1 billion, and accounted for more than 9 percent of the total value of all farm products sold. These data clearly indicate the importance of the dairy industry to the farm economy and to the economy of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy, viable dairy industry is essential to this Nation's general welfare. This legislation is necessary to assure continuous and adequate production of milk and to provide reasonable returns to producers. It is also critical that immediate action be taken. Once our dairy herds are liquidated, it will be years before full production can again be restored.

COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—AGAIN

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps less difficult to be courageous and expressive in a society which encourages its people to vocalize and indicate the extent to which they cherish freedom and liberty.

Although even in a free society, its people must be always alert and watchful in safeguarding those freedoms, it takes a very special sense of courage to continue the struggle for human and religious freedom when none exists.

And, so it is with the people of Lithuania, whose independence as a nation became nonexistent 22 years ago in 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and absorbed the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

On February 16, Americans of Lithuanian descent once again commemorated the anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, 57 years ago on February 16, 1918. Each year, the entire American Nation joins with them on this occasion, to indicate to the people of Lithuania that they are not forgotten nor invisible.

America has not been silent throughout these 22 years, since Soviet occupation of Lithuania. The United States has consistently maintained its policy of nonrecognition of the Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. And, through a proper sense of recognition, we have reaffirmed our awareness of their struggle and of our commitment to them.

We have witnessed several visible examples of the courage and determination of the Lithuanians and have caught a glimpse of the frightening nature of their struggle. There is the well-publicized

defection of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, who leaped aboard an American Coast Guard vessel in 1970.

The petition of thousands of Lithuanian Catholics to the Secretary General of the United Nations. And, the imprisonment of countless Russian and Lithuanian dissidents seeking religious freedom. It is incredible to think that these things are taking place in 1975, in modern times, before the eyes of the world.

Can there be a more fitting or proper course for the conduct of American-Soviet détente than to focus our efforts and attention on the plight of the Lithuanian people?

Also, with so much attention being given to the questionable accomplishments and the future of the United Nations, it would seem to me that the U.S. Congress and the President should actively pursue the focusing of world attention on the situation in Lithuania, through the global body. Such would be an earnest test of its effectiveness and a meaningful challenge to its commitment, as outlined in the U.N. Charter. I cannot imagine a more appropriate question before the United Nations than that of the status of the Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, the undaunted spirit and the determination of the people of Lithuania have somehow filtered through the iron wall of Soviet domination. By commemorating the occasion of their former independence as a nation, hopefully, the support and encouragement of the American people will permeate that iron wall and will clearly indicate to the Lithuanian people that they are being seen and heard, clearly and loudly, by a nation which remembers.

OFFICE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES DIRECTOR'S SPEECH

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am entering in the RECORD an excerpt from a speech by Mr. Glenn Schweitzer, Director of the Office of Toxic Substances within the Environmental Protection Agency. This January 29 speech given before the Synthetic, Organic, and Chemical Manufacturers Association succinctly lists the areas of major concern in drafting toxic substances legislation. He has correctly stated that the Congress will begin work soon on a toxic substances bill. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance, I intend to introduce such a bill.

The excerpt is as follows:

THE NEED FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES LEGISLATION

Beginning in 1971, the Administration and Congress have attempted to gain enactment of the Toxic Substances Control Act, and it seems almost certain that these efforts will be revived within this Congress. This legislation has often been described as "front-end" legislation designed to prevent problems rather than simply providing a reaction after

chemical contaminants have caused severe environmental or health damage. Also, preventive action early in the life of a chemical could minimize the economic disruptions attendant to corrective actions. Another welcome aspect of this legislation is its explicit call for a more deliberate balancing of risks and benefits prior to Governmental regulatory intervention in commercial activities. Finally, the legislation provides the basis for assessment of the entire life cycle of problem chemicals in determining how best to ameliorate the problems. Too often under existing legislative authority, we focus on the manifestation of the problem which is regulatable under existing authorities rather than on those aspects that are at the root of the problem.

The proposed legislation would give EPA new authority for (a) information acquisition on commercial chemicals, and (b) regulatory actions on chemicals not now subject to regulation under other authorities. EPA could require testing of chemicals which are suspected to pose unreasonable risks and also require other information from manufacturers including the name of the substance, chemical formula, amounts produced, uses, and known by-products. Confidential information would, of course, be respected. When shown to be necessary, and only then, EPA could restrict the use and distribution of chemicals that pose unreasonable risks.

While the final version of the legislation may influence the choice of the initial EPA activities in carrying out the provisions of the law, it seems clear that the following areas should be high on the agenda for early attention:

Elaboration and articulation of the criteria or sets of criteria to be used in weighing risks versus benefits, and in determining when regulatory action is needed. Clear understanding by both industry and Government of the ground rules for restrictions seems essential.

Determination of the character and scope of initial testing requirement and identification of specific chemicals or classes of chemicals of particular immediate concern. While the selection of substances to be covered by the standards for test protocols that are initially promulgated will in large measure reflect near-term judgments of experts concerning likely hazards and inadequacy of current data, concurrent work is needed to provide a better basis over the longer term for selecting areas of concern.

Development of regulations setting forth timing, coverage, content, and format of the reporting requirements for chemical manufacturers and processors, including both annual reporting and premarket notification.

Establishment of a data system for handling the industrial reports and test results that are submitted. Experience in the pesticide area, for example, underscores the importance of early attention to establishing efficient and decision oriented procedures if large numbers of reports are to be useful in assessing problems in a systematic fashion.

While we are uncertain as to the precise course of Congressional action concerning this legislation, we anticipate that toxic substances bills will be reintroduced in both the House and the Senate within the next few weeks. I suspect that they will be generally along the lines of the Conference Committee Working Print which was prepared in December in an effort to bring closer together differing Senate and House positions in several key areas. However, additional modifications will undoubtedly be incorporated by each chamber. Presumably another round of hearings will be held during the spring, and it will not be surprising if the legislation is again referred to a Conference Committee by summer.

Our understanding is that both environmental and labor groups will be pressing vigorously for early enactment of legislation. These groups have definite views as to some of the provisions of such legislation. With regard to industry you are in a better position than am I to predict the position that will be taken by different segments of industry.

While the Administration has been clearly on record as strongly supporting this type of legislation in the past, the current position on the legislation is still being formulated.

DEFICIT SPENDING AND CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ronald Reagan has once again articulated the positions of commonsense political thinking in two recent columns concerning deficit spending and the proposed Consumer Protection Agency. I must emphasize that those of us who believe in the principles of personal and economic freedom are fortunate to have Governor Reagan as a spokesman since he is one of the few prominent men on the national scene with an understanding of the free market, limited government, profit-and-loss system in which we should be striving to protect. What American citizens need today is freedom from what? Freedom from too much Government of course.

Three cheers for Ronald Reagan and his insight.

The articles follow:

"PUMP PRIMING" BOUND TO FUEL INFLATION (By Ronald Reagan)

It is clear from the President's State of the Union message and his tax proposals that preceded it that he has decided not to tackle head-on the powerful groups that have a vested interest in Big Government and deficit spending.

While his tax cut proposals will—at first—be welcome news to many Americans, and may provide a genuine psychological lift to public opinion regarding the economy, I fear there will be a heavy price to pay some months later when the resulting federal deficits steal those tax cuts back through renewed inflation.

Though he did call on Congress to put a moratorium on all new spending programs (except for domestic energy production), he did not insist upon cuts in the existing and proposed federal budgets. This amounts to a sharp retreat from his pledge of last August for a balanced budget by 1976.

In fact, the result of the newly proposed program will be a deficit of some \$30 billion this fiscal year and \$45 billion in 1975-76. Given the past track record of federal forecasting, the final figures could end up much higher.

It has taken the experience of the average American family in a few recent months to prove that the Keynesian theory that inflation-begets-prosperity is bankrupt. Today it begs recession.

Unaccompanied by federal spending cuts, the President's tax proposals rest on the assumption that you and your neighbors will use the money to go out and buy refriger-

ators, automobiles and other products. If everyone does, production and employment go up, at least temporarily.

Certainly, putting money into the pockets of those who earned it cannot be faulted. But there is no certainty that, after the frightening inflation of the last few months, people will want to do anything other than hide it under a mattress or in a safe deposit box.

In 1972, the economy was sluggish. The Administration's response was to persuade the Federal Reserve Board to loosen the money supply and thus credit. That produced what looked like instant prosperity, but its real result more than a year later was greatly aggravated inflation. Memories are short.

It was this inflation that brought on today's recession. "Pump priming," in the form of tax cuts without spending cuts, will only bring on steeper inflation a few months from now.

A major cause of inflation is the government spending more money than it takes in. Already, we, the taxpayers, are paying more than \$30 billion a year in interest on the national debt. To the extent that it pays interest, the government has less to spend on defense and domestic programs.

Bankrupt though it is (and a private business in similar condition would be so declared), the federal government will keep on running by going into competition with businesses and individuals for the limited amount of capital available in order to pay its bills.

Ultimately you, the consumer, will pay for it in the increased prices you'll pay. That's inflation.

Two basic remedies to this problem were missing from the President's message. First, he should ask Congress to curb the spending appetite of the programs of vested interests, such as those of the educationists, hospital builders (we have a surplus of beds), city and state grants, foundation grants and subsidies to various businesses and industries. It is time to gore some sacred oxen.

Second, he should insist that we "index" individual income tax rates by tying them to the cost-of-living index so when you receive a pay raise (to cope with inflation) you aren't robbed of it automatically by being thrown into a higher tax bracket as a result.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY ACT KEEPS POPPING UP

(By Ronald Reagan)

When you were young, did you ever have the experience of trying to carry a basket of kittens? One would pop its head up and try to crawl over the side of the basket, and while you were pushing him back down another would pop up on the other side of the basket. Soon, there were more heads than you had hands.

Proposed government programs can be like that. Legislation is introduced in Congress by those who think all answers must come from government. When the worst of it is defeated, we have a tendency to relax and think, "Well, that's that."

Just like those kittens' heads, though, the bills keep popping up until they're passed.

Take the so-called Consumer Protection Agency Act. Had it passed last year, it would have resulted in the creation of a big, new federal bureau, with the power to supersede all other government agencies, plus the power to take records and trade secrets from businesses large and small and make them public.

The bill drew strong opposition on Capitol Hill from those who fear Big Brother government and who resent the self-styled "consumerists" promoting the notion that people are too dumb to buy a box of corn flakes without being cheated, but are smart enough to choose protectors in government to run their lives for them. The professional con-

sumerists are, in reality, elitists who think they know better than you do what's good for you.

They fought hard for this bill, accusing opponents of being against any kind of consumer protection, which, of course wasn't true.

The bill's opponents decided to filibuster it. The filibuster is a parliamentary tradition in the U.S. Senate. It's the process of taking and holding the floor for debate until you've talked a bill to death.

Traditionally, those on the other side may try three times to vote for "cloture"—that is, to cut off debate and end the filibuster. But in the case of the Consumer Protection Agency Act, cloture had to be beaten back not three, but four times.

Don't start a celebration, though. Like the basket of kittens, this one will pop up again soon, maybe under a new title, or even as an amendment to some necessary piece of legislation that everyone supports.

It's a shame Congress will have to go round and round again over this nonsense—and the bill was nonsense. Worse, it was as big a threat to our free economy as anything that's been proposed.

Congress has the authority to change policies governing the practices of federal departments and agencies which have responsibility for protecting consumers. If there are shortcomings in those agencies, Congress can correct them. To create a competing, overlapping new agency instead is just plain irresponsible.

Take an analogy: If you owned a store and found that one of its departments was below par, you would consider changing management policy, personnel or prices, but you certainly wouldn't try to solve the problem by opening a store across the street to compete with yourself.

Yet that's what the promoters of the Consumer Protection Agency would have Congress do.

You should keep pen and paper handy to write your congressman, because it will soon be time again to push the kittens back in the basket.

TWO HUNDRED MILE FISHING ZONE

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution disapproving of the President's proposal to defer spending under the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 and the Anadromous Fish Act of 1965. These acts are the cornerstone of State-Federal cooperation in the field of fisheries management, cooperation which will become increasingly important as the proposed 200-mile fisheries zone comes closer to reality.

Whether we obtain a 200-mile fisheries zone by unilateral declaration, as passed by the Senate last December, or by successful negotiation of the U.S. position at future Law of the Sea conferences, the agencies of the United States will have increased responsibilities for the management of the Nation's fisheries resources beyond the zone of State control. We cannot expect a 200-mile limit to be effective or beneficial unless the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Coast

Guard have the benefit of competent research in the numbers and characteristics of the fisheries in the Federal zone. I submit Congress was wise in 1964 and 1965 when it chose to utilize the State's years of experience in managing fisheries to produce the research that ultimately the Federal Government will need.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for cutting the Federal budget and have consistently supported responsible reductions of that budget. But I cannot support the reduction of outlays for State research in this vital area, by what amounts to 20 percent of proposed expenditures for the second half of this fiscal year, until the President and NOAA demonstrate to Congress that Federal employees can do this needed research at less expense than the States.

I am placing in the RECORD at this point a letter dated January 28, 1975, which I received from Irwin M. Alperin, executive director of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, regarding this \$600,000 proposed deferral. Mr. Alperin echoes the sentiments expressed at last week's meeting of the State Fish and Wildlife directors here in Washington by Joe Colson of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and John Harville of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and fisheries commission directors from almost every State.

The letter follows:

ATLANTIC STATES MARINE
FISHERIES COMMISSION,

Washington, D.C., January 28, 1975.

HON. DAVID C. TREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TREEN: In his November 26 Special Message to the Congress on Budget Recissions and Deferrals, the President proposed two actions which are extremely damaging to the best interests of the fisheries of this nation and to the efforts of our coastal States to effectively conserve and support those fisheries. On behalf of the 15 Atlantic Coast States comprising the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, I respectfully request your active support for a Congressional override of the President's proposal to defer \$600,000 in federal grant-in-aid funds, and to rescind \$500,000 earmarked for implementation of the Eastland Resolution (S. Con. Res. 11).

The President's recommendation to defer expenditure of \$600,000 in federal grant-in-aid funding for fisheries conservation, research, and management in our States¹ seriously threatens the continuity and viability of long-term projects which have been Congressionally mandated under the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act and the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act. While the cuts proposed appear to be only at the 10-11% level (\$600,000 out of \$5.8 million), they have a real impact in excess of 20%, since they would be imposed after the fiscal year is half complete, and therefore would necessarily be absorbed entirely in the six months remaining. For our Atlantic Coast States, these drastic cuts in long-term projects will require such drastic and irreversible acts as cutting personnel, terminating ongoing research and development projects, or other major curtailments in fisheries conservation and management programs.

¹ Federal Register 39 (235) Dec. 5, 1974: 42626

HARBINGER OF SPRING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent heavy snowfall in my district in Queens, N.Y., has turned to slush, and winter is still very much in the air, but the first breath of spring is blowing up from the South.

In only 2 more days, the denizens of one of the most famous landmarks in my district, Shea Stadium, and the other boys of summer begin reporting to their respective training camps as the 1975 baseball season opens.

Both of New York's baseball teams, the National League Mets and the American League Yankees, are calling Shea Stadium home this season. I am proud to point out that Queens County and the Eighth Congressional District are indeed big league.

I am today inserting in the RECORD a story of the joys of spring training. It is written by Ed Hurley, a distinguished native of my home county of Queens, and it appeared in the February 2, 1975, New York Sunday News.

It was Ed Hurley's book "The Last Poor Man," that helped highlight the need for campaign expenditure reform. In early 1972, Mr. Hurley called national attention to the series of events that finally caused the downfall of the Nixon administration.

Today, however, I am inserting a story of a much lighter vein:

HOW TO BE SAFE AT HOME AND STILL BE OUT
ON VACATION

(By Ed Hurley)

A vacation trip to a big-league baseball spring-training camp is likely to rejuvenate the boy in any man. Regular-season baseball remains, dollar for dollar, one of the nation's few remaining inexpensive entertainment values. A spring-training trip can be even more a rewarding experience.

Attendance at exhibition games at the 17 Florida training sites have increased in recent years as dollar-conscious vacationers rediscovered that baseball and sunshine still go hand-in-hand.

Many snowbound, bored-with-winter easterners, especially those with school-age sons, plan a week or so in Florida to coincide with the mid-year recess and the grapefruit league's exhibition schedule.

SEE 'EM UP CLOSE

What an opportunity to view the season's budding prospects and famous veterans close up. The ballparks are small, the seats close to the playing field—and the prices are right.

The Mets, for example, playing at St. Petersburg, long a haven for retired New Yorkers, charge from 75 cents to \$2.50. Most clubs' admissions are in this range.

The exhibition season opens March 7 but the players begin reporting to their respective camps Feb. 21. Fans are more than welcome to view pre-exhibition workouts free of charge.

Manager Bill Virdon and his Yankees will again be in Fort Lauderdale on the ocean side of the Sunshine State. Their prices for the exhibition season have been raised this spring to a \$4 top. They still have 3,000 bleacher seats available at \$1.

Perhaps the multimillion-dollar contract awarded free agent Jim (Catfish) Hunter dented the fabled Yankee bankroll?

HUNTER THE BIG GUN

Hunter figures to be baseball's biggest training-camp attraction. The Yankees and the Fort Lauderdale town fathers are anticipating increased tourist trade. The Yanks, running second to the Mets in Shea Stadium attendance, would love to top the Mets' spring-training gate total.

Yankee spokesman Marty Appel says it is much more than an intra-city attendance rivalry. Florida towns playing host to big-league franchises depend to varying degrees on the teams for public tax dollars and a considerable amount of private industry revenue.

Matt Winick of the Mets' public relations office points out that his club brings about 300 people (players, coaches, team brass, etc.) to St. Pete during February and March. This means additional housing, meals, recreation and tax money for the area. The club maintains two ballparks. Payson Field is employed for pre-exhibition season drills (no admission charged) and Al Lang Field is shared for home games with the St. Louis Cardinals.

It is the fans' almost active participation that makes modern-day spring training such a delightful experience for the vacationing sports buff. What adult American male, at some brief stage of youth, didn't dream of wearing a major league uniform? What dad doesn't see his son wearing the same suit?

In either Florida or the southwest desert where seven other major league teams train, the players are truly within reach. At Vero Beach, where the Los Angeles Dodgers train, the players and spectators actually walk together over a little wooden bridge from the field to the parking lots after games.

COME ON BY, FOLKS

Charlie Blaney, director of Dodgertown, the official name of the club's huge spring-training plant, also welcomes the public to his base. The Dodgers have been training at Vero Beach since their gloried days in Brooklyn. Many holidaying New Yorkers—especially those over 40—make a Vero Beach game an annual must on their Florida schedules.

A father and his heirs may stroll around the grandstand barriers watching superstar Johnny Bench prep at Tampa for another campaign for the Cincinnati Reds or motor over to Lakeland and listen to manager Ralph Houk install that "Yankee Spirit" into his aging Detroit Tigers.

It isn't reasonable, of course, to hound players battling for those coveted roster spots. In most instances, players do react kindly to fan attention. Professional athletes generally realize it is the fan dollar that produces their six-figure incomes and national fame.

STAY WITH THE PLAYERS

It is also possible to register at—or visit—the public motels used by the ball clubs during their six-week stay. Some of the established stars like the Mets' Tom Seaver, Wayne Garrett and Jerry Grote prefer to rent apartments for their families. All the players are quite visible during the training grind.

Whether it be the Montreal Expos' base in Daytona Beach or the Chicago White Sox at Sarasota (once the Boston Red Sox camp), the thrill remains the same. There they are—real, live major leaguers.

You can watch them in pepper games, actually hear them chatter, joke, laugh and battle for those precious 25 regular season jobs. Of course, if this isn't all that thrilling to you, the weather is almost always a winner.

And if you can't recall your own younger days of yearning for a major league tryout, that boy in the family will remember a day or two with 1975 ball players all season back home.

CANCER OF POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the public concern about cancer has been reflected in the Federal commitment for cancer research, and in numerous other efforts in cancer detection, prevention and cure. There has been similar concern demonstrated over pollution and its effects on the environment, as well as the health of people.

What has received too little attention is the relationship between pollution and cancer. Because of our failure to adequately research this question, it was unknown until recently that many cancers are caused by the pollution that is spewed from our modern, industrial processes. The cure for cancer may be the effective control of pollutants.

Mr. Speaker, it is inappropriate for me to elaborate further on this issue at this time. It is only beginning to be thoroughly investigated, and it is better for the issue to be explored before the appropriate committees. I expect to hold hearings on this subject before the Subcommittee on Environment and the Atmosphere of the Committee on Science and Technology. My intent today is to alert my colleagues to this important issue, and ask that you consider the ramifications of any policy which might allow such deadly pollution to continue to be released.

I would like to insert a brief article from the February 16 Washington Post which describes the preliminary findings of our best scientists.

The article follows:

CANCER POLLUTION LINK IS SEEN

(By Peter J. Bernstein)

Painstaking detective work by medical researchers is producing mounting evidence that environmental impurities in man's habitat are the primary cause of most cancer.

Based on recent findings at a number of laboratories across the country, researchers at the National Cancer Institute estimate that 60 to 90 per cent of all human cancers are caused by environmental factors—from ultraviolet rays to plastics and pesticides.

The results show that while researchers have made some progress in developing a cure for certain forms of cancer, the most promising advances have been in prevention and early detection.

Using computers to analyze mortality data, NCI researchers have pinpointed cancer "hotspots" in industrial areas of the northeast from Boston to Washington and certain riverfront cities in the Midwest and South from Chicago to New Orleans. They are pressing the Environmental Protection Agency to place tight limits on the use of chemicals thought to cause cancer.

Most of the discoveries center on human exposure to these chemicals. Tests in different parts of the country reveal that man-made carcinogens escape into the air Amer-

icans breathe, the water they drink and the food they eat.

Last year an estimated 355,000 Americans died of some form of cancer, compared to 350,000 in 1973.

Researchers at NCI headquarters in Bethesda increasingly are turning to modern technology in an effort to unlock the secrets of cancer. Analyzing death certificates for a 20-year period from 1950 to 1969 with computers, they found that the most prevalent forms of cancer tend to occur in regions of the country where carcinogenic chemicals seem most pervasive—the so-called "hot-spots."

Computed according to age, race and sex, cancer rates turned out to be highest among adult white males. The incidence during those years was highest among white men, cancer specialists believe, because they tended to have factory jobs during the 1930s and 1940s, when their first exposure to cancer-causing chemicals may have occurred.

Dr. Martin Schneiderman, associate director for field studies and statistics at NCI, organized the computer work. Schneiderman said there usually is a latency period of 20 to 30 years between the first exposure to a carcinogenic chemical and appearance of malignancies.

"We strongly suspect there is an interaction between industrial exposure and smoking," he said. "Certain groups of workers are contracting cancer at a rate many times that of the population at large."

"Society has largely ignored the problems of delayed, irreversible effects of chemicals—swept it under the rug," said David Rall, director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. "We are still terribly uncertain about the risk these chemicals entail for the population in general and for individual members of the population. There is still no clear way of determining this risk."

Umberto Saffioti, associate director for carcinogenesis at NCI, estimates that of the nearly 2 million chemicals known, no more than 6,000 have been tested to determine whether they cause cancer. Of those, he believes, only half have been tested adequately. About 1,000 have shown some sign of being carcinogenic.

The NCI, working mainly through outside laboratories, manages to screen about 200 chemicals a year, but there is no way to screen new chemicals before they become part of industrial processes and escape into the environment. In fact, federal regulators have no way of knowing which new substances created each year will be used in industry.

Cancer specialists point out with considerable concern that the long latency period between the first exposure to a dangerous chemical and the occurrence of irreversible disease means that it may be several decades before the nation has a true understanding of what some new chemicals have done to public health.

"I don't think we should wait for absolute proof that some of these chemicals cause cancer before restricting their use," said Dr. John R. Goldsmith, an environmental cancer specialist in the California Health Department. "It may be years before we know what these chemicals will do. We should minimize their use now."

Goldsmith, who is on loan this year to NCI, believes that some carcinogens should be banned.

"There is no evidence of any so-called 'safe levels' for carcinogens," Goldsmith said. "But for practical purposes, the number of major carcinogens is not infinite—there are about 20 or 25—and there ought to be tight regulations on their use. People should not be exposed to cancer-causing chemicals like asbestos, benzidine, arsenic, heavy metals such as chromates, and the radiation emitters."

Already, biologists have found two possible cancer-causing agents in the blood of New Orleans residents who drink Mississippi River water. That has raised concern among some scientists that chlorination of a city's water supply chemically alters organic pollutants in the water, changing them into carcinogens. However, Environmental Protection Agency officials taking part in the study are known to be less concerned about the effects of chlorination than chemical contamination from sources such as oil spills and industry.

Their concern over the impact of the petrochemical industry would appear to be borne out by a recent NCI survey of bladder cancer. According to Schneiderman, the 1950-1969 mortality rates showed abnormally high incidence of bladder cancer in heavily industrialized areas, particularly such refinery centers as Newark, Chicago, St. Louis and New Orleans.

The highest bladder cancer rate turned up in Salem County, N.J., which is across the Delaware River from the giant petrochemical complex in Wilmington, one of the nation's oldest.

This spring NCI hopes to provide state health authorities with maps showing hot-spots for different types of cancer on a county-by-county basis.

"We hope to stimulate people in local areas to investigate just what's going on," Schneiderman said. "They may be able to discover chemicals or other sources of cancer that we don't know about."

Meanwhile, NCI researchers are examining the case histories of people who have died from different types of cancer to find out where they lived and worked, their smoking and nutrition habits.

But it's a laborious job, even with the help of computers. Right now, there is only a staff of three professionals—a statistician, a physician and a computer expert—doing the work.

The shortage of money for cancer prevention at NCI and other major research institutions dismays researchers, who point out that after 25 years and several billion dollars spent on laboratory research for cures, survival rates for the most common types of cancer—those accounting for some 80 per cent of all cases—are almost unchanged.

Critics of the national cancer program blame the administration for failing to come to grips with problems caused by cancer-causing chemicals. Rather than increase the staff of the National Institute for Occupational Health and Safety, the administration trimmed it from an authorized level of 1,100 people to 660. Research funds also have been cut back at EPA and the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences.

Cancer researchers are urging lawmakers to pass a toxic substances bill that would empower EPA to set up a system of pre-market screening of new chemicals.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Mr. Michael Kilian of the Chicago Tribune which I feel does much to place into historical perspective the issues which confront our great Nation. Mr. Kilian's widely read columns always exemplify the adage "many a truth is said in jest." His finely honed sense of journalistic

humor usually conveys political wisdom, and this is particularly true of his January 26 column. So that my colleagues might share this wisdom I am pleased to include the following:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 26, 1975]

CEASE THE LAMENT AND HANG IN THERE
(By Michael Killian)

One of the advantages of having been born during the Depression is the knowledge that the world was not created in 1946.

This knowledge seems to have eluded a young Washington columnist of my acquaintance [doubtless created in 1946 himself], who in these pages last week wrung his hands in sorrowful lamentation over the decline of the once-great United States.

He said that as a small child he was told by his mother about the greatness of the United States—how it had the best system of government in the world and would always win out. He looked to Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon as "straight and tall" champions of the American system.

But now, he's crushed. The not-so "straight and tall" Nixon was caught lying and breaking the law. The Arabs have the arm on us and "once mighty Detroit has been humbled." We failed in Viet Nam and our dominance abroad is slipping everywhere. Our new leader is full of doubts. Oh, gloom. Oh, doom.

"Is the system of government the best?" he asked. "What is the man to tell the child?"

Before he says one word to the little scamp, he ought to fetch himself a history book—one that starts before the year 1946.

He'd find that "straight and tall" Presidents have always been a myth. Washington bought land in Pennsylvania and then tried to get the government to build roads and canals to it. Lincoln allowed speculators and profiteers to run amok, while jailing newspaper editors. The backroom buddies of Grant and Harding stuffed their pockets with millions. The White House has been occupied by a succession of drunkards, fools, schemers, buffoons, phillanderers, scoundrels, and third-rate hacks from Missouri.

We gasp at such infringements as Watergate, the plumbers, and CIA domestic spying. Lincoln suspended habeas corpus. In 1917, if you got up on a box and denounced President Wilson, you'd get fingered by the American Protective League and hauled off to the slammer. Socialism wasn't merely suspect then; it was criminal.

The Arabs aren't the first to put the arm on us. We've gotten the same treatment from the British, the French, the Germans, the Canadians, Barbary Coast pirates, Mexican bandits, and the United Nations.

Viet Nam isn't our first military failure. We lost the War of 1812. We made asses of ourselves in the Punitive Expedition. We won "the war to end all wars," dictated the peace terms, created the League of Nations, and all of Europe went to hell almost instantly.

"Mighty Detroit" has been humbled with great regularity—some six times since 1946. In the 1930s, all of American industry was humbled. The financial community went berserk on 1889's "Black Friday." The whole country did the same thing during the panics of 1873, 1884, and 1907.

Ours has been a history of riots, plagues, famines, assassinations, lynching, scandals, sectionalism, segregation, fiscal disasters, and nincompoopish leadership.

But the point is, here we still are. As can be said of few other countries and no other democracy, we are governing ourselves in the same manner as we did nearly 200 years ago. Leaders have come and gone with constitutional regularity and [discounting the bedlam of the national conventions] in a consistently orderly and democratic manner.

Despite all our troubles, we enjoy more liberty and a higher standard of living than

any other country in the world—more than we ever have before.

What the man should tell the child is "Hang in there."

Or, if it were my kid: "Shut up and eat your steak or I won't let you have the keys to the snowmobile."

COLLISION OR COALITION?

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vic Gold has written a thoughtful news column which mentions our colleague HENRY REUSS. I insert it for the interest of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star-News, Feb. 8, 1975]

COLLISION OR COALITION?

(By Vic Gold)

Having given lip service to the principle of placing national ahead of partisan political interest, both President Ford and his Democratic congressional opposition appear hell-bent on conducting an executive-legislative civil war leading up to the 1976 election.

Indeed, if the first month of 1975 is a guide to what lies ahead, we seem to be in for the most bitter period of partisan relations between White House and Capitol Hill since Harry Truman and the 80th Congress did battle in the late 1940s.

Of course, Ford, as his staff is given to pointing out at the drop of a veto, sees himself and his political fortunes in the Truman mold. That was the spirit in which the President carried on his fight to elect Republicans during last year's congressional campaign, the results of which, obviously, rolled off him like water off a plastic football helmet.

How else to explain why, less than a month after the convening of the new 94th Congress, Ford has announced his intention to take his case "to the country" in yet another series of speaking engagements?

For its part, Ford's Democratic opposition views current events from a more distant historical perspective. They see the incumbent in the Oval Office not as Harry Truman after the 1946 election, but as Herbert Hoover following the Democrats' capture of Congress during the economic crisis of 1930.

Hoover's every effort to enlist Democratic support on behalf of his administration's proposals to fight the depression was spurned by a congressional majority looking to the presidential election of 1932.

Since the 94th Congress has a plethora of would-be chief executives, the Ford-Hoover parallel has at least that much going for it. Our Republican President's constant state of campaign fever is more than matched at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where an overwhelming Democratic majority sees two years of government-by-collision working in favor of their party's nominee in 1976.

One exception, however, would seem to be Representative Henry Reuss, D-Wis., the newly selected chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. Though a liberal Democrat, with all that implies in terms of opposition to White House policy, Reuss nevertheless believes his fellow party members in Congress should forego the political luxury of "sniping at administration failures and shoulder some of the responsibility for making economic policy, and making it work."

Toward that end, the Wisconsin lawmaker has been plugging for a bipartisan White House-congressional coalition to deal with

economic and energy problems from now until the election.

Citing Franklin Roosevelt's appointment of Republicans to his wartime Cabinet as a precedent, Reuss has urged that Ford recognize the realities of our current state of divided government by inviting Democrats to take key Cabinet positions in his administration.

To be sure, Reuss concedes, "coalition" would mean that the Republican White House relinquished "undiluted control over economic policy." But given the results of the last election, Ford's "control" in any case is hardly commensurate with his responsibility; whereas his congressional opposition, as has been noted here, enjoys the best of all political worlds: power without responsibility.

Thus, if the Reuss proposal had no other attraction than to make the Democratic opposition put their political futures where their mouths are, it would be worth Gerald Ford's (1) calling off his upcoming roadshow and; (2) calling in Mike Mansfield and Carl Albert for any Cabinet recommendations they might care to make.

EXCESSIVE REGULATIONS COST CONSUMERS BILLIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, anti-competitive legislation and regulations are costing consumers billions of dollars a year. The Federal Government's heavyhanded interference with competition is hamstringing the Nation's efforts to curb inflation.

Let me cite a few examples:

The Federal Power Commission recently turned down an oil company seeking approval to supply 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to American consumers at 52 cents per thousand cubic feet. So consumers in Eastern States continue to buy natural gas from Algeria, among other places, at rates up to \$1.86.

Air travel regulated by Federal authorities sometimes costs twice as much as unregulated—intrastate—airlines. Between San Diego and Los Angeles the difference is \$21.64 versus \$11.40; between San Antonio and Dallas the federally regulated airline costs \$31.37, the unregulated airline \$25, \$15 after 7 p.m.

When Congress jumped on the pollution bandwagon, it paid little attention to the inflationary costs. It is estimated that industry will spend more than \$127 billion between 1972 and 1976, additional costs which must be passed to consumers.

Although I support environmental cleanup efforts, I worry that many of the EPA standards for pollution control have not been carefully considered and may be needlessly expensive.

Restrictive rate policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission add \$5 billion per year in excess freight rates, according to a recent economic study. Although paid by shippers, the ultimate costs are passed on to consumers. Some examples:

The Southern Railroad invested \$13 million in jumbo grain cars and planned to reduce freight rates by 60 percent. But

the ICC vetoed the rate decrease. It took 4 years in court, 17,000 pages of sworn testimony to reverse the arbitrary ICC decision.

The ICC also caused higher electric power rates in several areas of the country by refusing to let railroads use lower rates on so-called unit trains carrying coal for utilities.

When Federal courts declared frozen foods and chickens to be exempt from ICC controls, freight charges dropped 20 to 30 percent, and have stayed lower.

At a time when energy prices have skyrocketed and contributed enormously to inflation, Congress has passed one of the most blatantly protectionist pieces of legislation ever to come through Congress. H.R. 8193 requires at least 30 percent of U.S. oil imports be shipped to the United States in U.S. ships, increasing the cost by 10 percent and taking \$20 to \$30 billion from the pockets of Americans in the next few years.

Regulatory overkill by the FDA is another example of increased costs added to the burden of inflation borne by American families. I have just received a press release from FDA praising their own efforts to investigate the poisonous nature of such deadly food additives as sugar, salt, pepper, et cetera.

These are just a few of many, many instances of Federal interference in free competition which results in more inflation and hardship for American families.

It is time for Congress to eliminate these practices.

Examples I have cited are not isolated instances. They are a part of an overall pattern of excessive Government regulation. The U.S. economy, which was once a model of freedom and productivity, has become regulation and subsidy-ridden. Our economic system is growing steadily less efficient and less productive due in large part to this kind of illogical governmental action.

It is up to Congress to show some leadership in reversing this trend as one major step toward curbing inflationary prices before it is too late.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, every summer approximately 10 million American youngsters troop off to summer camp. However, millions of parents who have made financial sacrifices to guarantee such an opportunity to their children, send them off totally unaware that no uniform standard exists governing the safety of these children while away from home. These parents, many of them in my own congressional district, believe their children will be protected by trained counselors and will live securely in safe, sanitary surroundings. Regrettably, they are unaware of the following facts: 45 States have no regulations whatsoever

applicable to camp personnel; 17 States have no regulations pertaining to program safety; 24 States have no regulations concerning personal health, first aid and medical services; 45 States have no regulations applicable to out-of-camp trips and primitive outpost camping; and 35 States do not regulate day camping.

In other words, the overwhelming majority of those children we happily send off for summer camp are at the mercy of the weaknesses possessed by the people they are handed over to for supervision. To be sure, the overwhelming majority of camp operators are scrupulously honest people who feel a real sense of responsibility to their charges. However, as in all areas of endeavor, there is a small minority who approach their task with less than total scrupulousness. The results are often tragic in the latter situation.

Last year, HEW issued a report on these consequences. A total of 7,800 camps were queried. Less than half responded. Those who did answer the Government questionnaire noted that in 1 year, 25 deaths, 1,223 serious illnesses and 1,448 injuries were associated with camping. These are shameful statistics for our country.

Now many parents around the Nation are making choices for the coming summer season. Innumerable choices will be made, not on the basis of substantial knowledge of what safety the camp offers, but on the basis of hearsay or promotional literature.

I do not advocate massive Federal intervention. Ordinarily, such regulation is the proper province of the individual States. However, only seven States have acted in a substantive manner. For this reason, I have joined in sponsorship of the Youth Camp Safety Act, one of the more overdue pieces of legislation introduced in this Congress.

Under its provisions, minimal Federal safety standards would be established. HEW would provide aid to individual States for setting up and maintaining their own safety standards and programs. Standards would be effective in those States lacking adequate plans. Due process, hearing procedures, and court appeal are also provided for in the measure.

Although my home State of New York is one of the seven jurisdictions which have comprehensive safety laws governing these camps, hundreds of thousands of children from our State attend camps in areas where no standards at all exist. As a result, they are as much at risk as children from areas which lack any regulations whatsoever.

There are Federal laws regulating and protecting animals used in research. We have innumerable laws on the statute books protecting wildlife. Yet we have no law protecting 10 million American youngsters in these camps. I believe the situation speaks for itself, and requires initiative on the part of Congress.

Our colleague, DOMINICK DANIELS of New Jersey, has pioneered in this legislative area, mainly because he took the trouble to listen to what has happened to some children. Others of us have become convinced by pleas, and I am privileged to join in this effort.

This is supposed to be an action-oriented Congress. We are here to do rather than to mark time. It is my hope that this measure will receive the earliest consideration by the full House.

FUSION RESEARCH MUST NOT BE BUDGET LIMITED—PROPOSED INCREASES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976 FUSION BUDGET

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy yesterday held its first authorization hearing on this Nation's—fiscal year 1976—controlled thermonuclear research—fusion—program. As you know, nuclear fusion is the process that provides the almost infinite energy of the sun and the stars.

Although it has never been specifically enunciated, I think most of us in Congress agree that this Nation should establish as a policy the goal of harnessing the fusion processes as a source of energy production at the earliest feasible moment. Then we can look forward to providing unlimited quantities of clean, cheap energy forever, not only for this country but for all mankind.

Responsible experts estimate that this Nation can have a fusion electric demonstration power plant on the line during the period between 1995 and the year 2000. One fact that is universally recognized, however, is that this will not be possible unless we provide massive support for the program, including a heavy emphasis on materials and engineering studies, starting at once.

The past 3 years have been the most productive in the history of controlled thermonuclear research, and certainly we are now operating on a new plateau—one which we have dreamed of and sought for more than 20 years. Now, for the first time, we are in a position to move forward with a much more aggressive research and development program; and now we can, with considerable confidence, predict success. However, success alone in a fusion electric program is not enough. The potential benefits are so fantastic that we must have fusion electricity as soon as we can. Therefore, our national policy should be that the fusion program should never be delayed because of inadequate funding to do what can be done—that is, the fusion research, development and demonstration program must never be budget limited.

Unfortunately, this is exactly what has happened in the preparation of the administration's fiscal year 1976 budget. The administration has cut below the level of spending which is scientifically justified if we intend to bring the reality of fusion electric power at the earliest feasible date. The cuts in the administration's proposed budget for fiscal 1976, although they are not large, could cost us

an entire year in getting fusion electricity on the line.

I have followed the fusion program closely for several years. I am well aware of the many difficult technical problems that must and can be overcome in the near future. These problems include a better understanding of the details of plasma physics; the development of superconducting magnet technology; the development of neutral beam heating to achieve the 100,000,000° temperatures needed for fusion; the development of materials that can efficiently and reliably withstand high energy-high density neutron fluxes; and the development of power conversion technologies tailored especially to the fusion energy source.

I have analyzed the administration's fiscal year 1976 budget request for the fusion power research and development program, and I believe that all parts of the request should be increased by the Congress.

The most important feature of the fusion budget request is a new, very large fusion facility called the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor, which is to be built at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory in Princeton, N.J. The purposes of this machine are to establish detailed plasma physics scaling laws at reactor sizes; to burn the fuels of fusion—deuterium and tritium—for the first time on a regular basis, thus producing reactor level power densities and as much energy from fusion as was required to produce the 100,000,000° plasma. In addition, this very large system will permit the performance of a number of major engineering studies not heretofore possible. The total cost of this machine is estimated to be \$215 million, which I believe is an accurate estimate, in large part because the machine is designed relatively conservatively to utilize established technologies.

The administration has requested only partial authorization for this machine, which provides \$7.5 million to begin design and initiate procurement of some selected materials—copper and steel. I believe that the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor should be fully authorized by the Congress at a total estimated cost of \$215 million with funding of \$23 million provided in fiscal year 1976. To accompany this expanded request, I propose to add \$5 million to the operating budget request for activities necessary to support the more rapid start.

I also believe we should be more aggressive in the area of fusion materials research. Our experience in all energy research and development to date indicates that materials play a major role in the ultimate success of any concept. This will, most assuredly, also be the case in fusion. A critical item in fusion materials research is the availability of high fluxes of fusion neutrons. I believe that two neutron source facilities should be authorized in fiscal year 1976. These facilities were described in the fusion program plan of February 1974, but were not included in the fiscal year 1976 budget request. One neutron source would be built at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California, using an established rotating target technology. It would take about 2 years to build and bring into operation and would cost \$5 million.

The second neutron source would provide a higher flux and take approximately 3 years to build. It would cost \$22.1 million and would be built at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico. It would utilize a new gas-target technology that has been under study at Los Alamos for the past 2 years. I believe that the early construction of these two facilities is critical to fusion power development, and I strongly urge their inclusion in the fiscal year 1976 budget.

In addition to the aforementioned items, I propose that the operating budget request for the program of \$120 million be augmented not only by the \$5 million that I just mentioned, but also by an additional \$15 million, primarily for engineering-related activities, and also to supplement work on confinement systems and plasma theory. In fusion engineering, these funds would accelerate neutral beam development—an area where the United States is the world leader, superconducting magnet technology, and systems studies. A part of the work in engineering would be performed at the universities, thereby helping to train engineering specialists for future use in the program.

Finally, I believe that an additional \$4 million for research equipment is necessary and desirable to augment the \$16 million budget request and to provide the additional equipment necessary to support the other items that I have described.

In summary, I suggest that the Congress take the following actions with respect to the fiscal year 1976 budget for the fusion power research and development program as submitted by the President. Add \$20 million to the operating budget, bringing it to a level of \$140 million; provide full authorization for the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor at a total estimated cost of \$215 million and provide fiscal year 1976 funding of \$23 million; provide an additional \$4 million in capital equipment, bringing the total to a level of \$20 million; and finally, I am proposing that the Congress add authorization and funding for the two neutron sources to be built at Livermore and Los Alamos. The Livermore facility will require authorization and funding of \$5 million. The Los Alamos facility will require authorization of the total project cost estimate of \$22.1 million and fiscal year 1976 funding of \$3.8 million.

Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize a point I made in the beginning: This Nation's fusion program must never be budget limited. The increases for the 1976 budget which I have recommended will avoid that limitation and will keep this Nation in the forefront of controlled thermonuclear research.

EASTON, MASS., CELEBRATES 250TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the

American Revolution Bicentennial celebration, our interest in America's rich and varied history is heightened, and the unique backgrounds of the New England townships have played a vital role in this proud history. This year the town of Easton, Mass., celebrates its 250th anniversary. Through the diligent efforts of students at the local Oliver Ames High School, the highlights of Easton's abundant heritage have been compiled, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to share this notable page from our American history with my colleagues:

HISTORY OF EASTON, MASS.

When Easton celebrates its 250th Anniversary in 1975, the commemoration will be of the past of one of the most historic towns on the South Shore. Unfortunately, most of Easton's history is little known outside the town, and only now is getting the national recognition it deserves. Evidence of this is the North Easton Railroad Station, one of architect Henry Hobson Richardson's five buildings in Easton, which has been declared a National Historical Landmark by the United States Department of the Interior.

Easton's heritage begins long before the Europeans first came to America. It was a border area of the Wampanoag Indians and many evidences remain today. Easton has several campsites used by them during the summer months, mostly along alewife streams from which the Indian got food. Arrowheads and other artifacts are still frequently found, and many legends circulate about King Phillip's cave near Stonehill College, and the warriors who once roamed the area.

Some time after King Phillip's War ended in 1676, Easton experienced its first English settlers. The land, part of a section called the Taunton North Purchase, had been acquired for 100 pounds by a land company. This amounted to roughly 2 pounds per square mile, and although the land was purchased in 1668, it wasn't until 1694 that the first settlers made their way to Easton.

These first settlers desired the water power that the three main streams afforded, as well as the bog iron and farming land in the southern part of town. It soon became evident that travel to Taunton, the "shire" town, was long and difficult, and the people objected to traveling those distances for church meetings. In some respects, Easton was more fortunate than many of the towns, as Bay Road passed directly through this area. Bay Road served as the main connecting way between Narragansett Bay and Massachusetts Bay. However, the Hockomock Swamp forced travellers some distance to the west, and Easton residents wanted autonomy. In 1710, Norton separated from Taunton, but it wasn't until 1725 that "East-end of Norton" was allowed incorporation as Easton.

Early Easton was definitely filled with individuals who were tight-fisted with money. At one town meeting in the 1740's, it was voted to pay the fine for not having schools because the fine was less than the schooling costs would be. On several occasions, Easton was forced by the state to improve its roads under penalty of court action. This frugality came to the foreground in the late 1790's when Raynham, the town to the south, petitioned the state to have a road built through the Hockomock Swamp. Since his road would be in Easton, but would really help only Raynham, Easton refused. Finally, after many delays the state ordered the building of the road and at that point Easton offered to give the swamp to Raynham. Raynham didn't want the expense either, and so refused and Easton was forced to build the road. Part of the funds were taken from school appropriations, naturally

enough, and this road through the swamp was set up as a turnpike to get back the investment. Thus, Turnpike Street came into existence.

Early Easton must have been a rather rough and tumble sort of place, as by 1786 the town was already on its third set of stocks, having worn out two sets by this time.

Easton's citizenry as well as its resources steadfastly supported the Revolutionary War, and much was done to assist freedom. Cannon for George Washington's army were cast at Perry's Furnace and proofed along Poquanicut Avenue (the designation of one section of town as "Furnace Village" came from this), and muskets were made at Quaker Leonard's Forge on East Elm Street. It was at this forge that supposedly the first steel produced in America, was made. Even today, charcoal "pits" (rings in the ground) exist all over town as a tribute to this early iron heritage.

Two militia companies marched from Easton after the "Lexington alarm", and these two companies became part of the rebel forces surrounding Boston. Easton continued support throughout the war, with 32 men serving with Washington at Valley Forge, an incredible number considering the size of the town.

George Washington supposedly spent at least two nights in Easton at taverns along Bay Road. The first place was at the Kingman tavern which was located near Rockland Street, and the other night was spent at the Benjamin Williams tavern while he was negotiating for cannon and shot. This tavern is still standing, and one of Easton's four milestones along Bay Road is in the front yard with the initials B.W. carved in it.

The women also worked for the Revolution, and several times Boston papers reported on the "patriotic activities" of Easton's gentle sex. Only one recorded Tory was found in Easton, perhaps because of the zealotry of the patriots. This zeal carried over to the British prisoners being held in Easton, as 2 of the 7 ended up serving in the Continental Army for George Washington.

The early 19th century saw a man move to Easton which would change the entire town's character. This was Oliver Ames, son of John Ames of Bridgewater, maker of the first shovels in America. Oliver Ames set up a shovel business that prospered to such an extent that by the end of the century, was the largest in the world. The Ames family directly influenced the growth of North Easton, and due to the different character of the areas of the town, it separated into factions that only now think of themselves as one town.

A disastrous fire in 1852 forced the Ames Shovel and Tool Company to build the stone shops which still stand, and this date marks the start of a fabulous era for North Easton. In addition to building new shops, the family set up many other buildings. One of the best examples of 19th century housing still exists as a row of homes on Elm Street, and these houses form part of a living museum that is North Easton. The Ameses were also philanthropists, and they hired Henry Hobson Richardson to build a Town Hall and a Library.

Because of dissent from other sections of town, Ames Memorial Hall was never accepted as a town hall and does not serve that purpose today. Perhaps it is ironic that the Frothingham House, another Ames mansion, serves that purpose today. Frederick Law Olmsted, the noted landscape architect who designed Central Park in New York and the Fenway in Boston, was commissioned to do the landscaping around Memorial Hall. The Rockery, still occupying a prominent place in North Easton center, was part of his work. He also helped landscape many of the estates in North Easton.

Frederick Lothrop Ames, richest man in

New England in the late 19th Century, commissioned Richardson to do three more buildings. One, the North Easton Railroad Station, was given by him to the Old Colony Railroad, of which he was a director. This building was recently re-purchased by the Ames family and given to the Easton Historical Society. This building is a National Historic Landmark, and it is hoped that this status will soon follow for the other Easton buildings deserving this designation.

F. L. Ames also had the Gate Lodge designed by Richardson, and it is one of his most personal works. Also, a smaller wooden building called the Gardner's Cottage was designed by him to be used as a model worker's house. These two buildings are both still in existence on Elm Street.

The philanthropy of the Ames family was carried still further with the gift of the high school, and Easton's high school is still called Oliver Ames High School in memory of this gift. In addition, trust funds were set up for the school department, the highway department, and for trees, and many of the streets of Easton have towering Maples along their sides which were donated by this family on a matching basis with the town.

The attentiveness to education was a trademark of the Ames family, and through their generosity, Easton became the second town in Massachusetts to have a public kindergarten, starting in the 1870's. The original Oliver Ames High School Band was also funded by Anna C. Ames in 1902, as well as gymnasium facilities for the schools. More recently, one of the Ames estates has become the home of Stonehill College.

South Easton was also growing steadily during this time. It too had major industry with the Ross Heel Company, the J. O. Dean Mill, and Easton Machine Company, makers of the Morse automobile. One of the cars made by this company is still in existence and makes an annual trip up to the Easton Historical Society's Auto Show.

The J. O. Dean mill is symbolic of the many mills in Easton's past, and Henry Ford purchased the turbine from this mill for his model 19th century village. On the Stonehill College property, not far from this mill, is one of the few millstone quarrying sites in America that still has millstones in various stages of completion. One can see there the granite outcroppings, the roughly outlined stones, round millstones broken loose from the bedrock, and the finished products waiting to be hauled away. Until recently, this site was little known.

Simpson Spring, home of the Simpson Spring Beverage Company, is also in South Easton, and this concern began making their quality beverages during this period. The spring is still used as the source of water, and has never gone dry.

Easton's total past can't be told with justice to it in so few words. Much of the town's history has to be seen firsthand to be understood. At the Church Street Cemetery, one of 35 or so in Easton, is the burial site of a lady who died in 1747 and it contains two headstones and two footstones for her. This mystery is still not fully explained. Off Chestnut Street, one can find the double cellarhole that horse thieves in the early 1800's used to hide their newly acquired steeds, and near South Street is a mill site with several millstones built into its foundation. You can find the remains of a lead and silver mine, the remains of the last working icehouse in New England, the only Bull Cemetery in the world (according to Ripley's Believe it or Not), and many other areas and sites that help you reflect on this fascinating town's past.

With a 1,200 acre Ames estate called "Borderland" now a state park, and with the Department of Fisheries and Game purchasing all of the Hockomock Swamp, Easton's future history appears as bright as its past.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This competition has traditionally spurred many outstanding young people to give insightful commentaries on topics that concern all Americans, and this year has been no exception. We could all learn a great deal by pausing to consider the thoughts of our young people who entered this contest. I think this is particularly true in the case of the essay prepared by the winner in my own State of Maine, Miss Laurie Ann Gibson of Auburn. Her script on "My Responsibilities as a Citizen" is not only beautifully constructed for oratorical effect, but also makes a number of original and penetrating observations about the nature and responsibilities of American citizenship. Because I know my colleagues will be interested in what Miss Gibson has to say, I insert a copy of her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS A CITIZEN

"Look up America, see what we've got . . ." so goes a popular soft-drink commercial; but, how many people today in America, having the title "citizen" have examined what we have got or more importantly in recent times, what we have got to give.

A United States citizen bearing this claim seldom stops to realize how lucky and fortunate he is to have attained this appellation almost effortlessly; for our generation is past having to stand, fight, and even die for its sake—or are we? Is citizenship as a state of duty dead, or even in peace eras are there certain duties, and designated privileges to be upheld as befitting the sacredness of the institution held next to nothing in our nation's history?

Abraham Lincoln once said, "those who share in the privileges of a government, should assist in bearing its burden." Basically stated that is the main duty of a citizen, native or naturalized, rich or impoverished, in peace or war. And in this era of growing unrest, of government scandals and oil boycotts, the responsibility of citizenship is falling heavier and more burdensome upon the common man. But is that wrong? I don't think so. It was the common man who fought for his "inalienable right" to begin with, why shouldn't he, in its depressions, defend it; for as Learned Hand once stated,

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women, when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can ever do much to help it."

Thus the responsibility lies with us in many facets, significant and synonymous with the terms "democracy" and "representative."

Firstly, let us understand and participate in our own federal, state, and local governments. They were set up by us originally, for us eventually, so if we don't bear the responsibility for them, who will? And if we don't let our views be known, our policy of national heritage, "of, by, and for the people" will not be carried through to its potential, oblivious to even definition.

Secondly, let us, in this "land of plenty" remember and heed the warnings that noth-

ing lasts forever and even the most plentiful of commodities will one day be scarce. One of the prime responsibilities of citizenship is regarding the welfare of its fellow citizens, hence the need for defensive measures, protective trading and, if need be, a little less greed; presently in reference to oil, food and even money and perhaps a little more cellophane and charity, for certainly the majority of our nation could afford it. The end results would be a stronger and more unified nation, closer in spirit and more in harmony with each other's needs and wants. And is not that the end result of citizenship?

Lastly, but in this world of strife, not least, is our responsibility to our fellow man. This is just as much a part of citizenship as any "constitutionalized decree", perhaps more so. For if we can't live in concurrence with other humans around the world, the entire concept of democracy is immaterial, for a government cannot exist without a people to govern, and without international unison, civilization, as we know it, will not, cannot exist.

Perhaps more aptly, the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt summarized our duties as United States citizens in his comment:

"Today we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace."

EXEMPTION ON INTEREST EARNED

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which, I believe, will put money back into savings banks, help ease the housing shortage, reduce the tragically high level of unemployment, and stimulate our depressed economy as a whole.

The legislation I am submitting would exempt the first \$1,000 earned as interest on savings by a married couple from Federal income taxation. Single persons would have the first \$500 of interest earnings exempted under the bill.

As many Members are aware, a similar measure was reported to the full House of Representatives by the Ways and Means Committee last December but it was not considered prior to the adjournment of the 93d Congress.

It has been estimated that passage of this legislation would lead to a yearly increase of as much as \$25 billion in deposits in savings and loan institutions alone, which would be enough to finance the construction of at least 300,000 new homes, and more importantly, create half a million badly needed jobs.

With the present extremely poor state of our economy, it is incumbent upon us to take every step necessary to quickly revive our national well-being. Exempting interest income from taxation would be an important part of this strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Ways and Means Committee and the full House to take prompt and favorable action on this measure.

EDUARD KUZNETSOV, SOVIET PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always been concerned with the plight of persecuted people everywhere. Presently, Soviet Russia is holding captive a large number of what can only be termed "political prisoners." These prisoners, many held for crimes such as "anti-Soviet propaganda," "slandering the Soviet system" and "betrayal of the fatherland," are regularly deprived of such basic rights as contact with friends and relatives outside the prisons.

On September 11, 1975, I joined with 14 New York metropolitan area Congressmen in establishing the Congressional Adopt-a-Prisoner program operated in conjunction with the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry. This program is an effort to bring to the attention of the general public the terrible plight of the Soviet Jews and to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet authorities to cease persecution of political prisoners.

The name of the man I "adopted" is Eduard Kuznetsov. Mr. Kuznetsov was first arrested for participating in a public reading of Mayakovsky's poetry in Mayakovsky Square. He was sentenced to 7 years in a labor camp for that so-called crime against the Soviet State.

By the time of his release from prison, Kuznetsov had developed intense feelings toward his Jewish heritage and he decided to emigrate to Israel. A few months after his marriage to Sylvia Zalmanson, a young Zionist and engineer from Riga, Kuznetsov was arrested for allegedly attempting to hijack an airliner to Israel. He was charged with treason and sentenced to death. Because of a worldwide outcry, Kuznetsov's sentence was reduced to 15 years at a specially strict regime camp.

Kuznetsov has repeatedly been denied contact with his wife and family and he has been repeatedly threatened with a transfer to the dreaded Vladimir Prison. A friend of Kuznetsov's, Hillel Butman, was recently transferred to Vladimir Prison for, among other things, attempting to compile a Hebrew dictionary.

During his imprisonment, Kuznetsov wrote and smuggled out of prison a diary detailing his treatment and the development of his Jewish commitment. An excerpt from the diary reads:

No matter how tragic is your acceptance of the world, life gives you such degrading blows that you make grimaces and gestures like a clown at moments that are the most unsuitable for a tragic role. For them, of course, it is not enough to sentence, to be shot, they must bring me to such a condition that I should make grimaces to amuse the public. No sir!

Were I a Spaniard, like Unamuno, I would not be afraid of the shout: "You can kill me, but not convince me."

We, as Americans, cannot, must not, let such men wither under the oppres-

sion of Soviet Russia. Our voices must rise up in protest against this inhumanity and denial of basic civil and humanitarian rights. We must use every vehicle within the power of our Government to pressure the tyrannical leaders of the Soviet state to release these poor people from their bondage. For whenever we assure one freedom of even one person in the world, we are a little more secure in our own freedom. Only through eternal vigilance can we protect against the spread of Soviet oppression and degradation throughout the world.

OUR NATION'S COMMITMENT TO OUR POW'S, MIA'S, AND THEIR FAMILIES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1973, when the United States entered into the agreement that was to terminate American involvement in the Vietnam war, we all looked forward with hope to the day when all of our prisoners of war could return to their country and the status of those listed as missing in action could be determined at long last. That the question of determining the ultimate fate of our missing men was considered of great importance to the United States is evident in the fact that the issue was specifically dealt with in article 8(b) of the Paris peace accords. Article 8(b) specifically states that—

The Parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action.

Now the requirements of that language are obvious. There may be other sections in the Paris peace accords that are subject to varied interpretations, but there is nothing vague about article 8(b). Yet the fact remains that the North Vietnamese have never allowed the United States to examine crash sites or graves in contested territory in either North or South Vietnam. It is indisputably clear that a thorough search of known grave and crash sites would yield significantly new information about the fate of our missing personnel. But until such time as the North Vietnamese comply with their obligations under the Paris peace accords little new information on the status of our missing men will be learned.

In spite of this fact the Department of Defense has continued its policy of reclassifying personnel previously listed as missing in action in Southeast Asia to dead whenever the Department feels it has sufficient reason to presume that a given individual cannot reasonably be

alive. Such a policy strikes me as being patently unfair and unwarranted. These reclassifications are being made in the absence of any new evidence to justify them. To continue to make such reclassifications without making onsite inspections of crash sites and graves, which would produce solid evidence concerning the fates of our missing men, will serve notice that we have written them off as of little consequence to us, and will demonstrate to the North Vietnamese that we do not intend to press them to live up to their legal obligations.

We must not allow the U.S. Government to adopt such an approach. We must not permit the laws of this Nation to be used to serve the bureaucratic convenience of the Department of Defense at the expense of the rights of our missing servicemen and their families. Just because of the North Vietnamese to date have not lived up to their end of the Paris peace accords with respect to article 8(b) is no excuse for us to amend that part of the agreement by refusing to demand compliance from them.

Let us never forget that it is possible that a number of our servicemen listed as missing in action may still be alive. Some were photographed while in captivity. In other instances the enemy issued propaganda releases and photos of official armed services ID cards of various Americans, noting that they had been taken prisoner. However, when the Paris peace accords were signed, many of the names of the same men alluded to above were not on the official lists released by the North Vietnamese Government. Clearly, Hanoi knows whether these men are dead or alive. But to this point they have refused to clarify their status.

In view of this situation, I am cosponsoring legislation which seeks to halt the reclassification of our MIA's by the Department of Defense until such time as we receive the information we need from North Vietnam and her allies to finally resolve the question of their fate. Until such time as this new information is available, I do not believe any reclassification to presumptive finding of death status should be permitted. By preventing such an action from occurring through the passage of this bill we will demonstrate our determination to the other side that we expect the agreements they signed to be complied with, and at the same time we will remove any doubt that the families of our MIA's may have that the U.S. Government is not doing everything possible to resolve this issue appropriately.

JERRY PETTIS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sorrow at the untimely death of our colleague from California Jerry Pettis.

It was my pleasure to know Jerry mainly from the House Prayer Breakfast group which meets each Thursday morning. He will be missed from that gathering.

His dedication to his constituents and his devotion to duty is evidenced in the fact he was on a business trip—not a pleasure trip—when his plane went down.

Jerry Pettis' absence is sure to be felt keenly among his friends and colleagues in the House and among his constituents and friends in California. This is the highest tribute that can be paid to a good man and an accomplished legislator.

My wife and I extend our deepest condolences and sympathy to Jerry's beloved wife and devoted family.

LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1975, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry commemorated the 57th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Once more, the commemoration of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania has proved to be a hollow celebration, for the citizens of Lithuania continue to live under the bondage and repression of Soviet rule.

While relatives and friends in Lithuania press on in the struggle to regain the freedom they once knew, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent continue in their efforts to remind the Congress of the plight of the thousands of Baltic peoples who have been subjugated by the Soviet Union into positions of virtual slavery. Thus, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution which was passed by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey on February 16. I hope that this resolution will serve to remind each Member that the bounties of freedom which so many Americans take for granted are the object of a great, ongoing struggle by the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. Let us hope and pray that Lithuanians may again enjoy the freedom which is democracy's lifeblood.

The resolution of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey follows:

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of New Jersey at a meeting held on February 16, 1975, commemorating the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in 1918 the Republic of Lithuania was established by the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920 Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all sovereign rights and claims by Russia over Lithuanian soil and her people; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1940 Lithuania was a fully independent and sovereign nation, a

member of the League of Nations, and a signatory of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union during June 15-17, 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania by overwhelming force of arms, and subsequently, forcibly annexed the Lithuanian Nation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has systematically conducted a policy of colonization, ethnic dilution and Russification within Lithuania; and

Whereas the United States Government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania to this very day are risking and sacrificing their lives in defense of the Communist regime in seeking political and religious freedom; and

Whereas the 89th U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurring Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the question of the Baltic Nations status at the United Nations and other international forums, focusing attention on the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people; now, therefore be it

Resolved that we, Lithuanian-Americans urge the President of the United States, members of Congress, and the United States Department of State to publicly reaffirm the United States Policy of non-recognition of the forceful annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, and to maintain that policy during all negotiations with the Soviet Union, especially, those concerned with the new Detente policy; and further

Resolved, to request the President of the United States to vigorously implement House Concurring Resolution 416 to the fullest extent; and further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to appropriate government officials.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY
OF THE U.S.A., INC., NEWARK
CHAPTER
VALENTINAS MELINIS, *President*.
K. BASYS, *Secretary*.

AUTOMAKERS AND CONGRESS ARE
RESPONSIBLE FOR AUTO SALES
DECLINE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have not been one of those in the vanguard, calling on the automobile industry to provide me with one so-called safety contraction after another that in the main have only served to increase the cost of our automobiles. My friend, Glen Travis, who has been in the automobile business for many years, feels that we, in the Congress, are just as responsible for the decline in automobile sales as the automobile makers are themselves. I think there is a measure of truth in what he says, particularly with respect to some of the half-baked proposals we hear these days being proposed by Members of the other body.

A full text of Mr. Travis' recent letter to me follows:

TRAVIS CADILLAC PONTIAC Co.,
Peoria, Ill., February 8, 1975.

Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing you today to ask again for a moratorium from further regulations to the auto industry for 5 years. If all cars met 1975 standards on emissions there would be very little problems in almost all of the United States. A rollback of the bumper regulations would also help to put men back to work. You can expect that the government agencies involved will not write their jobs away. When was the last time that happened?

The government (all branches) is responsible for the unemployment in the auto industry. The auto lay-offs and the related industry just about spell the cause of the recession, not the Arabs. The building industry was killed by the government, bleeding off the mortgage money. Then they bleed off more, and play Santa Clause to the building and loan.

The rebates are helping the sale of cars. The extra cost from government regulations is several times the amount of these rebates.

This week the news carried a story of a Senator or two who suggested a restriction on manufacturers, based on the average gas mileage of all the cars the company sold. This would immediately increase unemployment. Cadillac has about the best record of employment during the recession. There are too many little cars waiting for customers. Look at who got the biggest rebates. All General Motors could do would be to close Cadillac.

Senator Muskie demands to know why General Motors is not bringing out the Wankel engine, even when they know more about it than any other American company. All he has to do is look at what happened to Mazda. They had the U.S. government and all the press behind them, and look at their sales record.

Our government is the only one who wants to give the same medicine in larger doses after it has been proven to be the wrong medicine. The regulations for the 1976 and 1977 models will keep the auto workers unemployed, but the Bureaucrats busy and on the job.

Sincerely,

GLEN W. TRAVIS.

CONTENDER FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Los Gatos Times-Saratoga Observer reveals the sentiments of many Californians as we begin seriously to consider the announced and unannounced contenders for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1976. It reflects great credit on our senior Senator from California, Hon. ALAN CRANSTON, and also great credit on the preferences and perceptions of the Los Gatos Times-Saratoga Observer.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with my colleagues in the House this commendation of one of California's outstanding statespeople and to add my hearty agreement to the view that we should include ALAN CRANSTON among the men and women we consider for national leadership in 1976:

Well ahead of the quadrennial Democratic presidential convention, California in general and Democrats in particular are being visited by a series of distinguished candidates who hope to be their party's choice.

In late summer of 1976, each of these in turn will be praised as the "man who" (perhaps now, "the person who") will lead the Democratic Party to victory and the nation from the wilderness.

All are welcome, the state of the nation and the tourism business being what they are. One caution, though, to these out-of-staters. There are some of us here who find California's Senior Senator Alan Cranston, as well qualified in leadership, experience, and understanding as any of these talented travelers.

Senator Cranston has deep roots in California. He's been an overseas correspondent and author and knows foreign affairs; he was State Controller for eight years and given California's broad diversity of climate, occupations, and population, he knows domestic problems; he was a major factor in the resurgence of the State's Democratic Party after 1952, and anyone who can organize California's Democrats shouldn't find unifying the national party too difficult a task.

And finally, Californians gave Senator Cranston a remarkable million plus vote of endorsement in the recent election.

These assets are what make him an exceptional Senator; they also qualify him for both his party's nomination and the Presidency.

THE CASE OF THE CARABANCHEL 10

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. The Speaker, recent developments in Spain are heartening to those who have opposed the Franco dictatorship ever since it came bloodily to power more than 30 years ago with the assistance of military support from Hitler and Mussolini and the embargo policy of the United States and the Western democracies.

As General Franco nears the end of his life, democratic forces in Spain are reviving and focusing their efforts around demands for amnesty for political prisoners.

A tremendous opposition movement against the conviction of the Carabanchel 10 has been generated throughout Europe, while in Spain their case has been regarded by working people as symbolic of their entire struggle against the Franco dictatorship.

The Carabanchel 10 is the name given to 10 Spaniards who were arrested in 1972 on the charge of illegal association in seeking to organize trade unions. They were tried in December 1973 in an atmosphere of hysteria generated by the assassination of Premier Carrera Blanca on the first day of the trial, which was attended by a delegation of about 50 international observers, including former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and trade union leader Henry Foner from the United States. The 10 were found guilty and sentenced to up to 20 years in prison.

In this country, as part of efforts to

free the Carabanchel 10, an amicus curiae brief was signed by myself, civil liberties leader Roger Baldwin and a number of prominent labor leaders, including President Leonard Woodcock of the United Auto Workers, President Matthew Guinan of the Transport Workers Union, President Arnold Miller of the United Mine Workers, President Patrick E. Gorman of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, President Cesar Chavez of the Farm Workers Union, and President Harry Bridges of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

The Spanish Supreme Court announced the date of appeal for February 11, 1975, on very little notice, hoping to catch the international movement by surprise. Nevertheless, a delegation of international observers was present in the court for the appeal, including President Paul O'Dwyer of the New York City Council and President William Colavito of Local 455, Ironworkers Union.

On Saturday, February 15, the court announced that the sentences had been reduced to 6 years, 5 years, and 2 years and 4 months, with credit for time served. As a result, four of the defendants have been freed outright. There is no doubt that the international protests against the heavy sentences imposed on these trade unionists helped to win their freedom and the reduced sentences.

Among the many still in prison are nine Spanish intellectuals, including two active feminists, who are part of the liberal opposition to the Franco regime. According to information I have received from Amnesty International, one of the prisoners, psychotherapist and feminist Genoveva Forest, was subjected to severe torture and there is no reason to believe that some or all of the others were similarly treated. In addition, the prisoners were held incommunicado for long periods, and were not given adequate access to their defense lawyers, who are not fully informed about the specific charges against the nine.

A number of my colleagues have joined me in sending a telegram to the Spanish Government protesting the deprivation of rights and the torture used against these imprisoned men and women.

The campaign for complete amnesty for all political prisoners has reached new heights in Spain with the circulation of petitions sponsored by the Catholic Church and the Communist Party, among others. According to the New York Times, the petitions have already been signed by 60,000 people, including 2,000 members of the Spanish Armed Forces.

In this country, the anti-Franco struggle is taking the form of a campaign against the renegotiation of the secret treaty for American military bases in Spain, which expires in September. The campaign against the treaty is being spearheaded by the U.S. Committee for a Democratic Spain, 9 East 40th Street, New York City and by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 799 Broadway, New York City.

These latest events coincided with the celebration of the 38th anniversary of the Brigade, which consists of American

volunteers who fought in Spain on the side of the Spanish Republic in the 1930's. The anniversary took the form of a birthday tribute to their national commander, Steve Nelson, on Sunday, February 16, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York, which drew an enthusiastic crowd of 1,300 people.

An article by Mr. Nelson, Lincoln Brigade Recalled, appeared on the op-ed page of the New York Times on February 12, which is also, of course, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Text of the article follows:

LINCOLN BRIGADE RECALLED
(By Steve Nelson)

The Abraham Lincoln Brigade seems to mean nothing to nearly two generations of Americans. When I speak to college students and tell them Americans fought as volunteers for the legally elected Spanish Government, they stare at me in astonishment.

In February, 1936, five years after the monarchy abdicated, the Spanish people elected a Government of social change. Five months later the military launched an armed uprising with the support of deposed monarchists and major landowners. Within 24 hours, Hitler and Mussolini (by pre-arrangement, as we now know) were delivering men and supplies to the rebels, and the Republic was clearly in danger.

Many Americans feared that if Spain fell there would be no stopping Hitler's drive for conquest. We appealed to our nation's leaders to aid the Spanish Government, or at least permit it to buy arms for defense. But our Government chose "neutrality" instead. By November, the rebels stood at the gates of Madrid, and the Republic's cause seemed hopeless.

Then we read of volunteers from other nations appearing on the Government's side and helping to check the rebel drive. The news was electrifying. On Christmas Day, 1936, 82 Americans boarded the Normandie as "tourists" bound for France. Soon others followed, including myself. By February, 1937, several thousand of us were in Spain where we formed the Lincoln unit and took part in the defense of the Valencia road to Madrid. It was a long bitter battle, and our casualties were heavy.

After two and a half years of war, half the 3,100 American volunteers lay buried in Spanish soil. Spain had gone down to defeat, undone by the world blockade. Hitler, having fed on Spain and feasted on Munich, had gobbled up Western and Central Europe. Then the Axis declared war on the United States.

At this point, most of our able-bodied veterans, back home, sought to enlist. Since we were the only Americans with actual combat experience against German and Italian troops, you'd have thought the armed forces would be delighted to have us. Instead, some top brass viewed us with suspicion.

After all, we were "premature antifascists"—as though it was a crime to fight for the Spanish Republic. Some Lincoln veterans found themselves in detention camps, often together with members of the Nazi Bund, the pro-Hitler paramilitary operation in the United States.

It took time and pressure from many, including such members of the Roosevelt Administration as Eleanor Roosevelt and Harold L. Ickes and Henry L. Stimson, until policy changed and our men were accepted as equals in the merchant marine and, eventually, in all branches of service—and they fought in all theaters of war. They also served in the Office of Strategic Services.

When the war was over, some 350 Lincoln Brigaders had lost their lives. Many of our men had distinguished themselves in battle.

With the war over, we hoped fascism would be ended, too, but it was not. A few years later, our country embarked on the long, 25-year nightmare of official "anti-Communism." If you were a Lincoln veteran, you couldn't get or hold a Government job. We were named a "subversive organization" and put on the Attorney General's list. Many of us were hauled before the House Un-American Committee. I myself was sentenced for sedition, and a dozen other veterans went through trials and were sentenced to long years in jail. Later, the United States Supreme Court upheld the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's reversal of my conviction.

We survived the icy decades of the cold war. We took part in activities on behalf of Spanish political prisoners and their families, and were early and ardent foes of American participation in the war in Vietnam. What bound us together is what brought us together in the first place—our anti-fascist conviction. There were times when we were virtually alone in opposing the dangerous policy of continued United States support for the regime of Generalissimo Francisco Franco. Now, more and more Americans are joining in the effort to halt further aid to the Spanish dictator.

In Spain, new forces representing most sectors of the population have gathered to put an end to General Franco's rule and establish a broad democratic regime. One of the deterrents in their path is the existence of United States bases on Spanish soil and our nation's military pact with General Franco that constantly threatens American military intervention in the event of major political change.

Former Senator J. W. Fulbright warned of this danger some years ago when he commented on the pact in these words: "We should have learned from the tragic war in Vietnam. A commitment which requires spending of money and results in stationing of our troops on foreign soil contains the prospect that it might require the spending of American lives."

The pact expires in August. If we can help Americans grasp Senator Fulbright's warning and convince Congress to end our military support of General Franco's Spain, we who have fought a lifetime for Spanish democracy will feel that we haven't spend these years in vain.

A NEW PARTY?

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, and other newspapers of liberal persuasion editorially sniff at the thought of a new political party, the nonestablishment press in the hinterlands is not nearly so skeptical.

I include an editorial from the Daily News of Salisbury, Md., which I suspect expresses thoughts far closer to the grassroots than most of the liberal media:

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Daily News,
Feb. 17, 1975]

A NEW PARTY

Young Americans for Freedom and the American Conservative Union hooped it up the other night, giving vent to pleas for a new part in American politics as well as criticism of both President Gerald Ford and his vice president, Nelson Rockefeller.

New parties have had little success in modern times in this country, although the glamorous Teddy Roosevelt did it with the Bull Moose, and George C. Wallace of Alabama shook the regulars up with his American party.

But, aside from that, the political exercise has been limited to the Democrats and Republicans, with the Democrats swinging to the left and the GOP remaining on the right as far as philosophies are concerned. But then that has been changing drastically in recent years. Gov. Wallace put his finger on it sometime ago when he said of two candidates for President—"there ain't 10 cents worth of difference between 'em."

Right now, we have the spectacle of a once conservative rightist, President Ford, embracing much of what the Democrats have advocated over the year. President Nixon, running as a conservative the first time he was elected, ended up as a deficit financier. The problems now heaped on President Ford of course, call for some drastic action to get the economy going. But too much deficit financing without reducing inflation is going to be a bitter dose for the American people.

So, whither the conservatives? One concern now is heading off Nelson Rockefeller as a possible presidential nominee in 1976.

With the government becoming more bloated with each passing year and costs arising accordingly, not only in Washington but down through the grass roots, the day may well be at hand when the people who foot these bills will be demanding a more authoritative voice in government. And, with both major parties now essentially the same—it may take a new party to seek the reforms this country needs, particularly in Congress.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, those who are vitally interested in ending discrimination against minorities must be constantly vigilant. One of the multitude of subjects on which a careful watch must be kept is the enforcement of affirmative action guidelines to prevent discrimination in the hiring practices of Federal contractors, particularly in institutions of higher education.

I should like to submit for the RECORD an article by William Raspberry which appeared in the February 19, 1975, issue of the Washington Post. I believe that the comments of Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS regarding HEW's Office for Civil Rights' enforcement and interpretation of affirmative action will be of interest to all Members:

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS ON "AFFIRMATIVE ACTION"

(By William Raspberry)

Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) wants in on the debate over "affirmative action."

The debate has been heating up since last December when Peter Holmes, head of HEW's Office for Civil Rights (HEW-OCR), issued new guidelines to "clarify" the responsibility of colleges and universities in hiring minorities and women for faculty positions.

The guidelines followed sustained pressure from certain groups, including some college and university faculty members, to soften HEW's requirements. Or, as it was usually put, to make certain that misin-

terpretation of the requirements did not lead to "reverse discrimination."

Congressman Hawkins has taken a good, hard look, and what he sees is not reverse discrimination but "HEW-OCR's abrogating its responsibility under the law."

Under the Holmes clarification, college and university presidents, formerly under the impression that they would have to increase their hiring of minority and women faculty members, on pain of losing their federal funds, now know better.

The clarification goes in two important directions. Those university chiefs who want to increase their minority and female representation were told that they cannot advertise in any way that might seem to discourage white, male applicants.

And those who don't want to change their hiring practices were told that they won't really have to, so long as they are careful to make sure that the list of rejected applicants contains the appropriate number of minorities and women and so long as none of the rejects is demonstrably better qualified than those who are hired, with the university itself the sole judge of qualification.

The requirements, guidelines and clarifications have their roots in Executive Order 11246 (as amended), which calls for federal contractors to ban ethnic, religious or sex discrimination in their hiring practices. It also requires them to take "affirmative action" to see to it that their practices are not discriminatory. Violation of the order could lead to cancellation of government contracts, although it rarely has.

"HEW-OCR is responsible under the executive order to enforce the order's provisions in all the (approximately 1,000) higher educational institutions having contracts with the federal government," Hawkins points out. "In light of (Holmes' "clarifying" memo), a major concern being expressed by growing numbers of minorities and women seeking college faculty employment, by minority contract compliance officers, by civil and human rights advocates, and by some members of Congress, is the question of HEW-OCR's employment enforcement inadequacies."

There also are growing doubts over HEW's willingness to enforce equal-employment provisions, "since its obvious interests are in the supposed preferential treatment being given to minorities and women," Hawkins told The Washington Post.

The real issue—in fact, the only issue—is the systematic, consistent, deliberate denial of equal employment opportunities to minorities and women by institutions of higher education, and the encouragement HEW-OCR has given these institutions to continue their policy of discriminatory hiring of faculty."

The discrimination is continuing, says Hawkins, even though the widespread charges of "reverse discrimination" might give the impression that minority and female professors are flooding the college campuses.

He cites data from the Civil Rights Commission report of last month showing that between 1968 and 1973 the percentage of blacks rose only from 2.2 to 2.9. The increase of women faculty members during the same period was from 19.1 percent to 20 percent.

"Clearly, the promise of equal employment opportunity has not been achieved in institutions of higher education," the Civil Rights Commission said, charging that "HEW's failure to enforce the executive orders has played no small role in frustrating this objective."

Hawkins, looking at the same data, sees clear evidence of HEW-OCR's foot-dragging in response to its federally mandated obligation."

"Mr. Holmes wants to make a major case for so-called reverse discrimination," said the chairman of the Equal Opportunities subcommittee of the House Committee on

Education and Labor." If reverse discrimination truly exists, it must be operating in a vacuum, since those persons supposedly experiencing this kind of discrimination (white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males) still overwhelmingly control all of our nation's colleges and universities.

"They have not suffered any meaningful employment problems; the continued low numbers of minorities and women in college and university faculty positions attest to this fact."

He said Holmes' office has no realistic affirmative action policy and "obviously they need some assistance in this matter."

"That assistance is forthcoming," Hawkins promised.

CYPRUS—7 MONTHS OF TRAGEDY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we note a tragic anniversary, for it was 7 months ago that the nation of Turkey unleashed her forces for an illegal and ruthless invasion of the island of Cyprus. During this period both the nation and people of Cyprus have been devastated from the effects of more than one-half a year of civil strife and occupation by Turkey.

We, in the Congress, have dedicated ourselves to the restoration of peace on Cyprus. I and others pushed on numerous occasions for an immediate cut off of aid to Turkey for being in blatant violation of the Foreign Assistance Act. Finally after long months of compromise and concession we were able to cut off this aid effective February 5, which marked a historic day for this Congress and for the struggle for peace on Cyprus.

We have also been committed to the rebuilding of Cyprus. Congress overwhelmingly adopted my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which provided \$25 million in emergency relief aid to Cyprus. This money will be used to provide food and shelter for the quarter of a million refugees on the island, and will also help to rebuild the ravaged Cypriot economy.

Recently the Long Island Press published an article which sized up Cyprus 6 months after the invasion. The article paints a bleak and tragic picture of the current situation on Cyprus. I hope it will serve to show my colleagues the continuing need for the United States to work and help the Cypriot people achieve peace and stability. We have begun, but we must be prepared to continue.

The article entitled "Cyprus: 6 Months After the Invasion" follows:

CYPRUS: 6 MONTHS AFTER THE INVASION

(By Richard C. Gross)

NICOSIA.—Six months after an invading Turkish force split this island in two, the agony of Cyprus goes on.

Its economy is shattered, people uprooted, shops looted, its communities divided by hatred and its future clouded by a rivalry that extends beyond its shores to embrace Greece, Turkey and the superpowers.

For about 20,000 Greek and Turkish Cypriots, many of them once middle-class citizens with homes, businesses and automobiles, the misery is compounded by the winter cold

and rain, beating down on the tents where they now live.

Tourism, the second most important source of hard currency on what used to be a vacation paradise, is dead, with hotels empty and unemployment high.

Hundreds of homes of Greek Cypriots have been taken over by Turkish Cypriots in areas conquered by the Turkish army.

And a 35,000-man Turkish army of occupation roams much of the island, hated by the Greek Cypriots and, according to neutral sources, now resented even by some of the Turkish Cypriots who welcomed them when they swept ashore in July.

The spark that ignited the Turkish invasion was the overthrow July 15 of Archbishop Makarios, the only president Cyprus has known in 14 years of independence from Britain.

The Greek Cypriot national guard, led by Greek officers under orders from the now-defunct military junta in Athens, seized power and installed a onetime terrorist and newspaper publisher, Nicos Sampson, as president. Makarios fled the island with British help. Makarios returned from exile Dec. 7, but he is no longer recognized by the Turkish Cypriots as president.

The Turks, fearing the coup was a prelude to the union of Cyprus with Greece, invaded five days later.

Turkish troops still control nearly 40 per cent of the island along its northern tier only 40 miles from Turkey across the eastern corner of the Mediterranean.

The Turks hold some of the most fertile land on the island and the main port of Famagusta. Most of the Greek Cypriots have fled south and Turkish Cypriots have gone north. An estimated 181,000 Greek Cypriots and 8,500 Turkish Cypriots remain homeless.

"I don't like to call it partition but two Cypriotes—a Turkish Cypriot and a Greek Cypriot," said the constitutional leader of the minority Turkish Cypriot community, Vice President Rauf Denktash. "I think we shall be forced to move in that direction."

About 650,000 persons live on Cyprus, two-thirds of which is forested mountains, with Nicosia dominating the nearly treeless central plain. Eighty-one per cent of the people are Greek Cypriots and 18 per cent Turkish Cypriots.

Britain, succeeding earlier invaders, controlled the island from 1878 to 1959. Then a guerrilla campaign led by Makarios and Gen. George Grivas forced the British to grant independence.

With a constitution that tried to spell out every detail in the apportionment of power to both sides, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots bickered incessantly over who had the right to control what.

Violence erupted in December 1963. Clashes continued until United Nations troops moved in the following year to establish order. The troops have been there ever since, at a cost of \$350 million. More clashes occurred in 1967.

Before the invasion Loukis Pieri, 42, lived in Famagusta where he owned an auto driving school with four automobiles. He fled the oncoming Turks with one of the cars, his wife and the clothes on his back.

He now lives in the Lefkarides tent city and shares a tent with his in-laws.

"I'm not used to these things," said Pieri, who said he left \$22,000 worth of assets behind. "I'm 42 and never saw a war. It's like being in a shipwreck and then being all alone on a raft waiting and hoping for another ship to come."

"These people were the well-off in the country and this is what accentuates the refugee problem," said shaçallı Linus, a government refugee official. "These are not people like the Palestinians and those from Bangladesh. They had their own cars, their own businesses. Their own homes and all of

a sudden they find themselves in a tent with nothing.

"If these people cannot return to their homes, the economy will be completely destroyed and we can't foresee the consequences."

It costs the Cypriot government \$5.5 million a month to feed and care for the refugees.

Of the 105,000 Turkish Cypriots, 51,000 lived south of the Turkish-occupied region before the war. About 20,000 have fled behind the Turkish lines in the north since then, and the rest are trying to get north, government and Turkish Cypriot officials said.

"Today they feel they have a country in the north and they want to go there," an official of the International Red Cross said. "They have received instructions to go north. It's very well organized."

Neutral sources said 2,000 Turkish Cypriots have moved into Greek Cypriot homes in the north.

Several sources from international organizations said there was some disenchantment over the Turkish occupation among Turkish Cypriots.

"There are new facts being created and it is becoming a Turkish administration, not a Turkish Cypriot administration," one observer said. "Mainland generals say business executives are coming in and they are threatening to take over from the Turkish Cypriots."

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, ironically, February 16 marked the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Republic of Lithuania, as well as the 724th year since the founding of that state.

In fact, the history of Lithuania and her sister "Captive Nations" has been one lacking both freedom and independence, for, with the invasion and occupation of these Baltic States by the Soviet Union in 1940, Lithuanians have enjoyed the basic human liberties of independence for but 22 years since World War I.

The past decade of international intercourse has been heralded as the new age of "détente" and improved Soviet relations. Yet, the examples of Simas Kudirka and that Lithuanian sailor's bold leap for freedom, the recently arrested and imprisoned Lithuanian and Russian champions of religious freedom, and those few of the many dissidents who have gained visibility, must serve as a constant reminder of the painful, unyielding pursuit of this nation for freedom from oppression.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to match our accomplishments on the United States-Soviet political front with efforts on the very personal, human level of securing an end to such tyranny. We have as support and testimony the strong Lithuanian people, their intact culture, unfaltering spirit, and insatiable desire for freedom, independence, and self government.

The upcoming celebration of our Bicentennial of freedom should give pause to all Americans to reflect upon the many civil liberties we so often take for granted and others still fight so valiantly to secure. As we acknowledge our 200th year of independence, our thoughts should go to the 724-year-old nation of Lithuanians and their continuing struggle for human dignity and national recognition.

THE NONCANDIDATE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, though we are only midway through the second month of 1975, we are already beginning to witness an increasingly intense political and public relations battle among hordes of contestants for the 1976 Democratic Presidential nomination.

As usual, most of the combatants are located in a single place, the Senate of the United States. One day we see a senatorial visage adorning the cover of Time magazine. Then we learn of a campaign announcement film costing \$23,000. We hear of yet another summons to the press to flock to the Senate caucus room for an announcement of candidacy. And we read of other Senators, seemingly more reticent, who avoid overt declarations of candidacy but await the summons of a "brokered" convention.

The question that inevitably occurs to all of us who labor in the quiet anonymity of the House is this: Where will it stop?

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to be able to provide my colleagues with an answer to that question. It stops in room 248 of the Russell Senate Office Building, the office of the distinguished junior Senator from my home State of Maine, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.

No less an authority than the nationally syndicated columnist Arthur Hoppe has reported that Senator HATHAWAY will not—repeat, not—be a candidate for President in 1976. I have tried to reach the Senator for comment on these reports, but I have been told that he is studying the public statements of Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman and cannot be disturbed. However, the Senator's staff has assured me that Mr. Hoppe's report is substantially accurate. Senator HATHAWAY does not have a \$1 million war chest, and he has no plans to be photographed in an Indian war bonnet in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, while I regret that plans for the Hathaway Library in Auburn, Maine, must now be necessarily deferred for a few years, I nonetheless wish to commend my good friend for his statesmanlike decision. In keeping with the hands-across-the-aisle spirit that has characterized the Maine congressional delegation since my election to Congress,

I wish my Democratic colleague well in his nonquest of noncandidacy, and I insert Mr. Hoppe's article, "The Leading Front-Non-Runner," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

THE LEADING FRONT-NON-RUNNER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The most distinguished senator in Washington these days is William D. Hathaway of Maine. What distinguishes him from his colleagues is that he is the only Democrat in the Senate who is not running for President.

The bombshell news broke here last week when Senator Hathaway announced he would hold a press conference next Monday to announce he would make a major address a week from the following Tuesday to announce that he wasn't running for President.

Rumors that the husky, cigar-smoking, well-liked, freshman senator wouldn't immediately seek the presidency have been circulating here since his upset victory over Margaret Chase Smith in 1972.

As long ago as last April, he confided to a reporter from the Bangor (Maine) Weekly Bulletin that "many of my close friends and associates have urged me, for the good of the country, not to run."

He said at the time that he was "seriously considering" that course. "However, I must also think of the welfare of my family," he added. "The presidency pays more money."

Since then he has gradually been tabbed as the leading front-non-runner in an under-crowded field.

The fact that he had not raised more than \$1 million from party fat cats before the campaign contribution law was tightened only added fuel to the rumors. Moreover, he has not once been photographed eating a knish in the Bronx, wearing a Sioux bonnet in Sioux Falls, or identifying himself to disinterested, homeward-bound factory workers.

Instead of charging about the country criticizing the President, it has been widely noted, Senator Hathaway has steadfastly remained in Washington criticizing the President.

In his announcement announcing his forthcoming announcement that he wouldn't run, the senator pledged, to the relief of many, that he would not issue a position paper on the Middle East.

"It is not that I don't have a position," he said. "It's that I don't understand it."

He added, however, that he stood four-square for full employment, lower taxes, improved welfare benefits and a balanced budget. "It's just that I don't see," he told his cheering non-supporters, "how all that's possible."

In a rare private interview (he is rarely asked for one), the moderately liberal senator was asked if he would have to adopt a more conservative image in hopes of losing the liberal vote. Would he, for example, speak out for doubling the defense budget and quadrupling our aid to Vietnam?

"I've found it very difficult to change my image," he said. "My wonderful wife, Mary, has been trying for years. But I always instinctively duck."

Would he instead, then, vote for what he believed in? "Yes," he said firmly. "And I believe in getting reelected."

Finally, he was asked the critical question: "Why, sir, are you, a popular, respected member of the majority party, not running for the presidency?"

A far-away look entered his eye. "Hmmm," he said, pausing to blow a smoke ring, "now that you mention it . . ."

DR. EDELIN: VICTIM OF A NEW
CRIME

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I know there must be many Americans who, like myself, were shocked to hear a verdict of guilty in the manslaughter case against Massachusetts physician, Kenneth C. Edelin. A Washington Post editorial of February 18 lays out the case and its implications extremely well and I would like to have it reprinted here:

THE EDELIN TRIAL

By convicting Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin for manslaughter, the State of Massachusetts has brought disgrace to itself and to the whole judicial system. The charge against the doctor should never have been brought by the prosecutor. The trial judge should never have allowed the case to go to the jury. And the jury's verdict, itself, is suspect. While we believe the conviction will not stand on appeal because it is constitutionally invalid, the wrong which has been committed in Massachusetts against Dr. Edelin, the medical profession and the law itself cannot be fully repaired.

The charge against Dr. Edelin—murdering a fetus during a legal operation by failing to take all possible steps to bring it to, or to continue its life—may well be unique in American legal history. There was no law on the statute books and no prior case suggesting that the routine procedure used in an abortion operation involved a criminal act. The prosecutor thought up the legal theory of his case—that a fetus is a live human being—and found someone to try the theory out on. He took no steps to warn Dr. Edelin or the medical profession that he had created a new crime. That lack of notice, alone, is enough in our view to make this conviction unconstitutional and to establish that the prosecutor grossly abused the power the law places in his hands. Regardless of what one thinks about abortion, it ought to be obvious that there is something fundamentally unfair about charging a man with murder without warning him in advance that what he and other doctors have been doing for years is now to be considered murder. Only a prosecutor with a low regard for the Bill of Rights and no regard at all for elementary fairness would proceed in this manner.

The same process, however, has been followed by the Boston prosecutor in a second case. Next on his list are four doctors who are charged with violating an 1914 law against grave-robbing. The charge against them is that they performed unauthorized autopsies by engaging in medical research on aborted and dead fetuses without getting permission for autopsies from the women who had been aborted. At the time the research was being conducted, hospitals and doctors generally regarded an aborted fetus as surgical tissue to be routinely disposed of the same way other surgical tissue is disposed of. As in the Edelin case, the prosecutor created a crime, failed to warn anyone that the routine procedures would place him in jeopardy, and proceeded to seek and win an indictment.

The impact of these two cases on the practice of medicine and on medical research in Boston, and elsewhere, is likely to be enormous. It will mean that some women

will be denied the abortion to which the Supreme Court has said they have a right. It will mean that doctors will have to attempt to bring life to a fetus when they are convinced it can have no meaningful life. If the principles of these cases are to be enforced, prosecutors or police will have a reason to patrol operating rooms and hospitals. And the two cases already have brought to a halt much of the medical and biological research that involves the use of a fetus or of fetal tissue. It is worth noting that one of the essential steps in developing a vaccine against polio involved the use of fetal tissue in laboratory experiments.

Behind all this, of course, is an effort to sneak around the Supreme Court decision limiting the power of states to make abortions illegal. The Boston prosecutor has done indirectly what he must know he cannot do directly. That, in itself, is an expression of gross disregard for the system of law that has generally served this nation well for 200 years. The proper way to have proceeded in these matters would have been for the Massachusetts legislature to have passed laws creating the crimes the prosecutor has created on his own. Those laws could then have been tested in court—where we believe they would have been held unconstitutional—without dragging in five bystanders and charging them with crimes for doing what they believed to be ethically and legally correct work.

Those who oppose abortion and the Supreme Court decision do have legitimate courses of action open to them. They can try to narrow the scope of the decision through legislation. They can try to persuade the Court, in a proper case, that it was wrong. And they can try to persuade Congress and the state legislatures that the Constitution should be amended. We hope such efforts fail, because we believe the matter of abortion is a subject that rests properly with a woman and her doctor. While we defend the right of those who disagree with us to seek their goal through legitimate means, it should be clear that legitimate means can never include the attempt by the prosecutor's fiat to create new crimes and thereby to control private and medical ethics.

The demonstration of raw power that has been permitted to go on this month in a Boston courtroom, unfortunately, is not unique. It has occurred before when prosecutors and judges used the processes of the law to harass those whose views they would not tolerate. But that does not excuse it.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1975, marks a special day in man's historic struggle for freedom and self-determination, for it was on that day 57 years ago that the Estonian people established their own government and proclaimed their independence.

The Estonian American National Council in the Chicago region is commemorating this 57th anniversary of freedom with a program at the Latvian Community Center, 4146 North Elston Avenue in Chicago, on Sunday, February 23.

Taking part in the commemoration ceremonies are Olaf Tamrk, chairman of the Estonian Association of Northern Illinois, who will be the independence day speaker, Mrs. Tamrk, a soloist in the musical program, and the young people playing musical instruments.

The president of the Estonian Society of Chicago is August Parts, and the regional director of the Estonian American National Council for the Midwest is Alexander Koepp. These men are performing dedicated service to the members of these organizations and to their community.

The Republic of Estonia grew and prospered for 22 years from February 24, 1918, to June 1940, when that nation was overrun by the Soviet empire and forcibly incorporated by the Soviet Union. Estonians have not accepted this foreign occupation of their land and still risk their lives to defy their Communist captors.

Tragically, the freedom-loving people now living in Estonia are unable to join in celebrating this auspicious independence day occasion, as they are forced to live in bondage under the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union. Despite their long suffering under the harsh yoke of communism, no amount of repression has succeeded in stifling the Estonian's yearning and constant hope for sovereignty and individual freedom.

Periodically stories of persecution and suppression of human rights break through the Soviet curtain of censorship, but we may be sure that there are many such violations which do not become known publicly. According to census figures for 1970, Estonians constituted only 68 percent of the population as opposed to 88 percent in 1939. This is a reflection of the fact that the Russian Communists have continued their campaign of intimidation and harassment in Estonia through these long years of occupation with mass deportations to other parts of the Soviet Union and attempts to destroy Estonian cultural autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, it was for these reasons that I introduced the following resolution at the beginning of the 94th Congress:

Whereas the Government and the people of the United States of America have maintained and enjoyed excellent and friendly relations with the Governments and peoples of the Baltic States Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, during the years of independence of these Republics; and

Whereas the concept of liberty and freedom of choice of government is still alive in this country, as it has been constantly since the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the evidence produced at the hearings of the select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics overwhelmingly tends to prove that the actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to these free and independent Baltic Republics were contrary to the principles of international law and the principles of freedom; and

Whereas the people of this Nation have consistently shown great sympathy for the peoples of these three Republics, especially as a result of their enslavement and as a

In short, they are interpreted as signs of health.

Those who insist that they are signs of a severe social disease can be dismissed as starchy-eyed moralists, sentimentalists and understandably without influence or power. As a matter of fact, the few serious moral critics of our society do not have constituents. Intellectually and temperamentally they cannot appeal to the masses. Neither can they expect support from radicals of the right or the left because they tend to be as much concerned with methods as they are with ends; they cannot accept moral ends through immoral means.

The moral schizophrenia pervasive in the American society appears to be no more curable by words than is personal schizophrenia curable by psychotherapeutic preachments. Political, religious, civil-rights panaceas have been tried and found palliative at best and cruelly disillusioning at worst.

The essential for hope is to be found in that critical minority of human beings who insist upon being unrealistic, who for some still unknown set of reasons continue to argue that human beings are somehow capable of the possibility of empathy, compassion and sensitivity even as cruelty and hostility and insensitivity and rationalized dishonesty now dominate.

Fortunately for the future of a civilized society there exist these human beings who, while they are not nominated for high office and if nominated are not elected, nonetheless remain concerned about moral and ethical values and justice in the affairs of men.

They also seem to have the courage to risk the repeated expressions of their concern and thereby serve as a gnawing and irritating conscience to those who have attained success.

In the final analysis only these individuals provide the hope for that ultimate type of realism that is defined by the capacity of a society to survive rather than to be destroyed eventually on the altar of human barbarity.

THE KIWANIS CLUB OF COMPTON CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time member of the Kiwanis Club, I would like to salute the Kiwanis Club of Compton, Calif., on the 50th anniversary which was celebrated on February 5.

Carrying the tradition of this fine organization which was begun in 1915 to give individual men the opportunity to take an active role in community affairs, the Kiwanis Club of Compton has long promoted service and responsibility rooted in sound ideals and principles. This particular chapter has dedicated itself to enriching the human and spiritual values of life by living up to the meaning of the word Kiwanis, an Indian saying for "We trade."

Recognized as a group of citizens committed to promoting high idealism in public and personal relationships, members of the Kiwanis Club, of Compton, are concerned with helping both young and old to enjoy a richer life. During their 50-year history, they have raised over \$100,000 which has been donated to the community, particularly for proj-

ects related to the development of our youth.

All Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the Kiwanis organization. Its 275,000 members of 5,900 local chapters have proven responsive to community needs—growing from their original interest in public affairs and underprivileged children to recognize changes in society and so adapt their programs to meet special needs. For this reason, their constitution is never static but rather flexible to meet changing times.

The Compton Kiwanis is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when men of good will cooperate in the spirit of public service. I join the community and city officials in congratulating all Kiwanians on this milestone occasion of their golden anniversary. I know that the next 50 years will bring a continuation of their leadership as a dynamic force in community life.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING'S BIRTHDAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, it is especially fitting that we of the 94th Congress give every consideration to legislation designating Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday a national holiday. Given the current state of the economy and the President's proposals, it would be all too easy for this session of Congress to ignore the great social wrongs to which Dr. King's efforts were addressed. Passage of this legislation would show the poor people of our country that Congress is committed to the ideals voiced by the Reverend Dr. King.

Dr. King was a man of deep faith, single-mindedness of purpose and great dignity. His philosophy of passive non-violence has much to offer to the poor and oppressed of all colors, ages, and national origins. If today we pay new attention to the ideals of civil disobedience, perhaps we, too, can have the successes which Dr. King was able to achieve in the area of civil rights. His Montgomery, Ala., boycott of buses was a landmark in the all-too-brief history of the eradication of injustices committed against minorities. The November 1956 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court declaring segregation on Alabama buses to be unconstitutional was a watershed both for Dr. King and for all those dedicated to the fight against discrimination and oppression. That decision demonstrated that violence is not the only way to end injustice in America. Martin Luther King's vision that true equality in our country can be achieved through commitment to the ideal of brotherhood and the tactics of civil disobedience—sit-ins at lunch counters and department stores, freedom rides, boycotts and marches—was no idle folly. Nonviolent passive resistance has helped the black people in America. We of the

94th Congress can demonstrate to the American people that we are dedicated to equality for black people and for all Americans who suffer from prejudice.

We cannot ignore racism. We cannot ignore the oppression of minorities in our country. It is incumbent upon this Congress to restore the public's waning confidence in Government by dealing with the actual problems of our people. Let us show this Nation's poor, those who took part in Dr. King's poor people's campaign of 1968, that the man they looked to for leadership, whose dream they shared, is honored by his country.

BILL TO PROTECT THE VOTING RIGHTS OF AMERICANS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING BACKGROUND

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with Congressman HERMAN BADILLO, of New York, a measure which has historic importance in protecting the right to vote of American citizens of Mexican and Puerto Rican backgrounds under the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. This bill would also strengthen existing provisions of the Voting Rights Act by extending the act an additional 10 years, by establishing a permanent ban on literacy, and adding court review of the Attorney General's failure to send Federal examiners under the act.

The main thrust of this bill is to assure that Americans of Spanish-speaking backgrounds are not denied the right to vote.

There has been a systematic effort to deny the right to vote to Mexican Americans and Puerto Rican Americans and render their vote ineffective. Section 1 of this bill states the findings of Congress concerning voting abuses against persons of Spanish origin. It points to the existence of procedures and practices with respect to voting, including English only election and registration procedures, which purposely or effectively discriminate against persons of Spanish origin contrary to the 14th and 15th amendments.

There are over 6 million Spanish-speaking Americans of Mexican descent living in the United States. The vast majority live in the five Southwestern States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California. Most are poor, many are illiterate in English and large numbers are subject to a variety of discriminatory laws and conduct which operate pervasively to deny equal opportunities in housing, employment, education, and voting. With regard to voting in particular, Mexican Americans in the Southwest are subject to a myriad of laws and practices which deny them the right to vote as effectively as similar laws and practices deny the right to vote to black Americans living in the South.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was

passed because previous statutory attempts to rectify voting rights abuses in certain jurisdictions of the Nation had proved frustrating and unsuccessful. The same situation with regard to registration and voter turnout as between whites and blacks in the Deep South of 1965 prevails today in the Southwest as between Anglos and Mexican Americans. Under-registration and lower voter turnout are pervasive among Mexican Americans. According to a survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census, only 46 percent of Mexican Americans reported themselves as registered to vote, with only 37.5 percent reported as voting. The comparable figures for whites are 73.4 percent registered, and 64.5 percent voting.

Not surprisingly, when minority voters are denied access to the ballot box, they are denied the chance to elect members of their own groups to political office.

In California, for instance, Mexican Americans comprise 18.8 percent of the total State population. Yet, in 1970, of 15,650 major elected and appointed positions at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—only 310 or 1.98 percent were held by Mexican Americans. In Texas, where Mexican Americans comprise 18 percent of the population, only 298, or 10.7 percent of the 2,770 elective offices were held by Mexican Americans. The same discriminatory patterns are apparent with respect to Federal officials. Thus, although each congressman represents on an average approximately 480,000 people, the 3.8 million Mexican Americans in California have elected only one Congressman. Similarly, the 2.3 million Mexican Americans in Texas have elected only two congressmen.

By comparison, in the nine counties of Arizona presently covered by the Voting Rights Act, the percentage of Mexican American elected officials has nearly doubled since 1965 and the State just elected a Mexican American governor. Arizona's population of Mexican Americans is 18.8 percent, yet of 424 Federal, State, and local elective offices, only 34—8.2 percent—are held by Mexican Americans.

A recent study of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights of voting abuses directed against Mexican Americans in Uvalde County, Tex., shows many of the same practices which were prevalent in the Deep South in the early 1960's. The Civil Rights Commission study shows that duly registered Chicano voters are not being placed on the voting lists; that election judges are selectively invalidating ballots cast by minority voters; that election judges are refusing to aid minority voters who are illiterate in English; that the tax assessor-collector of Uvalde County, under Texas law responsible for registering voters, refuses to name members of minority groups as deputy registrars; that the Uvalde County tax assessor-collector repeatedly "runs out" of registration application cards when minority voter applicants ask for them; that the Uvalde County tax assessor-collector refuses to register voter applicants based on the technicality that the application was filed on a printed card bearing a previous year's date.

Other abuses were uncovered by the

study of the Civil Rights Commission in Uvalde County, and elsewhere in Texas: widespread gerrymandering with the purpose of diluting minority voting strength; systematic drawing of at-large electoral districts with the same purpose and design; maintenance of polling places only in areas inaccessible to minority voters; excessive filing fees required in order to run for political office; numbered paper ballots which need to be signed by the voter, thus making it possible to discover for whom an individual cast his ballot.

Texas has other voting abuses, especially involving annexation of only Anglo areas but not Mexican American neighborhoods, redistricting in which all Mexican Americans are huddled into one county precinct although they constitute 70 to 80 percent of the county population, shifts from single member elections to at-large elections—each practice in itself having the effect of diluting and rendering the Mexican American vote ineffective.

In California, the most serious impediments to full enfranchisement of the urban Mexican American have been gerrymandering and registration abuses. The problems are especially acute in Los Angeles County where the majority of the California Chicanos reside. The results of gerrymandering can be observed by the fact that 3.8 million Spanish-speaking in the State are represented by one Federal representative—out of 43—2 State senators—out of 40—and 4 State assemblymen—out of 80.

Rural Mexican Americans in California also face problems similar to those faced by Mexican Americans in Texas. These include economic and physical intimidation, language difficulties coupled with complex voting and registration procedures—only recently did California provide for bilingual election and voting procedures—poor or nonexistent voting assistance to migrants and farmworkers, and difficulties in obtaining a sufficient number of registrars.

The Civil Rights Commission and citizen groups have not been alone in finding a history and tradition of invidious discrimination directed against Mexican Americans. In *Graves against Barnes*, the Federal District Court for the Western District of Texas made extensive findings which show that the Mexican Americans community in Bexar County, Tex.—San Antonio—has been victimized by long-standing State policies which have both the design and effect of discrimination. The court in *Graves* mandated single-member State legislature electoral districts for Bexar County, because multimember districts, when viewed in the context of past and present discrimination, unconstitutionally operated to deny an effective opportunity for Mexican Americans to make an impact on the political process. Language was only one problem, the court said:

This cultural and language impediment, conjoined with the poll tax and the most restrictive voter registration procedures in the nation have operated to effectively deny Mexican Americans access to political processes in Texas even longer than the Blacks were formally denied access by the white primary. [Id., at 731.]

In a January 1975 report entitled "The Voting Rights Act: Ten Years Later," the Civil Rights Commission also dramatize continuing abuses against Mexican American and Puerto Rican American voters. These practices include location of polling places as a deterrent to voting, inadequacy of voting facilities, adverse changes in polling places, lack of minority and bilingual election officials including supervisors, and lack of a bilingual electoral and registration process.

Further, the Commission report stresses the need for federally conducted surveys in selected States and counties to determine the level of voter registration and turnout by race and national origin. On this point, the law is quite clear: Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 mandates that the Secretary of Commerce must conduct a survey to compile registration and voting statistics by race and national origin in areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. It is my understanding that the Civil Rights Commission requested on two separate occasions that the Commerce Department conduct a survey on voting and registration for Americans of Spanish-speaking backgrounds. Despite the statutory mandate, the Commerce Department has ignored those requests. It is vital that Congress rectify this serious omission and act immediately to insure that the Federal Government meet its statutory responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this bill, which I have introduced today to amend the Voting Rights Act to protect the right to vote of persons of Spanish origin.

Section 1 of the bill establishes a new coverage formula designed to apply in areas which have a significant Spanish origin population. The latter is defined as any State or political subdivision of a State with respect to which the Director of the Census determines that more than 5 percent of the voting age citizens are of Spanish origin.

The formula consists of two conditions to be determined by the Census Director and the Attorney General, respectively: First, registration or voting averages, which are below the national average in connection with the 1964 and 1968 presidential elections; second, exclusive reliance upon the English language in all aspects of registering and voting.

States and localities which fall within this coverage formula would be subject to the remedial "cures" authorized by existing law. Covered areas would be subject to section 5's voter law clearance procedures, section 6's Federal registration requirements, and section 8's poll observer provisions. In order to reinstate its own registration and voting processes, a State or local subdivision would have to demonstrate to a three-judge District of Columbia court that it has not used—during the preceding 10 years—any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practices or procedure which had the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote as guaranteed by the 14th and 15th amendments.

The three-judge District of Columbia court—appeals from whose decisions go

directly to the Supreme Court—would retain jurisdiction for 5 years over a State or local unit which has reinstated its own processes. During that time, the Attorney General can ask the court to reopen the case for purposes of challenging a discriminatory law or procedure.

However, if the Attorney General determines that a State or political subdivision has not engaged in a prohibited discriminatory practice during 10 years preceding the filing of an action, he is required to consent to the entry of judgment.

Section 2 of the bill would amend the act's section 5 voter law clearance procedures to make them apply to the provisions of section 4 of the act as amended by this bill. Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act dictates that whenever certain States or political subdivisions wish to change their electoral laws or procedures, such changes must be approved as non-discriminatory by either the Attorney General or a three-judge district court in the District of Columbia. Clearly section 5 provides an efficient administrative mechanism for dealing with voting abuses experienced by Americans of Spanish origin or descent. And clearly it is needed today in the Southwest as much as it was needed in the South of the mid-1960's.

Section 3 of the bill would make an amendment to section 6's provision authorizing Federal examiners for similar purposes.

Section 4 of the bill specifies an additional condition requiring more than 50 percent registration of Spanish origin voters for terminating Federal registration requirements.

Section 5 of the bill extends for an additional time—10 years—the provisions of section 4(a) of the 1965 act which ban the use of literacy tests in certain States upon the finding of certain conditions by the Attorney General.

Section 6 of the bill provides for limited review procedure by the Federal district court whenever the Attorney General fails to make a certification under the Federal registration requirements of the Voting Rights Act.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 201(a) of the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, to permanently ban literacy tests and related devices within the jurisdiction of the United States.

This bill clarifies and legislatively strengthens recent Federal court decisions affecting Spanish speaking voting participation. These decisions provide a reliable basis for enactment of my voting rights measure. In Katzenbach against Morgan, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress has the power to interfere with any State interest served by an English literacy requirement in order to remedy equal protection clause infringements. Moreover, the justices noted that grounds exist for extending voting safeguards to persons of Spanish origin.

Further, in both South Carolina against Katzenbach, and in Oregon against Mitchell, the constitutionality of the original act and the 1970 amendments, respectively, were sustained in suits brought by several States, one of which was Arizona, which has a substantial

Mexican American population. And in Oregon, eight justices concurred that a nationwide ban on tests and devices could be constitutionally grounded on the 15th amendment and could operate to bar discrimination against Mexican Americans. In so holding Justice Black wrote:

Congress also had evidence to show that voter registration in areas with large Spanish-American populations was consistently below the state and national averages. In Arizona for example, only two counties out of eight with Spanish-surname populations in excess of 15% showed a voter registration equal to the statewide average.

A number of lower court rulings, such as Torres against Sachs, and Arroyo against Tucker, have recently ordered election authorities to provide Spanish language aids to certain persons of Spanish origin so that they might fully exercise the franchise.

PARAGUAYAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS ENCOURAGED BY THE UNITED STATES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Paraguay makes steady progress in South America. We are always proud of Paraguay as it consistently supports, under the capable leadership of President Alfredo Stroessner, all progressive programs with the United States. Here in the Congress of Washington, we are interested in keeping up with the current plans and developments in Paraguay. I asked our Ambassador, George W. Landau, to give me a current economic summary from down there in Asuncion. I know you will be interested in the current economic report from Paraguay.

The summary follows:

PARAGUAY

Although Paraguay is one of the poorest nations in the Western Hemisphere with a current per capita income of approximately \$350, great strides have been taken in recent years to not only improve the standard of living of the country's inhabitants but to promote economic development as well. Thanks to recently concluded agreements with her two neighbors, Brazil and Argentina, Paraguay is presently on the threshold of a major economic change. As a result of these agreements to construct two and possibly three major hydroelectric installations, Paraguay may become within the next decade one of the world's richest nations on a per capita basis in electric energy.

Paraguay is a completely landlocked country approximately the size of California but with a population of only 2.5 million. Traditionally the Paraguayan economy has largely been dedicated to subsistence agriculture with a foreign trade based on exports of primary products and imports of machinery and equipment to assist in the modernization of the country. Cattle raising is the principle economic activity of the nation and meat products the main export.

In addition there are exports of a wide variety of other agricultural products, including cotton, soybeans, tobacco and essential oils. Another major export in recent years

has been lumber from Paraguay's extensive forests. In the past five years Paraguay's exports have increased by more than 300 percent while, during the same period, her foreign exchange reserves have risen by 800 percent. Foreign investment has also been on the increase bringing needed capital for fuller development and utilization of the nation's human and natural resources.

By the signing of treaties with Brazil and Argentina for the construction of two and possibly three major hydroelectric complexes on the upper Parana River, Paraguay has begun a new and important stage in her economic development. The current estimate for the total cost of construction of the joint Paraguayan-Brazilian hydroelectric projects at Itaipu is \$5 billion. When completed, this project will include the largest single hydroelectric dam in the world with a generating capacity of almost 12.5 million kilowatts. The agreement signed with Argentina provides for the construction of a joint hydroelectric project at Yacyretá-Appé presently estimated to cost \$3 billion. This dam will have a generating capacity of 3.3 million kilowatts. A third hydroelectric project called Corpus which also would be constructed jointly with Argentina, is presently being studied.

Once these projects are completed, Paraguay's half share in the production will make her one of the world's largest per capita electric energy producers. Adding this potential to Paraguay's traditional encouragement of foreign investment plus the political and social stability brought about under the leadership of President Alfredo Stroessner, a rapid economic development for the nation and her people seems assured.

Traditionally, Paraguay has welcomed interest in its potential markets here by American companies, and can be expected to be an excellent market for goods and services related to the new hydro-power schemes and the industry they will stimulate.

AN URGENT NEED: THE NURSE TRAINING ACT

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, last year, the House passed a 3-year extension of the Nurse Training Act because extensive hearings and study of the situation showed that continued Federal assistance was needed: First, to maintain the supply of registered nurses; second, to increase the numbers prepared as nurse practitioners, clinical specialists, and for other positions requiring advanced preparation; and, third, to improve the distribution of registered nurses. On February 19, 1975, I cosponsored the Nurse Training Act of 1975, H.R. 3268.

The 1974 bill was pocket-vetoed by the President after the 93d Congress had adjourned. Now, the administration has come out with a proposed budget for fiscal 1976 that would abruptly wipe out practically all assistance to nursing schools and students. I am hard-pressed to understand the logic behind these actions. For one thing, we certainly should maintain our supply of nurses—they constitute the largest group of health care providers.

Also, given the present state of the economy, this could have a devastating

effect on many States which would have to try to replace this loss of funds. In addition, most nursing students do not come from high-income families, and it would mean that many of them would have to give up their education plans. This was pointed out in a recent letter to the Washington Post, a copy of which is attached. As we will soon have the Nurse Training Act before us again for action, I think my colleagues would find this letter of interest. I hereby insert it in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1975]

IN THE BUDGET: A THREAT TO HEALTH CARE

As The Post points out in a Feb. 4 article by Stuart Auerbach (20% Cut Proposed in Health Spending) the President's fiscal 1976 budget would reduce spending for such important health delivery programs as maternal and child health, migrant health care, immunization, mental health and others.

But nearly overlooked in the huge budget report is the threat to present and future health care delivery posed by cuts in funds for health manpower training. Nursing, the largest of the health professions, would be particularly hard hit with virtually all support wiped out. This sudden drop from a \$146 million funding level in 1975 could bring serious results. Allied health and public health student aid are also badly cut.

Some 50,000 nursing students face loss of loan, scholarship and traineeship funds. In the President's budget, scholarships and loans are reduced to phase out levels and traineeships for advanced education are eliminated. Many nursing students would be unable to continue their education. Experience has shown that this is particularly true of those seeking advanced preparation to become nurse practitioners, clinical specialists, teachers, nursing service directors, all areas of severe shortages today.

The proposed budget also would eliminate all direct aid to schools of nursing which will doubtless mean program cutbacks and in some cases, school closings. With support and incentives offered under the Nurse Training Act of 1971, enrollments increased by some 45,000 from 1971 to 1974. However, this gain could prove short-lived if federal aid is abruptly ended.

The President quite rightly observes that greater attention is needed on the problem of maldistribution of health personnel. A partial answer to this problem is being provided by nurse practitioners prepared to provide primary care. Many are working in rural and inner city locations where health services have been scarce or non-existent. There are still only a few thousand nurses prepared to function in this capacity, yet the administration budget does not provide for any expansion of programs preparing nurse practitioners, and it includes no assistance for nurses wishing to get this kind of advanced training.

A bill extending the Nurse Training Act and including funds specifically earmarked for expansion of nurse practitioner programs and advanced nurse training was pocket vetoed by the President following adjournment of the 93rd Congress. It has been reintroduced in the 94th. We think it is crucial to the future of health care in this country and urge that it be speedily enacted into law.

EILEEN M. JACOBI,

Executive Director, American
Nurse Association, Inc.

WASHINGTON.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here today to commemorate the 57th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and to decry the Soviet Union's 35-year occupation of that proud and gallant nation.

Lithuania has existed as a nation for more than seven centuries, and on February 16, 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was established. Yet you will not find that nation drawn on any maps today as a distinct country. Why? Because after only 22 years of independence, Lithuania and her neighboring countries, Latvia and Estonia, were successfully invaded and absorbed by the Soviet Union in 1940.

I find that not only sad, but ironic. I find it ironic because yearly we witness the emergence of infant nations, see them recognized by the United Nations, and hear them hailed by the Soviets. Yet the ancient and honorable nation of Lithuania remains a virtual colony of the Soviet Union and we see no end to this policy of Russification in the near future.

While advocating self-determination in developing nations, the Soviets carry on a reign of terror in Lithuania, violently suppressing personal and religious freedoms.

Despite persecution and imprisonment, the Lithuanians continue their struggle, their spirit unbroken. In the recent past, we have seen dramatic proof of the Lithuanians' courage.

In 1970, a Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, leaped to freedom from a Soviet fishing ship off the Massachusetts coast.

In 1972, Romas Kalanta set fire to himself to protest Soviet repression and sparked demonstrations by thousands of other young Lithuanians.

Although Kalanta died for his beliefs, Seaman Kudirka's story has a happier ending. As many of you already know, Mr. Kudirka's escape was aborted and he was mistakenly returned to Soviet custody. Tried for treason, he was imprisoned for 4 years and 10 months. While sympathetic Americans, including many of us here in Congress, attempted to free him. Last August his release was secured. The fact that his mother was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., and he was able to claim American citizenship made his release easier. But it was not until November that he and his family were finally able to emigrate to the United States.

Seaman Kudirka was one of the fortunate. Nameless thousands of his countrymen are not so lucky. They are in prison, literally and figuratively, waiting for the day when their homeland will once again be free.

We cannot forget these people. I am proud that the United States has ada-

manly refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors. But we must do more, and now, in the present spirit of détente, is the time.

**A WORRIED CONSTITUENT VOICES
FRUSTRATION**

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in the past month I have received letters from many of my constituents voicing their frustration, and their sense that the administration just does not care about the great needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals in our Nation. These income groups, already the segment of our population which bears the largest share of the suffering which results from our present inflation/recession spiral, find no comfort in the President's proposals to deal with our economic and energy problems. Indeed, they can only see greater insensitivity, and more hardship on the horizon when they examine the effects of such policies as an excise tax on imported oil and tax decreases which once again spare the wealthy at the cost of low- and middle-income wage earners.

I believe that one letter I have received, from Joan Miller of California's Ninth Congressional District, articulates this frustration and pessimism most eloquently. I therefore commend Ms. Miller's letter to my colleagues' attention:

JANUARY 14, 1975.

Congressman PETE STARK,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STARK: After listening to President Ford's preview speech, I'm more disturbed than ever. It doesn't take much sense to realize that between the new gas tax and its effect then on the trucking industry, the average and below average wage earner will end up in the red again income tax decrease or not.

Personally I could care less about a tax decrease, especially an across the board one. Most of us are due for only a pittance while the big guy, who doesn't need it is being handed a thousand dollars. The public is sick of this foolishness.

The gas tax won't have any effect on gas consumption at all. The average person has already cut back on gas so he can afford groceries and 7½¢ per gallon won't deter the guy with money. I must assume that the President and his mighty counselors can figure this out, and therefore I must assume that they don't really want a drastic cut back in gasoline consumption at all since that would be unfavorable to the oil companies. Gas rationing is the only equitable plan and the only plan that will get us out of the clutches of the OPEC. The American people would support the President if he ever came up with a plan that had the ring of concern for our country instead of concern for oil companies.

If you must support an income tax decrease, make it a meaningful one. How about

a fifty percent cut for the family earning \$10,000.00 or less with four or more in the family and no cut for those families who earn more than \$25,000.00, \$30,000.00? If more money is still available to be returned, then give back a 5% to 10% to the families within these two brackets.

Just to show that this is not a greedy letter, my husband is a surveyor for the California Department of Transportation earning between \$14 and \$15 thousand dollars a year and we have four in our family. These days we are very thankful that we have an income at all.

This is a critical time in the careers of our legislators. We are watching them closely especially in areas where the demands of the oil companies and public utilities are constantly being met while ours seemingly go unheard. I am a registered Republican, but Governor Brown has the right idea. Some may call it tactics, but his show of frugality is making points with the average man.

Our prayers are with you and your colleagues. You have some tough decisions to make and the public will be watching.

Sincerely,

JOAN MILLER.

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the need for good medical care for everyone is at an all-time high, many highly qualified doctors are deciding to give up their practice because of the almost prohibitive costs of malpractice insurance.

On a personal level, my own physician and good friend, Dr. L. F. Albright of Spring Lake, N.J., told me of incidents where doctors have retired from practice rather than pay the astronomical premiums it would cost for malpractice insurance. I also heard a news report of an instance where a prominent Chicago doctor retired rather than pay the estimated \$40,000 to cover his malpractice insurance for a year.

In all candor, I do not profess to have the answer. Today, however, in an attempt to begin a long, hard look at this problem, I am introducing legislation in the House which is a companion measure to S. 482, which was introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, none of us should be wedded to any specific piece of legislation. The various bills introduced should be given hearings so that we can work out a realistic and comprehensive piece of legislation to resolve this problem.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter I received from the Freehold Area Hospital in Freehold, N.J., and an editorial from the Asbury Park Press, both of which touch on this crucial subject:

FREEHOLD AREA HOSPITAL,
Freehold, N.J., January 30, 1975.

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This hospital seeks your consideration and assistance in seeking legislative reform to cure the current medical malpractice insurance crisis. Our trustees have reviewed this problem and suggests the following:

1. Since medical malpractice insurance is becoming prohibitively expensive and . . .
2. Since many insurance companies are cancelling coverage for both hospitals and physicians and . . .
3. Since recent jury awards in medical malpractice cases are reaching astronomical sums and . . .
4. Since the cost of increased insurance premiums (for both physicians and health care institutions) are ultimately borne by the consumer and . . .
5. Since many are urging the adoption of an arbitrated system to adjudicate medical malpractice claims (See attached editorial, Asbury Park Press, January 24, 1975)
6. That the State of New Jersey adopt legislation providing for a "common sense" system of medical malpractice review and awards similar to "workmen's compensation" or "no fault" auto insurance.
7. That this hospital stands ready to help document the need and/or draft proposals to remedy a very unpredictable and expensive system currently in use.

Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue. Please let us know if we can provide further information.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH SAKER,
President, Board of Trustees.

[From the Asbury Park Press, Jan. 24, 1975]

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

Skyrocketing costs of malpractice insurance, and the threat that insurance will not be available to all doctors and hospitals, warrant the inquiry that the New Jersey Senate proposes. The public eventually must pay the rising costs. It also is affected because inability to obtain insurance can make doctors unwilling to accept difficult cases or prescribe treatments with potential risks even when informed consent is granted by patients.

The matter has become urgent by the decision of one of the principal underwriters of malpractice insurance to withdraw from several eastern states. The company contends that it is unable to raise premium costs fast enough to cover jury awards. Insurance Commissioner James Sheeran has proposed a plan whereby other states would join New Jersey in a pact under which companies that write malpractice insurance in any state that adopts the Sheeran plan would have to provide coverage in all participating states. He contends such action is required to break a virtual monopoly employed by a few carriers.

Dr. Malcolm C. Todd, president of the American Medical Association, says a solution to rate increases of 400 per cent should be sought through creation of a medical injury compensation plan comparable in some but not all respects to the workmen's compensation insurance system.

Under the Todd plan the scope of liability would be broadened to include not only negligence-related cases but also injuries arising from medical treatment that are not the result of negligence or bad judgment. The proposal warrants a full study. The fact that "no fault" auto liability insurance was developed by many states suggests that a

better approach can be worked into the judicial system for malpractice insurance.

In testimony before the New York Legislature Dr. Todd noted that whether a patient wins a substantial jury award for malpractice depends on variables such as how good his lawyer is, where the suit is tried, and the jury's mood. This view is supported in part by a study by Superior Court Judge Botter of New Jersey, not confined to malpractice cases, reporting that juries in some counties are more biased toward plaintiffs and in other counties more inclined to side with defendants.

"For the patient the current malpractice litigation system is nothing more or less than a form of shooting craps," Dr. Todd testified in New York. "And for the public-at-large it's become a very expensive form of craps shooting."

Any solution that a full inquiry develops will bolster the relationship between a patient and a doctor and a hospital and its patients. An adversary relationship in health care because of weakness in the present malpractice insurance system hurts the public as well as those who dispense medical care.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY—1975

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to commemorate the 57th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania which was celebrated this past Sunday. It is fitting that each year we in the House take time to note this important yet tragic day in world history for while this day is celebrated as Lithuanian Independence Day, for the past 3½ decades freedom has been but an elusive dream for the people of Lithuania.

February 16, 1918, was a glorious day for the Lithuanian nation for with their Declaration of Independence they were culminating a struggle to free themselves from Russian domination. Yet the freedoms they worked so hard for were to be shortlived for only two decades later Lithuania was to again fall under Russian domination when it was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. They have remained under their control except for a brief period during the Second World War when they fell into Nazi hands.

Yet despite these adversities the spirit of freedom runs strong in the people of Lithuania. The spirit has been renewed due to the improvement of relations between the Soviets and the United States. The Lithuanians look to this Nation as the epitome of a free nation, for leadership in convincing the Soviet Union to restore freedom and dignity to their nation. I have long contended that our agreements with the Soviets should contain provisos which will achieve this long desired goal.

A study recently put out by the Free-

dom House organization showed that in 1974 the U.S.S.R. had some 37.5 subordinate people under their control including Lithuanians. These are staggering figures which demand the consideration of this administration. Let us work for good relations with all of our adversaries, but let us not forget the plight of the oppressed peoples of the world, for they, too, should be able to live in a world of peace and dignity.

I am happy to participate in this important day. I salute the many contributions of the Lithuanian American community and assure them as well as the people in Lithuania that we in the United States share and support them in their efforts to achieve freedom.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the winning address for the State of Kentucky in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States' Voice of Democracy Contest which was composed by Mr. Jimmy Gentry of Cadiz, Ky.

Mr. Gentry's award-winning entry follows the contest theme, "My Responsibility as a Citizen," and calls to mind the heritage of America and the personal, deep-seated conviction that this young man has concerning our Government and Nation and the things that make it great. The message is as follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Jimmy Gentry)

Listen! Can you hear it? Can you hear the sounds of a lonesome wind. The sound of leaves crackling as they rustle on a cool autumn day in September. Can you hear the sound of silence—silence, the opportunity that echoes the sounds of the past. As I consider the stillness around me, I can hear men of yesteryear whispering about freedom, the potent quietness of a new nation, and a new kind of government. As I listen, I can visualize the men that died for my freedom, and I can begin to realize the responsibility that I play as a citizen of the United States.

The late President John Kennedy said that the cost of freedom is high, but that Americans have always paid it. During our nation's greatest challenges, freedom must have been of great value, for the price was death. My forefathers died for this valued cause that allows me to live in a country where I may worship in the church of my choice, where I may voice my opinion in the government, where I may live without fear of being independent.

Each American has a responsibility to those forefathers, and to his country. That responsibility is called citizenship. Citizenship entitles you and me to become active participants in the American way of life in our community, in our state, and in our nation. Citizenship requires you and me to be involved in our government at all levels, helping us to better understand the obligation that we have. Citizenship entails the realization of our benefits or else they will gradually erode from our custody. As an individual citizen, I have a responsibility to

my constitution, to my country, and to my family.

As a responsible citizen, I have an obligation to my constitution which is our foundation of Democracy and the law of the land. Our constitution was written to ensure everyone in America equal rights of citizenship, the right to be involved and to participate in government, and the right to be free in choices of individual concerns. I must understand the meaning and content of our constitution. I must learn to recognize the extent of tolerance for differences of opinion in a democracy. I must defend these constitutional standards until evidence appears to merit constructive change.

As a citizen, I have an obligation to these United States—my country. Whether I am in the midst of my own community, or on foreign soil, I am responsible to my government. God has truly shed his grace on me. He has allowed me to live in the greatest land on earth and granted me the greatest opportunity of freedom known to history. He has permitted me to be an American. Yes, when walking in the stillness, I can hear freedom, peace, and pride. As the bird sings, and the child plays, they remind me that I have a lot for which to be thankful, much for which to be responsible—America. As a citizen, I will defend my country at all times, both day and night, home and abroad. In the time of crisis, I must stand with her as a boy stands close to his father in time of fear. After the conflict, I must stand ready to cooperate in healing wounds which threaten my democracy. In time of peace, I must be alert and prepared to guard against threats to equality and justice. I must love, cherish, and respect my country—the United States. As George Washington said, "I must observe good faith and justice toward all nations. I must cultivate peace and harmony with all people."

May I never forget that as a citizen, I have a compelling responsibility to my parents. Too many young Americans have already taken undue advantage of their heritages. I must remember that my mother and father shared in these heritages and helped pave the way for me. They are the ones who give me a home, encouragement and love. Thus, I must be a son who cares about their lives and their future as well as they have cared about mine.

Yes, I can hear the sound of a warming lonesome wind forever telling my needs of freedom. These sounds will forever echo my responsibility as a citizen. I pray that every opportunity of silence may forever remind me of my undying obligation to cherish and continue the responsibilities of citizenship.

PHILADELPHIA'S WASTE DISPOSAL EXPERIMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia is about to begin a 3-year experiment of waste disposal which could have national implications.

The purpose of the study is to determine whether land disposal of digested sewer sludge can be made safer and cheaper than ocean dumping.

City Water Commissioner Carmen F. Guarino has stated that his department will spread 15.2 million gallons of sludge each year on land belonging to the Letterkenny Army Depot Military Reservation, near Chambersburg, Pa. The U.S.

Department of Defense has agreed to provide 650 acres for the experiment.

WASTE DISPOSAL EXPERIMENT

The study, which will begin in 1976, will cost \$4,878,000—with the Environmental Protection Agency paying 75% of this and the Water Department the remainder. Site preparation, including construction of facilities, will be done this year.

Guarino said that a "go ahead" for the study awaits only final approval by EPA of an environmental impact statement. He noted that the study, which the Water Department has been planning for more than a year, has become very urgent.

Only recently EPA ordered the City to cut ocean disposal in half by 1979 and to end it completely by 1981. "Unfortunately," said Guarino, "EPA has never made a scientific study of land disposal. At present, no one can be sure that land disposal is a satisfactory substitute for ocean disposal."

Guarino said that past studies (by the Franklin Institute and the Marine Science Consortium) have shown that ocean disposal of Philadelphia's sludge is environmentally safe. "Other studies show that it is much cheaper than land disposal would be."

Under the Water Department plan, sludge will be transported to Letterkenny in vented railroad tank cars. These cars will load sludge at the Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant and unload it within the Letterkenny reservation. At Letterkenny, the sludge will be stored in an impermeable basin and then will be redistributed by portable piping to the fields.

Up to 500 acres will be used for sludge application during the three years, but only three acres will be irrigated at a time. The total sludge deposited from 1976 to 1979 will equal 30 dry tons per acre—a tonnage well within federal safety limits. The sludge will be applied in various forms, such as liquid or cake, pasteurized or unpasteurized, in order to test the effect on the land.

Water Department engineers will analyze this effect constantly. Guarino noted. "We want to find out what the impact is on air, water, and soil quality, and on plant growth and composition. We shall determine also if there is any health hazard from pesticides, toxic metals, pathogens, parasites, or viruses."

Other purposes of the study will be to learn.

The best techniques for handling and transporting the sludge.

The most satisfactory rates at which digested sludge can be applied to land without polluting the environment.

Whether land disposal is more or less economic than other disposal methods.

The disposal site is located 10 miles from Chambersburg and is remote from other large population centers. Guarino said that the land slopes gently away from nearby communities, and that drainage at the site will be carefully controlled through runoff basins, surface water analysis, and regulated release. Odor will also be controlled. "We do not expect any community to be affected by the sludge deposits," said the Commissioner.

Some of the Letterkenny land is rented from the Federal Government by farmers, who grow forage crops. "The farmers look forward to the sludge as a free soil conditioner," noted Guarino. "It will reduce their fertilizer costs."

Guarino said that the Water Department will be counselled during the three-year study by an advisory committee. This committee will include federal, state, and local officials, as well as sanitary and agricultural experts.

Noting that Letterkenny land will not be available to Philadelphia for permanent use, Guarino said that all structures and piping will be removed at the conclusion of the study. Altered land will also be restored.

IN SOLEMN OBSERVANCE OF THE
57TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RE-
PUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the congressional tribute to the people of Lithuania in commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day of February 16, 1918, which all freedom-loving people throughout the world have been observing this past week in protest of governmental oppression of people and their basic human rights.

In manifesting the deep concern we all feel for the people of Lithuania, I wish to insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress the following resolution adopted by Lithuanian Americans of the State of New Jersey which most poignantly brings into sharp focus the continuing need for concerted action in mustering world opinion as a viable force in achieving universal understanding and agreement on basic human rights principles that will eliminate government controls that dominate the personal freedoms of the individual to live and worship in the land of his choice and stifle the independence and sovereignty of a nation of people. The resolution which was forwarded to me by the United Committee of Lithuanian Americans and endorsed by the Honorable Kazys Janekunas, president of the Lithuanian-American Community of New Jersey; Valentinas Melinis, president of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey; and Pranas Purnas, secretary of the United Committee reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of New Jersey at a meeting held on February 16, 1975, commemorating the 57th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

Whereas in 1918 the Republic of Lithuania was established by the free exercise of the right of self-determination by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920 Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all sovereign rights and claims by Russia over Lithuanian soil and her people; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1940 Lithuania was a fully independent and sovereign nation, a member of the League of Nations, and a signatory of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union during June 15-17, 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania by overwhelming force of arms, and subsequently, forcibly annexed the Lithuanian Nation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has systematically conducted a policy of colonization, ethnic dilution and Russification within Lithuania; and

Whereas the United States Government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure of Lithuania and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania to this very day are risking and sacrificing their lives

in defiance of the Communist regime in seeking political and religious freedom; and

Whereas the 89th U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurring Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the question of the Baltic Nations status at the United Nations and other international forums, focusing attention on the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic people; now, therefore be it

Resolved that we, Lithuanian-Americans urge the President of the United States, members of Congress, and the United States Department of State to publicly reaffirm the United States Policy of non-recognition of the forceful annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, and to maintain that policy during all negotiations with the Soviet Union, especially, those concerned with the new Detente policy; and further

Resolved, to request the President of the United States to vigorously implement House Concurring Resolution 416 to the fullest extent; and further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to appropriate government officials.

It is also significant on this anniversary date to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress the following communication that I received from His Eminence Vincent Brizgys auxiliary bishop of Kaunas, Lithuania, attesting to the continued refusal of the Soviet Union to recognize the sovereignty independence of countries it has occupied since World War II which includes Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics:

FEBRUARY 10, 1975.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE,
Member of Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The last two decades may be called years of freedom. The last remaining former colonies are being recognized as independent and are being admitted to the United Nations. The Soviet Union joins the free world in congratulating them and applauding their independent Statehood. However, it remains silent, grim and intransigent about ever withdrawing from formerly independent countries it has occupied since World War II, such as the Baltic Republics, among which is Lithuania, whose people and friends commemorate February 16, as the Restoration of Independence at the conclusion of World War I.

I should like to avert your attention to the Soviet Constitution imposed also upon Lithuania, which guarantees religious freedom together with other freedoms. It is now two years that the Soviets have greatly intensified their policy of terror in Lithuania against the faithful and all readers of religious literature, even of those several publications printed with Soviet sanction. The most rabid terror is directed against the readers of *Chronicles of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, which contains nothing but simple statements of bare facts, namely, of Soviet violations of their own Constitution regarding the freedom of religion. In Soviet-enslaved Lithuania and in the Soviet Union only the bravest dare react against violation of the Constitution and they are the only ones who are punished for venturing to speak of them publicly and to protest them.

This is the daily way of life today in the old honorable nation and state of Lithuania, while the rest of the civilized world is granting independence to peoples barely emerging into nationhood.

I am very grateful to you and to all who have not forgotten Lithuania in her present conditions of slavery and her courageous and gallant people. I trust that time is not far distant when humaneness, truth, justice and freedom will prevail and flourish once again in Lithuania.

With sincere regards, I remain

Faithfully yours,

VINCENT BRIZGYS,

Auxiliary Bishop of Kaunas, Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary observance of this historic agreement of the Lithuanian people establishing the Republic of Lithuania, I am today reintroducing the legislative proposals which I joined with many of our colleagues in sponsoring in the 93d Congress reaffirming our resolution which was adopted by the 89th Congress directing that the question of the status of the Baltic Nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania be placed on the agenda of the international forum of the United Nations to help seek the restoration of the right of the people to exercise self-determination to national independence and sovereignty of these Baltic States. These House concurrent resolutions read as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the three Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been illegally occupied by the Soviet Union since World War II; and

Whereas the Soviet Union will attempt to obtain the recognition by the European Security Conference of its annexation of these nations; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition of the forcible conquest of these nations by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the European Security Conference should not agree to the recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and it should remain the policy of the United States not to recognize in any way the annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Government and the people of the United States of America have maintained and enjoyed excellent and friendly relations with the Governments and peoples of the Baltic States Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, during the years of independence of these Republics; and

Whereas the concept of liberty and freedom of choice of government is still alive in this country, as it has been constantly since the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the evidence produced at the hearings of the select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics overwhelmingly tends to prove that the actions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to these free and independent Baltic Republics were contrary to the principles of international law and the principles of freedom; and

Whereas the people of this Nation have consistently shown great sympathy for the peoples of these three Republics, especially as a result of their enslavement and as a result of the inhuman exile and deportation of great numbers of law-abiding persons from their native lands to imprisonment in

slave labor camps in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President of the United States of America should continue the American policy of nonrecognition of the unlawful absorption of the Baltic States Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and continue the recognition of the diplomatic and consular officers of these Republics as the lawful representatives of these three nations in the United States of America; and

(2) the President should take such steps as may be appropriate, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to raise in the United Nations the question of the forced incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and request the United Nations to conduct an investigation of conditions in the said Baltic Republics to the intent and purpose that Soviet armed forces, agents, and colonists be withdrawn therefrom, and that the exiled peoples of these Republics be returned thereto in freedom, and that free plebiscites and elections be held therein, under the supervision of the United Nations, to let the people, in freedom, make their own election and choice as to government.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege and honor on behalf of the people of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey to join in this annual observance of our Lithuanian heritage and trust that through our mutual endeavors and responsibilities that we will strive to continue to achieve international understanding and agreement that will eliminate the oppression of people and restore "human rights" and the rights of self-determination by the peoples of the captive nations of the world.

STATEMENT ON BILL TO PROHIBIT "SUPER-PRICING"

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit the practice of super-pricing by retailers. Super-pricing occurs when a retailer increases the price of an item after it has already been marked for sale.

To halt the growth of this unethical activity, my bill classifies price hiking as an unfair trade practice which is in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Moreover, this bill would enable the FTC to order restitution of money received by any person, partnership, or corporation in violation of the FTC Act.

This bill is fair to retailers because it would prohibit only those increases which are unjustified. When an item is originally marked, the retailer considers his costs and decides on a fair price. Though the retailer may face increased costs on subsequent shipments, the price hike does not affect those items previously marked and sitting on the shelves. If the price were fair when it was placed on the article, it remains fair until the article is sold. Super-pricing a commodity provides the retailer with windfall profits.

And the consumer who is already caught in the vice of rampant inflation, pays for these undeserved receipts. With the Wholesale Price Index up 23.5 percent between November 1973, and November 1974, consumers face steeper prices each time they return to the store or supermarket. This bill will provide substantial savings on food and many other products at a time when price reductions are desperately needed.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill which offers a very basic and long overdue type of consumer protection.

CONSUMER ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE- INCOME HOUSING FIELD

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I may or may not have had any impact in influencing the thinking of young men and women engaged in the mortgage banking industry last week, but it was a pleasure for me to attend the National Mortgage Banking Conference of the Mortgage Bankers Association in Kansas City, Mo., on February 13 and speak at the luncheon meeting of the MBA's young mortgage bankers committee. In that talk I tried to spell out some of the consumer issues and problems in the housing and home finance field which affect the middle-income family particularly.

This is the family which pays its own way, gets no subsidies of any kind, and pays the taxes which help to support a wide variety of Government programs intended to help others. That family today is priced out of the housing market by the high interest rates which make the monthly carrying charges on the average new home beyond the reach of a wage earner in the average brackets.

I was pleased to see in remarks by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas in Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD inserting the transcript of the CBS "Face the Nation" interview with Mr. George Meany of the AFL-CIO on February 9 that Mr. Meany came out strongly in favor of a direct lending program for average income families to enable them to buy homes when interest rates are too high in the private lending field. As Mr. PATMAN pointed out, I have been sponsoring legislation to carry out that very idea. In this Congress, it is H.R. 1081, and is again cosponsored, as it was in the previous two Congresses, by Chairman WILLIAM A. BARRETT of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

This bill creates the Homeowners Mortgage Loan Corporation as a Federal agency to make direct loans of up to \$30,000 to families with incomes up to \$12,000, or thereabouts—a figure which can be raised to reflect average wage levels—to buy homes at an interest rate no higher than 6½ percent, during periods when mortgage money is not avail-

able to such families from private sources at reasonable rates of interest.

A modified version of this proposal was approved by the Housing Subcommittee in 1972 as part of our mammoth housing bill that year which died in the Rules Committee in the final weeks of the 92d Congress. It was subsequently passed over as part of the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act—unfortunately so because it is needed now more than ever. I intend to do everything I can to push it through in this Congress.

SETTLEMENT COSTS, ESCROW ACCOUNTS, AND REGULATION OF CLOSING FEES

At the mortgage bankers' meeting last week I discussed the Homeowners Mortgage Loan Corporation bill briefly, but was requested to devote my remarks primarily to the issues involved in the recently enacted Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974, Public Law 93-533. This disclosure law grew out of an investigation of inner-city home financing procedures in the District of Columbia by an ad hoc subcommittee of the Banking Committee which I chaired in 1969 and 1970, and the need for it was further amplified in full committee investigations thereafter into the section 235 scandals.

Public Law 93-533 is not nearly as strong as the settlement reform and escrow account bill I had sponsored as title IX of the housing bill of 1972, and which I introduced as H.R. 12066 in the 93d Congress. However, it fortunately ended up in conference as a better law than the bill the House had originally passed last year. Among other things, it does not deal at all with the issue of assuring home buyers some modest return on the \$9.5 billion of their money set aside by mortgage lenders each year in non-interest-bearing escrow accounts for the payment of real estate taxes and casualty insurance. The \$9.5 billion figure was developed by a comprehensive investigation into residential real estate escrow accounts made at my request by the General Accounting Office in 1973.

TEXT OF REMARKS AT MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

I went into these issues, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks last Thursday at the Mortgage Bankers Association conference in Kansas City, discussing them from the standpoint of the consumer interest in connection with the largest single expenditure the average family ever makes—the purchase of a home.

Under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion the text of that speech, as follows:

CONSUMER ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING FIELD

(Address by Congresswoman LEONOR K.
SULLIVAN)

After many years of service on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which now has the new name of Banking, Currency, and Housing, it is always a pleasure for me to meet with mortgage bankers—particularly younger ones who perhaps haven't yet solidified their economic views in the concrete of long experience. But while I am happy to be here, I know these are not the happiest of times for those engaged in the mortgage lending business. Therefore, I wish there were some bright words of great promise I could bring to you today—such as assurances

that by the time you get home customers will be breaking down your doors to borrow money to build or buy homes. Instead, about all I can do is hope that you have a wonderful visit in exciting Kansas City, so that you can at least take home some happy memories.

I am sure you will learn much here to help you in your work, particularly if these meetings develop some new ideas that will help revive the home building industry and find ways to channel more money into this vital area of national investment. We are working on that same problem in the new Congress—particularly the allocation of credit into essential uses and away from speculative and inflationary activities. But the cold water which the Secretary of the Treasury poured over that idea at hearings of the Patman Subcommittee on February 4, right before the current Congressional recess, indicates that we are going to have to push and force the Ford Administration to take more effective steps than it has so far indicated a willingness to take in the controversial area of credit management to help the housing industry.

Secretary Simon's discouraging testimony, coming right after the delivery to Congress of President Ford's dismal Budget Message—which in turn had followed one of the gloomiest Presidential State of the Union Messages any of us can remember hearing—puts us all on notice that unless Congress can hammer out and enact a unified program to attack our many economic ills on all fronts, and make it work, we will just muddle along through another couple years of very high unemployment, very high prices, incredibly high budget deficits, depressed housing markets, and a grim succession of further economic shocks.

A HARD ROLE FOR CONGRESS TO TRY TO FILL

In attempting to write a comprehensive and unified national economic policy, Congress is stepping into a role which is almost impossible for it to perform well. This is not a "cop-out", or an excuse in advance for the inevitable setbacks Congress will experience in trying to take the lead in economic policy. It is important for the public to understand that the 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the 100 United States Senators are each, in effect, sovereign powers subject to no philosophical discipline other than our consciences and our desire for the good opinion of the voters who send us to Washington. We vote as individuals—not as party members. The majority rules—except sometimes in the Senate where one-third plus one can block action through the device of the filibuster—but it is a constantly changing majority. The fact that there is a two-thirds Democratic Majority in the House does not mean that any Democratic party leader can dictate the steps Congress will take. There will be times and issues in which the minority party may actually call the tune if it makes a convincing case for its position.

The economic diversities which characterize opinion in the United States are reflected, too, in the 535 Members of Congress, regardless of party. Rural area legislators look at things differently from those of us from urban areas; and within each grouping, bitter battles often develop over the right policies to follow. For instance, how unified is *your* local school board on controversial issues in your own community?

DEPENDENT UPON A RELUCTANT PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTER

The President, on the other hand, can promulgate an Administration policy which is unified and is obediently followed by all who work for him—or they don't work for him any longer. In contrast, neither Speaker Albert nor Senator Majority Leader Mike Mansfield can "fire" a single Member of either Chamber or force him or her to vote

contrary to that person's own convictions or judgment or concept of public interest.

There is another basic aspect of our problem in setting unified national policy objectives. It is this: once we enact a program—any program—particularly one pushed through over the President's objections, or veto—we are still dependent upon the President and his appointees for administration of that program. If he wants to prove our policy is wrong, he can readily find many subtle ways to make it fail. The price and wage control program, as it was administered between January 11, 1973 and April 30, 1974, is a good example.

Congress passed the program originally in 1970, over President Nixon's vigorous objections, as part of a veto-proof bill. He said he would never use the authority. But exactly 365 days later, he put it into effect, and from August 15, 1971 to January 10, 1973 the program did work in stopping inflation. However, shortly after his re-election in 1972, Mr. Nixon set out to demonstrate that the controls were inherently bad, and by April of last year there was no longer any sentiment in this country to continue the controls unless and until there were assurances that they were going to be administered by people intent on making them effective. We do not yet have that assurance.

So these are some of our problems today in trying to lead. Once we achieve the difficult task of agreeing among ourselves on what the policy should be, we face the even more difficult task of finding ways of mandating effective administration of those policy decisions by a perhaps reluctant or antagonistic White House.

DEALING FIRST WITH EMERGENCY ECONOMIC ISSUES

Nevertheless, in the next few months there will be a lot of action in the Congress toward restoring vitality to this economy, and I'm sure there will be some unorthodox approaches. But I don't think you will see a wild-eyed legislative fandango in which we rush about in all directions at once. One thing is certain, however; we just can't let things continue as they have been going.

Taking first things first, we have been dealing so far primarily with emergency situations—taking action to block scheduled increases in food stamp costs for the needy; to rollback the \$1 a barrel February 1 increase in the tariff on imported oil and March 1 and April 1; to impose a moratorium on foreclosures of homes growing out of loss of employment in the auto industry and other industries hard hit by recession; to provide for tax cuts; and to expand public service employment opportunities for the unemployed. But these are not *solutions* for either inflation or recession. They are merely cushions against a hard fall, not a ladder to the stars.

Surely we have the imagination and the resourcefulness and the brains and will as a people to cope with our basic economic problems, put our unemployed back to work, and as John F. Kennedy used to say, get this country moving again. We have done it before in the past 42 years, under all kinds of difficulties, and we can do it again.

HELPING THE AVERAGE FAMILY BUY A HOME

And one of the best places to start, of course, is by making it possible once again for the average-income family to buy a good home. I am sure you all agree with that. But as long as it is much more profitable to lend money for other purposes than for housing, the average income family is going to remain priced out of the mortgage market. So we must either bring down interest rates substantially throughout the economy, or provide more funds especially earmarked for housing, at below-market rates. I think we must do both things.

A bill of mine, H.R. 1081, which Chairman

William Barrett of the Housing Subcommittee is co-sponsoring, would establish a direct Federal loan program to provide average income families—the policeman, fireman, teacher, auto mechanic, retail employee, assembly line worker, and so on—with loans up to \$30,000 at no more than 6½%, to buy a home, when mortgage money is not available at reasonable rates from normal sources. At present interest levels, this would represent a subsidy. But over the 30-year life of such mortgages, the government would get all of its money back plus a fair return. You may at first glance regard this idea as competition for your industry, but it is not; you are not reaching this same family today. You can't. But if a program of this kind were started, and operated during periods of tight money, it would provide your firms with additional revenue in servicing such loans—as you do now on FHA and GI loans sold to Fannie Mae—and it would stimulate the home-building industry and all of the industries which are dependent upon it, and thus the whole economy. And it would provide many needed homes.

But let me turn now to the subject I was asked to discuss when Lee Holmes, legislative counsel of the Mortgage Bankers Association, invited me to speak to you—the subject of settlement reform and escrow accounts.

In the latest issue of the "Mortgage Banker", there is an extensive article by William E. Cumberland, MBA General Counsel, on the new law going into effect June 20 of this year to regulate real estate settlements. The article describes the law in detail, and it is hardly necessary for me to repeat those details. But the Cumberland article does not go into the background of its enactment—why it was passed, why it was needed; what it is intended to accomplish.

THE HOME BUYER'S SETTLEMENT TRAUMA

As long as I can remember, friends of mine buying homes for the first time have complained bitterly about the shock waves which struck them at settlement time. The cost of the homes they had agreed to purchase usually reflected their relative state of affluence—they had figured down to the penny how much they could afford to put down, how much they could afford to pay each month, how well they could manage expected periodic repairs; they estimated annual heating and utility costs and figured them in, too—and the taxes and insurance. And they had budgeted, too, or thought they had, for the somewhat vague "closing costs" the real estate salesman told them to expect. Then they went to the lender and filled out some papers and perhaps got some additional information on the mysterious closing costs. But, later, when they went to settlement—bam! There was this item they didn't expect; and that one; and then another, all of them sizeable, so that by the time the home buyers left the settlement office they were so flat broke and over-extended they didn't know how they were going to pay the movers to get them into their new home—or the painters or carpenters or other craftsmen they had planned to hire to make changes to accommodate their furniture.

By the time those same people bought another house, they had a pretty good idea what to expect at closing; nevertheless, no matter how hard they tried to get all of the settlement costs identified and itemized in advance, so they could be prepared, there were almost always unexpected additional expenditures required at the last minute in order to close.

Generally, consumers regarded these expensive experiences as part of the total trauma of buying a home—something you have to put up with in order to have the home you wanted. Most home buyers assumed the FHA or the VA or the Home Loan Bank Board or the Bar Association or somebody

was looking out for their interests in these situations and that the settlements costs undoubtedly were legitimate, if not fully understood. They weren't aware that sometimes they were being cheated and overcharged.

ORIGINS OF THE SETTLEMENT COST LEGISLATION

Early in 1969, the Washington Post ran a series of articles about a Washington, D.C., federal savings and loan which had run into deep financial trouble because of excessive loans to certain local real estate speculators in financing the purchase and resale at inflated prices of low priced housing in the District of Columbia. That S&L had to be merged by the Home Loan Bank Board into another Federally chartered institution in D.C., but it owned a vast quantity of dilapidated or abandoned housing which had gone to foreclosure. These almost worthless properties had to be taken over by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. As a senior Member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I proposed an immediate investigation into the background of this financial disaster and its drain on the FSLIC. Chairman Patman agreed, and the next thing I knew I had the responsibility for conducting the investigation as chairman of an ad hoc subcommittee on financing of inner city housing. What we learned in that investigation uncovered the first warning signs of the vast dimensions of the Section 235 scandals which the Banking Committee further documented in later studies.

But we also found rampant conflicts of interest, artificial kiting of values through straw party deals and fictitious turn-overs, and a pattern of vulture-like practices including kickbacks, bribes, excessive fees, phantom services, and a variety of other abuses involved in the transfer of a piece of property from seller to buyer.

As a result of these disclosures, Congress in 1970 passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set maximum charges on settlement costs on FHA and VA housing. This authority has never been used to this day, but it is in the law.

In 1971 and 1972, we began the drive to write settlement reforms into the housing laws to apply to all Federally-related mortgages and the Housing Bill of 1972, as approved by the Housing Subcommittee that year, included a strong Title IX containing far-reaching reforms in real estate settlement practices. Unfortunately, the Housing Act that year died in the Rules Committee in the closing days of the 92nd Congress, and did not become law.

\$9.5 BILLION IN ESCROW ACCOUNTS YEARLY

In 1973, we renewed the fight over settlement costs and reforms and also went into the subject of non-interest-bearing escrow accounts for taxes and insurance. The General Accounting Office, at my request, made a formal study of escrow accounts and estimated that as much as \$9½ billion is placed in such accounts each year by home buyers who derive no interest from this money, while the lender can use this interest-free money for his own purposes until such time as the taxes and insurance premiums become due. The amount of interest lost to the individual home buyer by this device is not great—it is the principle of the thing that upsets many home buyers forced to establish escrow accounts. But the financial benefits which can accrue to a large-scale lender from the temporary investment or other use of all of this money can be very substantial indeed.

Under the settlement reform bill I introduced in 1973, the home buyer would have had the option of electing to pay his own taxes and insurance premium when due—investing those funds meanwhile in any way he desired—or of permitting the lender to establish an escrow account on which a mutually satisfactory interest rate could be

negotiated if both parties were so agreeable. This proposal was not included in the final version of the new Settlement Reform Act passed last October, but I intend to renew it in the new Congress. If it does become law, I suspect that only a small percentage of home buyers—those who are sophisticated about money matters—will actually seek to take advantage of it at first, but eventually I expect to see general adoption of the principle that the sizeable amounts put aside each year for taxes and insurance should bring some financial benefit to the home buying public which is putting up this \$9½ billion each year.

The fear has been expressed that if taxes and insurance payments are not escrowed in advance during the year, many, many homes will go to foreclosure for non-payment of taxes. That would not occur under this proposal for the simple reason that if a borrower ever fails to meet tax or insurance charges when due, the lender could immediately step in and protect the mortgagee's interests by paying the amount due and adding it to the mortgage, plus penalty costs. But that is a matter of future legislative debate.

NEW DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

In the meantime, however, beginning June 20, virtually every family buying a home in the United States is going to have to be given, as a matter of right under Federal law, a full, itemized explanation of every closing cost—far enough in advance of settlement to be able to shop among competing suppliers of settlement services for the best deal he can obtain. Furthermore, only legitimate charges and fees can be assessed—no hanky-panky involving kickbacks and side payments for services not performed.

You might well ask why Congress has chosen this particular time—when the housing industry is in its worst depression in decades—to impose new restrictions on real estate transactions and perhaps reduce the revenues of the professionals who specialize in real estate transfers. Aren't they hurting enough right now?

The answer to that question is simple: it has taken Congress until now to find out about and pin-point and act on the abuses which had been allowed to grow and fester over generations in the transfer of title to real estate. I think all of you are familiar with the way many of those abuses have operated. Real estate transactions have customarily been under state jurisdiction, and the states did a poor job, by and large (not all, but most) in enforcing fairness to the home buyer in a field in which the average family makes its largest life-time investment. The time for action was long past.

NO REGULATION OF RATES CHARGED

The new act which takes effect in June does not go the full distance toward meeting the problems of assuring consumers absolute fairness in the real estate marketplace. Like the Truth in Lending Act which preceded it, this new law emphasizes full disclosure and some moderate regulation of specific abusive practices. But the law does not regulate actual charges made for legitimate services. And these vary so widely between areas of the country and among Bar Association groups setting what appear to be illegal minimum charges that I am sure Congress will want to go further in making the reforms effective.

An unsuccessful attempt was made in connection with the 1974 Act to go backwards and repeal the 1970 legislation allowing HUD to set maximum charges for FHA and VA settlements. Even though the 1970 authority has never been used, it stands as a warning to everyone in real estate to help eliminate excessive charges to the home buyer, or rate regulation will occur. HUD now has the responsibility to resurvey the actual charges made in connection with real estate settle-

ments and report to Congress within three to five years on whether rate regulation is desirable in the public interest. And under the new law it must also report on the desirability of requiring lenders to pay all closing costs—presumably passing on these costs in the interest rate charged the borrower. The theory behind this proposal is that the lender alone has the economic power to bargain effectively with the providers of settlement services to obtain the best and fairest prices for these services, and thus provide an incentive within the settlement industry to reduce its charges for competitive reasons.

NEED FOR SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCEDURES

We will learn some important thing when the new law takes effect. We will learn whether advance disclosure of costs by the providers of settlement services will encourage home buyers to shop for the best terms. We will learn whether simplification of settlement procedures and clear explanation of what they mean and what they cost will lead to better practices in the title search and title insurance and related businesses. And we will learn whether encrusted old practices which should have been eliminated many years ago in the transfer of real estate can survive in the glare of greater customer awareness.

Our objective in the new law is not only to bring more information to the home buyer; it is also to bring down the costs of an expensive sideshow to the main event of selling homes and financing them. As was pointed out in our hearings, a Boeing 747 can be transferred from seller to buyer with a simple contract and a minimum of red tape; but a single family home, located on the same piece of ground for 30 years and owned throughout by the same persons, seems to require the services of untold numbers of specialists in transferring title from one party to another. Granted that real estate law can be tricky; it is not a field for amateurs. But there have been too many tricks played in that tricky field, and the message from Congress is clear: Let's clean it up, for the benefit of the home buying public, and for the benefit, too, of the honest people in the real estate industry.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the Washington Star-News published an excellent article by Isabelle Shelton describing the child and family services bill, H.R. 2966, which 87 colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined me in sponsoring.

Companion legislation, S. 626, is being sponsored in the other body by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota and 24 of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the child and family services bill would authorize \$1.85 billion over 3 years to support a wide variety of programs for children and their families including nutrition, health, education, and in-home and center-based day care on a part- and fulltime basis.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee I am privileged to chair joined the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, chaired by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota, to begin hear-

ings on this important measure. These joint hearings will resume tomorrow.

Our witnesses this morning included the Honorable Jerry J. Apodaca, Governor of New Mexico, chairman, Early Childhood Education Task Force of the Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; Marion Wright Edelman, director, Children's Defense Fund, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Roland L. Mindlin, chairman, Infant and Preschool Child Committee, American Academy of Pediatrics, Arlington; Mrs. Dorothy Lasday, member of board of directors, National Council of Jewish Women, Washington, D.C.; and Carmen Maymi, Director, Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Tomorrow we shall hear from Joseph Reid, executive director, Child Welfare League, New York; Judy Helms, executive director, National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Frederick Green, associate director, Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C.; and a panel consisting of Frederick Weintraub, Council for Exceptional Children; Hal Benson, United Cerebral Palsy; and Paul Marchand, National Association for Retarded Persons.

Because the Washington Star-News article, Mr. Speaker, is a brief description of the history and issues involved in the child and family services bill, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

DAY CARE BILLS STRESS VOLUNTARINESS
(By Isabelle Shelton)

Congress this week begins a new effort to pass a comprehensive child care bill, to replace the one vetoed by President Nixon in 1971.

Hearings will open Thursday on two bills similar to the one Congress passed in 1971.

These, however, cost less than the 1971 bills, and they put heavy emphasis on broad parental participation and the totally "voluntary" nature of the program. The 1971 program was voluntary, too, but these bills say so more often and emphatically.

The fund scaledown presumably is an attempt to make the measure more enticing to President Ford, who, although he has not mentioned day care specifically, has said he will veto any new federal programs.

The other changes seem designed to allay fears aroused in some quarters by the Nixon veto message, which charged that the legislation would weaken the American family by committing "the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child-rearing over against the family-centered approach."

The Chief new bills, similar but not identical, were introduced early this month by Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) and Rep. John Brademas (D-Ind.), with broad bipartisan sponsorship (87 other House members and 24 senators).

Even the name is changed, to stress family participation. In place of 1971's Child Development Act, it will be known as the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. The change is more than cosmetic, so far as the bills' sponsors are concerned. While the 1971 bill also included parental involvement, the legislators really do have a deep commitment to the idea of heavy family involvement, which was pioneered so successfully in the Head Start programs begun in the '60s. They believe it is one of that program's great strengths.

In addition to funding a broad spectrum of child care programs (part-day, all-day, after-school, in-house tutoring), they also would provide prenatal care, nutrition assistance, early medical screening and treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions and classes for parents and prospective parents.

Both bills call for an expenditure of \$1.85 billion over a three-year period, starting in fiscal 1976 (July 1, 1975), but with the first year limited to \$350 million for training, planning and technical assistance. No actual programs would start until July 1, 1977.

Mondale and Brademas would have the new program administered by a new Office of Child and Family Services, which would in effect supplant the Office of Child and Family Development in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The HEW agency would operate in each state through "prime sponsors," which could be a state or locality or a public or non-profit private organization. Heavy family involvement would be required all along the way through a system of parental councils and policy committees.

Both bills provide that 65 percent of the available funds must go free to families with income below the U.S. Labor Department's minimum annual budget for a family of four, which currently is \$8,181 nationwide and \$8,547 in the Washington metropolitan area. Mondale would require the Secretary of HEW to establish a sliding fee schedule for families earning above that figure, based on family size and ability to pay. Brademas would let these rates be set at the local level.

The Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth (which Mondale heads) and the House Select Subcommittee on Education (with Brademas as chairman) will hold joint hearings Thursday, Friday and next Monday, with more planned for March and perhaps April.

The first three days will be devoted to testimony about the need for such a program. This, again, is probably aimed at refuting allegations in Nixon's veto message that the program really isn't needed. Some groups eager for action say this is a "waste of time," as the need has been voluminously documented.

Economist Mary Dublin Keyserling reported in 1972 in a wide-ranging survey for the National Council of Jewish Women: "In community after community the people most knowledgeable about day care needs and existing services told council interviewers that an eight or tenfold or even greater expansion of quality day care would not suffice . . . Federal funds for day care now help provide services for fewer than five percent of the children of economically disadvantaged families most in need."

Mrs. Keyserling cites one horror story reported by one of her investigators, who found two children, aged 10 and 12, in sole charge of a roomful of younger children.

"This center should be closed. Absolutely filthy. Toilets not flushed, and smelly. Broken equipment and doors. Broken windows on lower level near back stairs and doors. Broken chairs and tables. No indoor play equipment. One paper towel used to wipe the faces and hands of all children. Kitchen very, very dirty."

Another investigation called a similarly dismal center she visited "a sad case of inhumane dehumanizing of kids by an owner who makes plenty of money."

Mondale and Brademas both express confidence their measure will pass, with the differences between them amicably worked out.

"I think it should pass the House more easily than last time," Brademas says, "with our 92 new members. They're younger, well educated, and they are mostly family men and women with children of their own."

The White House has not yet taken a position on the measures. "We haven't seen them," a spokesman said of the bills, but he recalled Ford's threats to veto any new programs.

There are some stiff controversies ahead, which the two leaders know. Both stress that their proposals "are not etched in stone," and that they want input from interested groups.

Besides their own differences over such question as fee schedules, there are these looming areas of conflict:

Profit-making day care centers are expected to fight to be more fully included in the federal program. The bills now allow them very limited participation. Some groups such as the American Parents Committee oppose any inclusion of profit-making facilities.

Albert Shanker, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, has launched an aggressive drive "to insist that the prime sponsor for all early childhood and day care programs receiving federal monies to be the public schools." He is quite frank in declaring that he is motivated by the fact that many school teachers are out of jobs and many more will be because the birth rate has declined. He dreams that the child care program can provide jobs to an additional 800,000 school teachers. He points out that a lot of classroom space has also been made available by the population drop.

When questions are asked about the public school's ability to provide the other services in the pending bills—particularly health services, where public schools' record has not been luminous—Shanker handles that by recommending removing those services from the bill. He even would drop the word "Family" from the title.

There still are some people who share former President Nixon's suspicions of any such program. Dr. David Crane, a Martinsville (Ind.) psychiatrist, recently said passage of such a measure would defeat "the family-oriented school of thought" and for "the vast majority of American families who strive to rear their children in an atmosphere of personal attention, love and respect and not consign them to concessions of strangers whose interest are primarily business."

JUST HOW SICK ARE WE?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate a system of nationalized medicine for the United States have been very effective in causing Americans to believe, on the one hand, that a "crisis" exists in the American medical system and that, on the other, that "crisis" can be dealt with by adopting the kind of socialized medical systems which exist in England and in other European countries.

Neither of these propositions is borne out by the facts. The British National Health Service was enacted by a socialist government in 1948. The founders of the Health Service estimated its cost in 1974 would be \$400 million; in fact, it is nearly 20 times that. The services provided have been dramatically cut. Some emergency wards have been closed, some cancer patients have gone potentially fatal days without radiotherapy, because of staff shortages.

While the United States, under its private practice system of medicine, has a surplus of modern hospital beds, England has a shortage, with long waiting lists for hospital services. Former Health Services Secretary Sir Keith Joseph has publicly described himself, when in office, as Britain's "biggest slum landlord." What he meant was that dozens of Britain's 2,300 hospitals are more than 100 years old—moribund and beyond modernization.

Why anyone who has carefully studied the British system and compared it with our own would call for a change toward socialism is impossible to understand. By any objective standard, that system has failed to live up to its promise.

The other idea so popular with those who wish to nationalize medicine is that most Americans are unable to obtain proper medical care.

In a recent study, Michael F. Meyer, a senior premed student at the University of Chicago working under a grant from the Heritage Foundation of Washington, D.C., discovered that less than 9 percent of all patients surveyed had hospital expenses exceeding \$2,000. Mr. Meyer also discovered that only 1.4 percent of all patients had hospital expenses exceeding \$5,000 and that,

At high expenditure levels, Medicare patients comprised an increased portion of those individuals incurring such expenses.

Mr. Meyer concludes that,

Approximately 1% of all Americans incur catastrophic illnesses each year of which total medical expenses exceed \$5000 and of this one per cent, a large portion of the individuals are either (a) psychiatric patients or, (b) patients qualifying for Medicare.

This is hardly the "medical care crisis" in whose name some wish to eliminate the private practice of medicine and replace it with a regimented, nationalized system.

I wish to share Mr. Meyer's review of his findings, which appeared in the form of an article entitled, "Just How Sick Are We?," in the October 1974 issue of *Private Practice*, with my colleagues and insert it into the *RECORD* at this time:

JUST HOW SICK ARE WE?

(By Michael F. Meyer)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article presents the findings of an extensive study on catastrophic illness carried out by Mr. Meyer, a pre-med senior at the University of Chicago, under a grant from the Heritage Foundation of Washington, D.C.)

It's hard to pick up a newspaper or magazine these days and not see something about the "health care crisis" in America. This "crisis" supposedly stems from inadequate medical facilities, overworked doctors, and health insurance which is not available at reasonable rates. Fueling the crisis atmosphere has been the allegation that enormous numbers of Americans suffer catastrophic illnesses each year. The idea has become so ingrained that most Americans are beginning to take it for granted that their chances of becoming seriously ill are rather good. I only hope we have not yet reached the stage where being healthy is considered somewhat out of the ordinary.

The facts tell a decidedly different story, however. Americans are not "dropping like flies" from catastrophic illnesses. Regardless of what the media are telling us, the facts

are quite clear and speak for themselves. These facts, along with other key findings, are outlined in study I completed earlier this year. This study involved an intensive look at patient hospital expenses, which comprise the major portion of expenses for catastrophic illness. Specifically, all patients discharged in a certain period were analyzed in terms of their total hospital expenses. These hospital expenses were classed in various levels so that the percentage of individuals with hospital expenses at any given amount could be determined (for example; the percentage of patients with hospital expenses above \$2000). The study involved 132 hospitals in 25 states in three surveys comprising a sample of 25,926 patients. The hospitals were compared to the total number of hospitals in the U.S. by type, size, and other factors. They represented those hospitals which nationally have 92.5% of all admissions. The key findings were:

1. Less than 9% of all patients surveyed had hospital expenses exceeding \$2000;
2. Only 1.4% of all patients surveyed had hospital expenses exceeding \$5000;
3. At high expenditure levels, Medicare patients comprised an increased portion of those individuals incurring such expenses. This was revealed by a special survey which unearthed the following facts:
 - a. Of all patients surveyed, 19.3% were Medicare patients;
 - b. Only 9.9% of all patients surveyed with hospital expenses less than \$1000 were Medicare patients;
 - c. 40% of all patients surveyed with hospital expenses above \$3000 were Medicare patients.

The analysis of the types of hospitals nationwide also revealed some interesting facts.

1. Patients in psychiatric hospitals, while comprising only 2% of total hospital admissions, have on the average, catastrophic illness expenses: the average cost per patient stay being approximately \$8000;
2. Patients in tuberculosis and other respiratory disease hospitals and long term general hospitals, while comprising .4% of the total hospital admissions, also have on the average catastrophic illness expenses: the average cost per patient stay being approximately \$6000.

Based on the surveys conducted, the national statistics, and other studies indicating that hospital expenses comprise the major portion of catastrophic illness expenses, the following conclusions may be drawn for the U.S. population:

1. Approximately 1% of all Americans incur catastrophic illnesses each year of which total medical expenses exceed \$5000.
2. Of this one percent, a large portion of the individuals are either
 - a. psychiatric patients or,
 - b. patients qualifying for Medicare.

An earlier, smaller study anticipated these findings. In the April 1972 issue of this magazine, Francis A. Davis, MD, presented a report on catastrophic insurance, part of which discussed the incidence of catastrophic illnesses. He found that in Shawnee, Oklahoma, where he practices, only one percent of the patients had hospital bills in excess of \$2000 in 1971. He also found that 84% of those patients with hospital bills in excess of \$2000 were over 65 and qualified for Medicare. The present study, with a wider sampling and therefore slightly different statistics, validates his general conclusion, namely that only a small percentage of Americans are becoming catastrophically ill.

In conclusion, Dr. Davis wrote, "Doctors should tell these facts to their patients and Congressmen." Two years later, these facts on catastrophic illnesses are clearer than ever. Why then do most people think there is a health "crisis" in terms of catastrophic illness? Perhaps because the only "crisis" is that the truth is being hidden from the

American people. Members of the medical profession, while trying to present the facts, find themselves in competition with politicians and media men looking for one "crisis" after another.

It is time to present the facts to the American people. Let's stop creating "crises" where they don't exist, and get on with solving the real problem facing the medical profession today.

PROSPERITY IN PEORIA, ILL.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, how frequently have we heard the expression "How does it play in Peoria?" As Members well know, I am mighty proud to have been born and reared in that community and continue to sing its praises. While many parts of the country have been in serious economic straits these days, we consider ourselves to be somewhat of an island of prosperity, as attested to by the article appearing in the *Peoria Journal Star* under date of Sunday, February 2 and I would include, Mr. Speaker, the entire text of the article printed in the *RECORD* at this point, to give you all some idea of "How it is playing in Peoria":

PEORIA: A "PROSPERITY POCKET"

(By David Miller)

There's more to Peoria's economy than just optimistic predictions.

Several dozen letters—some of them outright job applications—have shown up in the Chamber of Commerce's mail in the last six months. Residents of other towns or states have heard about Peoria's economy, and want to know if it's true.

Media looking for counterpoints to the withering national economy have turned up "pockets of prosperity" in places like Wichita, Dallas, and Muscatine, Iowa, which boasts a .6 per cent unemployment rate.

Peoria's another such pocket. While there's none of the glamour of a boom town built around airplanes or autos, Peoria has an unexciting but solid manufacturing base which signals stability.

And that may mean a job for a plumber out of work in Chicago, or a design engineer from Ohio.

"They look at this as a growth area . . . they know there's work," said Giles Flanagan, chamber president. "When they start coming into a place like this (the chamber), that's significant."

Recent unemployment figures here have been consistently—often markedly—below state and national levels. Tri-county unemployment for January will be between 4.5 and 5.5 per cent, predicts Robert E. Schmidt, manpower analyst for the Illinois State Employment Service.

The figure is due this week, and Schmidt cautioned that the percentage, up from December's 3.7 per cent, isn't as ominous as it seems. Part of the rise is due, he said, to normal seasonal unemployment.

ELIGIBILITY COVERAGE CHANGED

Another factor is a change in unemployment eligibility coverage made in early January. Schmidt said coverage has been extended to some farmers and domestic workers previously not included in calculations.

National unemployment figures for January will also be bloated because of the

change, Schmidt said. While stressing the broadened standard is here to stay, he estimated that this month's figure would have shown a .5 per cent raise in terms of December's method of calculation.

"Nobody seems to be taking any tremendous drops, other than seasonal," Schmidt said. He's been watching Peoria's unemployment fluctuations for 13 years, and said he sees no drastic dips on the way. Peoria won't be "in boom times" this year, he said, but then it never has been.

Mayor Richard Carver agreed, saying that while Peoria has never hit the economic peaks, neither has it slipped into the valleys. He cited steady growth, which has kept Peoria sober in times of economic buoyancy, and stable when the national economy has stuttered.

When asked why Peoria is in good shape, most people shrug and gesture vaguely in the direction of the general offices of Caterpillar Tractor Co. As Caterpillar goes, they say, so goes Peoria.

They're right, said Flanagan—it's hard to measure the impact of a major company with 33,600 local employees. There have been no layoffs, and none are anticipated, said Fred Tuerk, public relations chief.

CATERPILLAR CONSISTENT

Caterpillar has consistently deigned to discuss its impact on Peoria and speculation on how many jobs its new buildings may create. But an indication of Cat's economic future comes from last year's production schedules, which Tuerk said were at "a very high level" all year long.

"It's not too definitive . . . there's no way we can estimate our backlog (of orders)," Tuerk said. But he said virtually all of the company's major machine and engine products were still being allocated to buyers at the end of December.

Which means there is still a back-up demand for Caterpillar products, but Tuerk said he could not discuss how big the demand is, or how long it might last. Although not commenting on Caterpillar's long-range hopes for growth, he reviewed the company's building program:

The Mossville basic engine plant is completed and occupied, and the warehouse should be finished by late spring. The second basic engine plant should be done in late 1976.

Office additions in Morton should be finished in mid-year, and renovation of current office space is being planned.

The new steel fabrication building next to the levee in East Peoria should be closed in by the end of this year, and in operation late next year.

Work on the foundations at Mapleton is due to start soon, and steel should be going up this fall.

A fourth Caterpillar warehouse facility is going up in Pioneer Industrial Park.

Others have estimated the new Caterpillar facilities will create between 3,000 and 6,000 jobs for the area, but Tuerk said he couldn't confirm the figures. He did say that, to his knowledge, staffing of the new buildings wouldn't mean reducing the work force in current facilities.

But Caterpillar's dominance isn't the only factor in Peoria's economy. Flanagan said, explaining there are other companies with "muscle and talent."

"We don't have all our eggs in one basket," Flanagan said. "The basic industries that are here just happen to be those that are growth-oriented."

COMPANY STRENGTH HELPS

Keystone Steel and Wire Co.'s 2,600 employees have been scrambling to keep up with the demand from agricultural and energy markets. Record sales and earnings in the last three months may be matched this quarter if demand holds, according to Donald R. Moore, president.

Bemis Company, Inc., had to meet a "tremendous demand for paper and bags in 1974," said plant manager W. J. Ray. He said the plant is feeling the economic slowdown, but said it hasn't caused any cutbacks in total employment.

Ray said there's a chance of a shortened work week for Bemis' 500 or so employees, but was optimistic that business will soon rise out of its seasonal slump once customers work through their inventories.

"As long as it's a little slowdown, we do not view it as a drastic situation, just a pause in planned growth," Ray said, adding that he made it through the 1930s depression without much trouble.

Hiram Walker and Sons, Inc., is in its seasonal lull right now, said Bill Day, plant manager. Seasonal employees have been laid off, but he said all regular workers are still on the job.

"I would say, the way we're feeling right now, it (production) will hold steady, maybe somewhat less volume than last year," Day said.

The near future looks good at Hyster Co., according to Ron Bengston, plant manager. There haven't been any layoffs, he said, and none are anticipated for the 500-strong work force.

"The orders right now are, I'd say, pretty good . . . that could change, but it's okay, pretty stable," Bengston said.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. is in good shape, according to a spokesman:

"The company is still looking for experienced welders and machine operators and . . . the order backlog is continuing at a substantially high level."

Flanagan and Bob Arnett, economic developer for the chamber, said large-scale growth of businesses is an important buttress to Peoria's economy. Flanagan said a lot of people just don't realize what all the building and planning means.

"People who live here and see another building going up just say 'Ho-Hum . . . another \$10 million at Ashland Chemical, so what else is new? What I'm saying is that this is news,'" Flanagan said.

The payoff, he said, comes in the form of construction jobs to put a facility together, and then the jobs the facility creates for itself. Flanagan scoffed at the idea of Peoria's economy being even shaky.

PROBLEM HERE "UNREAL"

"If we have any kind of problem here, it's an unreal one . . . people want to believe the worst."

"Hell's bells, everyone in the country is worrying about where their next buck is coming from and here the people say, ' . . . they're not making any progress' on projects like the downtown redevelopment," Flanagan said.

An off-hand survey shows "at least \$100 million" in area building projects, said F.M. "Bill" Bourland, president of First Federal Savings and Loan. While residential construction is lagging behind commercial and institutional projects, it may increase toward summer, he said.

Money is starting to loosen up, Bourland said. Prime interest rates have been falling, and local savings accounts are starting to fill up again.

The more savings an institution has, the more it can loan. After the squeeze last year, mortgage financing will be available this year, Bourland said, if people choose to buy homes. "They're not buying real estate now for other reasons. . . . I have to admit I think people have gotten a little bit turned off by the cost of housing," Bourland said.

But national surveys have shown people are edging back into the housing market, mainly in response to price cuts made by builders and realtors. Local residential building may be down, but it is still moving along.

Bourland said the first six show-houses at

First Federal's Charter Oaks project will be open in early May. He said 60 single family units should be completed and sold building this season—another 25 units will be started by fall.

Commercial National Realty just opened 12 units in its new Edgepoint development, and 20 more should be on the market in April, said president Bernard Pilon. CNR's Versailles Gardens project is also growing, he said, adding that, "This is the best January we've had in 10 years."

The five-acre lake at Willow Knolls is cleared and starting to be filled, and work on 36 condominiums will start when the weather breaks, said Ted J. Fleming, one of the owners of Peoria Athletic Clubs, Inc., handling the development.

BUILDING MONEY ESSENTIAL

More building activity is taking place in Pioneer Industrial Park, where nine structures have gone up since July. Another 11 are either under construction or on the verge of it, said James E. Gilchrist, vice president and general manager.

"We've got a head of steam built up out here," said Gilchrist. The Park employs around 7,000 people, and 200 of its original 725 acres are still available for development.

Gilchrist, as well as Fleming, expressed concern for having more money available for development loans. Local banks and savings and loan associations have an estimated \$1.5 billion in financial assets, Bourland said, but the costs for major developments cut into that quickly.

Some of the big bucks are going for major construction projects at all three Peoria hospitals.

Methodist Hospital announced a \$14.5 million program in fall of 1973, but inflation has pushed that estimate up to \$19 million, said Roger Monroe, public relations spokesman.

Monroe said construction of the parking deck should be completed in late summer, and the two-story doctors' medical center on top of it by the end of the year. The hospital's new energy plant and electrical facility should be ready sometime in March or April.

At St. Francis, work is almost finished on a \$100,000 pedestrian tunnel between the hospital and the adjacent convent. Remodeling of the kidney disease treatment center should be done next month, and a \$140,000 communications center is to be done in March.

A \$2.5 million medical office building will probably be ready for use in early fall, according to Edward McGrath, associate administrator. And the \$2.2 million addition for the school of nursing should be under way this summer. Another \$3.5 million in new construction and remodeling is set to start within the next year.

The new professional office building at Proctor Hospital is 85 per cent complete, and the \$1.5 million facility should open July 1. More construction and alteration of the hospital is being planned, a spokesman said.

Flanagan said hospitals are the area's third largest employer, and said he looks for an increase in related jobs once the above programs and the \$6.2 million Peoria School of Medicine are completed.

FARMING CARRIES INFLUENCE

One of the area's central economic influences—farming is also one of the hardest to pin down. Peoria County Farm Extension Advisor George Perisho said the coming season looks good so far, but quickly added anything could happen.

"The wheat crop looks real good now, but we don't know what to expect with all the freezing and thawing. . . . We could lose it if it freezes out now," Perisho said.

Although there's enough moisture in the ground to promise a good season, he said eventual production totals depend heavily on good summer weather. Additionally, pro-

duction may be off if farmers carry through on threats to leave their fields fallow.

"This is the big thing," Perisho said. "They're waiting for a price rise."

Commodity prices have fallen sharply since last fall. Farmers faced with higher fuel, fertilizer and material costs have been talking about letting some fields lie empty this year, according to Harold Steele, Illinois Farm Bureau president.

Observers not wise in the ways of agriculture might also wonder about the recent large number of farm sales and auctions, but Perisho said it happens every year at this time.

The agricultural work force—and associated food processing jobs—are the only categories showing a decline in size in the last 10 years, according to the Illinois State Employment Service (ISES).

SKILLED LABOR IN DEMAND

As Peoria has grown, there has been a continuous demand for skilled labor to support local manufacturing. Presently ISES says there's a shortage of machinists, machine setup men, millwrights, tool and die makers and auto mechanics.

There's also a premium on skilled workers—there aren't enough good welders, secretaries, stenographers and store buyers. General duty nurses are also in short supply, as well as licensed practical nurses.

On the other hand, the market is tight for those seeking work as porters, truck drivers, general clerks, materials handlers, and general sales personnel. Cashiers and checkers outnumber the jobs available, and waiters and waitresses have to put up with long hours and low pay.

But for all this, the community is still solvent, according to Clint Jostad, manager of Northwoods Mall. Stores that were open in November, 1973, reported an over-all hike of 57.5 per cent in retail sales by November, 1974.

Jostad said part of Northwood's success is because people are learning to know where it is, and once they learn, he said, they start buying—the year between Novembers showed:

- A 21.9 per cent raise in card and gift sales.
- A 65.5 per cent raise in jewelry sales.
- A 56.3 per cent raise in music items.
- A 58.8 per cent raise in book sales.
- A 31.8 per cent raise in shoe sales.
- A 46.7 per cent raise in handicrafts.

Jostad's ebullient summary was simply, "The merchandising is good."

Downtown merchants said they were happy with last year's sales levels, but wouldn't discuss the percentage increases.

Stanton Bluestone, president of Bergner's, said his downtown store hadn't done as well as the Sheridan Village store.

"Peoria has no economic problem, per se," Bluestone said, explaining that Peorians have been "psyched" by the recession around them. All they need to start back downtown, he said, is a little motivation, confidence.

Another positive index for Peoria is reflected in the increasing grant monies received in the last few years. The city comptroller's office reported \$499,352 in federal and state money went into the corporate fund in 1972; \$501,604 in 1973; and \$601,107 in 1974.

If Gov. Dan Walker's \$4.1 billion accelerated building program for the state gets through the General Assembly next month, Peoria will be in even better shape than it is now, said Mayor Carver.

"With a stable employment base and positive psychological benefits . . . Peoria should actually get a stimulus out of it," he said. As far as the recession goes, Carver said:

"It's about as bad as it's going to get in Peoria."

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN ACT OF 1975

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of deliberations by the 94th Congress, I introduced H.R. 1719, a bill to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, the Equal Rights for Women Act of 1975. It has been my privilege and responsibility as a citizen, a woman, and a Member of this House of Representatives to sponsor legislation embodying many of the provisions of H.R. 1719 in sessions dating back to 1968.

Section 2 of my bill, stating the purposes of the act, will indicate the broad scope of current law which denies equal treatment under the law, discriminating on the basis of sex. Section 2 says:

It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide for injunctive relief against sex discrimination in public accommodations, (2) to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to eliminate sex discrimination in public facilities and public education, (3) to extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include sex discrimination, (4) to prevent sex discrimination in federally assisted programs, (5) to prevent sex discrimination in Federal employment, (6) to insure equal employment opportunity in the hiring of State and local government employees, (7) to remove the exemption of educational institutions from equal employment opportunity laws, (8) to provide the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with cease and desist powers, (9) to prohibit sex discrimination in the sale, rental, or financing of housing or in the provision of brokerage services, (10) to apply equal pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to women in executive, administrative, and professional positions, (11) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make matching grants to States for the establishment of commissions on the status of women, (12) to eliminate certain provisions discriminating against women, and to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make recommendations to equalize the treatment of the sexes under the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, (13) to eliminate sex discrimination in the armed services and in programs for veterans, and (14) to require the Commissioner of Education to conduct a survey and report to the Congress on the denial of equal educational opportunity because of sex and make recommendations to eliminate such denial.

Mr. Speaker, men and women seek equality under the law in the amendments which I have offered in this wide-ranging legislation. While it is true that the overwhelming majority of "women's rights" legislation which has been offered before the Congress has sought to end discriminatory treatment of women, it is also true that there are a number of instances under current law in which men are likewise treated unfairly.

Such is the case in provisions of the Social Security Act relating to benefits to which surviving widowers are entitled

upon the death of a spouse who may have contributed amounts to the social security trust fund equal to or even more than her husband. The social security tax is levied on the basis of earnings and totally without reference to the sex of the taxpayer. Not so the benefits accruing to the spouse and minor children of a working woman who dies, retires, or becomes disabled.

This is just one instance among many where the law does not treat the citizen equally, and one instance among many where passage of my bill will correct the situation.

This matter of inequities in the social security system is the subject of a resolution adopted on February 12, 1975, by the council of the city and county of Honolulu by unanimous vote. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I wish the resolution to be printed in the RECORD for the information and consideration of my colleagues, and urge favorable action on the Equal Rights for Women Act of 1975:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INVESTIGATE INEQUITIES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM AND TO MAKE APPROPRIATE AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Whereas, approximately 33 million working women in the United States contribute more than 9 billion dollars annually to the Social Security system; and

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of the City Council of the City and County of Honolulu that the Social Security Act fails to provide social security benefits to husbands and widowers of women workers under the same conditions as such benefits are provided to wives and widows of men workers; and

Whereas, as an example of such disparate treatment, under the law as presently written the widower of a working woman who dies before the statutory retirement age may receive one ludicrously insubstantial "lump sum" payment (\$255.00) despite the fact that his deceased spouse contributed substantial sums to the social security system over a period of many years, unless said widower is able to prove that he has been dependent on his deceased spouse for at least one half of his support; and

Whereas, the widow of a working man who similarly dies before retirement is entitled to collect relatively substantial amounts without being required to prove such dependency; and

Whereas the protection which the social security system affords the spouse and minor children of a working woman who dies, retires or becomes disabled compares individually with the protection afforded by the system to the spouse and minor children of a working man who dies, retires or becomes disabled; and

Whereas, a major purpose and principal justification for the social security tax is to provide benefits for individuals in their old age and for their surviving spouses and dependents, and the tax is levied on the basis of earnings and totally without reference to the sex of the taxpayers; and

Whereas, the sex of the taxpayer is nonetheless in many instances the controlling factor in the determination of benefits, as demonstrated in the examples set forth above; and

Whereas, the discriminatory attitude underlying such legislation, discounting as it does the value of a woman's employment, has the paradoxical effect of rendering men the

real losers in terms of actual benefits received; and

Whereas, these provisions of the Social Security Act are antiquated, irrational, unfair and almost certainly unconstitutional; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, State of Hawaii, that the Council urges the Congress of the United States to investigate the inequities in the Social Security system and to proceed as speedily as possible to amend those provisions of the Social Security Act which calculate benefits on the basis of the sex of the taxpayer; and

Be it further resolved by said Council that the Clerk be, and she is, hereby directed to transmit copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Finance, the Chairman of the United States House Committee on Ways and Means, and all members of the Hawaii congressional delegation.

SOUTH VIETNAM: WE MUST NOT ABANDON AN ALLY IN NEED

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the situation in South Vietnam at the present time is critical. In violation of the Paris agreement, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong continue in their aggressive efforts to take over the Saigon government by force.

The new aid which is being requested for the South Vietnamese is to be used only for essential military needs. Those who argue against such aid on the basis of alleged corruption in Saigon or of other forms of mismanagement are not, in reality, discussing the perilous situation before us.

The bulk of aid being requested, for example, \$198 million, would go for additional ammunition. Of the rest, \$26 million would go for fuel, and \$36.9 million for spare parts, rifles, and other supplies. Handling and transportation would cost \$39.1 million. This additional money would not even be sufficient to put back into the air the planes now grounded for lack of fuel, spare parts, and ammunition. The planes now operating, however, would be able to fly additional missions. At the present time, rationing limits South Vietnamese aircraft to less than half the missions they are capable of flying.

Referring to those who argue that the United States, having expended 50,000 men and some \$150 billion defending South Vietnam, can now demand that they survive entirely on their own, columnist Crosby S. Noyes notes that—

There are still some Americans around who can recognize double-talk when they hear it and who are not much impressed by rationalizations for the most disgraceful sell-out in American history. One suspects that they will be heard from, now and then, in the months to come.

Those Americans who reject the concept of abandoning an ally which faces continued aggression are being heard more and more. Columnist James J. Kilpatrick, for example, says of those who wish to stop aid to South Vietnam that—

This is a failure of the will, the most melancholy of all failures. We are not asked to send men. We are asked to provide money only—money in the form of arms, ammunition, aviation fuel. . . . Are we too tired even to provide arms in a desperate hour for a small and valiant ally? If so, the cause of human freedom creeps closer to that deep sleep from which no traveller returns.

I wish to share with my colleagues the column "Abandoning an Ally," by Crosby S. Noyes, which appeared in the Washington Star-News of February 4, 1975, and the column, "Friends in Need," by James J. Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Star-News of February 5, 1975, and insert them into the RECORD at this time:

ABANDONING AN ALLY

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

For those few of us who are still a bit squeamish about the spectacle of the United States deliberately and coldly abandoning an ally, this is a painful period. Because if all of the readings of the mood in Congress are correct, this is precisely what we are preparing to do in South Vietnam and Cambodia.

There is not even much of an attempt to disguise the betrayal. Leave aside the fruitless debate over the origins of the war or the wisdom of our part in it. Surely, at this point there can be no question that as a nation and as a government we did everything that we could—and possibly much more than we should have done—to encourage the South Vietnamese to resist the effort of North Vietnam to establish its control in the South.

Surely, there can be no question either that under the Paris agreement of 1973, we assumed an obligation to aid South Vietnam to resist continuing Communist military pressure. The government in Saigon signed the agreement, permitting the withdrawal of American forces from their country and the continued presence of at least 100,000 enemy troops within their borders, on the firmest assurance that they would be supplied with the means of defending themselves.

The obligation, furthermore, has been formally ratified by the American Congress. Last year, the administration asked for \$1.4 billion in military and economic aid for Indochina. The Congress, in its wisdom, took the affirmative action of authorizing \$1 billion. And then, with an even more dazzling display of sagacity, it decided that \$700 million—one-half the original request—would be enough to fulfill what was a recognized obligation.

It wasn't. Today, with a buildup of enemy forces now exceeding 170,000 in South Vietnam, backed by large stockpiles of Chinese and Russian equipment, the government in Saigon is in desperate military straits. The administration, which has not come close to resupplying South Vietnam on a one-to-one basis over the last year, has returned to Congress with a request for the additional \$300 million which Congress originally authorized. The almost universal prediction is that the request will be refused.

Two schools of thought, in the country and the Congress, have combined to produce this likely result, neither of which reflects much credit—or even much humanity—on its adherents.

The first consists of those who have long believed that there was something morally wrong about this resistance of South Vietnam to conquest by the North. These people go a very long way toward embracing the classic Communist theory about "wars of national liberation" which says, in effect, that any military action that promotes "socialist ideas" and the political spread of the Communist system is automatically a just war, deserving the support of all progressive peoples. And conversely, as the Soviet "Red Star" put it recently:

"A war is unjust and reactionary if it is a continuation of a policy aimed at suppressing the revolutionary struggle, freedom and independence of any particular peoples and working peoples' socialist achievements. . . ."

The other school, which normally does not greatly favor promoting the "cause of socialism and communism," has come to the simple conclusion that any further support of South Vietnam is useless and that the cause to which so much American effort has been devoted is lost. This possibly tenable conclusion, however, is bolstered by a number of utterly specious arguments.

It is said, for instance, that the United States, having expended 50,000 men and some \$150 billion defending the South Vietnamese, can now demand that they survive entirely on their own, without further outside help. It is implied that the South Vietnamese are no longer worthy of our support (in contrast, say, to the Israelis who make more efficient use of the arms and money they receive). It is suggested that help from us at this point is simply prolonging the agony and that all would be well if the Vietnamese were left alone to "settle their differences between themselves."

Yet there are still some Americans around who can recognize double-talk when they hear it and who are not impressed by rationalizations for the most disgraceful sell-out in American history. One suspects that they will be heard from, now and then, in the months to come.

FRIENDS IN NEED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

President Ford has asked Congress to provide supplementary arms aid for South Vietnam, and the word on Capitol Hill is that Congress won't agree. If that pessimistic prediction is accurate, it is bad news not only for South Vietnam but for the whole of the free world as well.

Mike Mansfield, Senate majority leader, expressed his own opposition a couple of weeks ago: "Additional aid means more killing, more fighting. This has got to stop sometime. It is up to these people to settle their differences in their own way."

It is an oversimplification, though not a gross one, to say that the agonizing conflict in Vietnam is at bottom a struggle between freedom and slavery. What Mansfield is saying is: Let the chance for freedom go. The senator is tired. Let it go.

This is a failure of will, the most melancholy of all failures. We are not asked to send men. We are asked to provide money only—money in the form of arms, ammunition, aviation fuel. We are asked only to provide the people of South Vietnam with the means for fighting back. Observers in Saigon agree that if such aid is not forthcoming—if it is not forthcoming now, within the next six weeks—the Communist invasion will succeed. But the senator is tired. He finds "more fighting" abhorrent.

There is no such failure of will on the Communist side. In the two years since the Paris agreement was signed, Moscow and Peking have redoubled their aid to Hanoi.

The North Vietnamese, in contemptuous violation of the truce, have infiltrated the South with 170,000 troops. The Communist forces are armed with new artillery, rockets, and antiaircraft weapons. The Communists are not tired.

In my own view, at least, the arguments in favor of providing the requested arms are compelling. We are not talking of "aid to President Thieu," or of "propping up the corrupt Thieu administration." This is straw-man stuff. In the continuing struggle between freedom and slavery, Thieu is one poor, weak, mortal man. He does not matter. We are talking, rather, of the people of South Vietnam, and of the faint, flickering candle they have fought so valiantly to keep alive. What do we say to these people? Let the candle go out?

Every American knows of the sacrifice the United States has made already: 55,000 dead, more than \$100 billion spent. The sacrifice of the people of South Vietnam is not so widely understood. A better idea may be gained by using a factor of ten. In recent weeks, the South Vietnamese army has suffered one hundred casualties a day. It is as if an American army were losing a thousand. Upwards of two million South Vietnamese are directly involved in their war effort. It is as if we had mobilized 20 million.

Is it conceivable that the Vietnamese people would keep fighting if it were only for the honor and glory of "a corrupt little dictator"? This is nonsense. If the Thieu government did not command a large measure of popular support, it would have been toppled long ago. What, then, could impel the people to resist? Why has their will not failed? Tired as they are, they are not as tired as old senators. They do not regard the triumph of the Communists as inevitable. They ask only: Give us arms! And they will fight on.

Of course the requested aid should be provided—quickly, generously, unstintingly. Simultaneously, every possible diplomatic pressure should be applied to Peking and Moscow. If there is such a thing as "world opinion," that opinion should be marshalled against the North Vietnamese aggressors.

Are we too tired even to provide arms in a desperate hour for a small and valiant ally? If so, the cause of human freedom creeps closer to that deep sleep from which no traveler returns.

PROPOSALS TO HELP OUR ENERGY AND ECONOMIC DILEMMA

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, although I have gone on record in opposition to gasoline rationing except as an absolute last resort, a recent letter from one of my constituents provides food for thought on this and other measures that would bring our present energy and economic dilemma under control.

Additionally, this letter gives clear evidence that people are genuinely concerned about these issues—concerned enough not only to urge affirmative action, but to thoroughly consider and outline their own proposals. I am happy to share this letter with my colleagues:

COLUMBUS, GA.,
January 17, 1975.

JACK T. BRINKLEY,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRINKLEY: As the Ninety-Fourth Congress convenes to cope with some of the most perplexing problems in our nation's history, I feel compelled to write to you and voice my preference of positive actions that should be taken by the Congress to help alleviate some of these problems. This is the first time I have written to anyone in the Congress to request something, but since the Executive Branch seems confused, bewildered and capable of only grasping at straws, Congress should be encouraged to take the initiative and pass strong remedial legislation at the earliest possible dates.

The American people do not mind meaningful sacrifices that will involve all the people, indeed, the people I know and talk to are looking for some form of firm guidance to control inflation and eliminate this recession that has been fueled by indecisiveness and inaction.

Below are some of the measures I would like to see employed by Congress to get our country back to full scale production, and stop this ridiculous Yo-Yo type economy that has plagued us for the past six years.

1. Ration gasoline. Do not raise import duties or raise taxes on fuels. The American people would welcome a good strong program designed to allocate fuel equitably and yet ensure that critical activities such as transportation and farming would not be unduly curtailed.

Objective: Reduce national fuel consumption five million barrels per day by July 1, 1975. This would have the desirable side effect of forcing oil price reductions by the Middle East producers.

2. Pass legislation limiting the size of new automobile engines and chassis so that present day mile per gallon averages would be increased considerably.

Objective: Reduce national fuel consumption another ten million barrels per day by January 1, 1977.

3. Impose moderate wage and price controls, but extend them clear across the board. A fully organized program, if given half a chance, will succeed.

Objective: Stabilize the economy and increase productivity. This will help immeasurably in restoring the confidence of the people in our government.

4. Encourage farm productivity by initiating land clearing and land reformation programs employing, where health and feasibility permit, people drawing unemployment compensation. Also, encourage farmers to use every available foot of land to produce more.

Objective: Produce enough farm products to export additional millions of tons annually.

5. Launch a full scale railroad reformation program. This should be a government subsidized program creating thousands of jobs. It would be employed to modernize, streamline, and increase the versatility of our railroads and mass transit systems.

Objective: To make rail shipments practical, economical, and speedy. This would also greatly reduce transportation's energy requirements.

6. Initiate programs to reward industries for efforts made to promote austerity in the use of this nation's natural resources. Publicize activities designed to motivate all citizens to become actively involved in conservation of all resources.

Objective: To ensure adequate resources for use during our lifetime, and preserve bounties for posterity.

I realize this correspondence is rather lengthy, and I beg your indulgence. I am not submitting the above actions as a panacea to all the problems facing us, but as topics which I think worthy of very serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,
ELDRIDGE W. BROWN.

ADVICE FOR A SOUND ECONOMY—II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on page 3678 of yesterday's RECORD, I placed a letter to President Ford from four economics professors at Grove City College regarding a four point program to end inflation and stabilize the U.S. dollar. I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following editorial comment on the letter, published in the Wall Street Journal of February 2, 1975:

REVIEW OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

President Ford has received advice from many economists in recent months. Some has been solicited, as at the so-called summit conferences on inflation late last year, and some has been unsolicited. The latter category includes advice from the economics faculty of Grove City College, a Pennsylvania institution that seven years ago conferred an honorary doctor of laws degree on Mr. Ford. His degree notwithstanding, the President appears most unlikely to heed the Grove City professors. Still, their view seems worth bearing in mind when so many economists are beginning to talk sanguinely of reduced inflation and economic recovery later this year and a surging stock market seems to agree.

The Grove City economists sent a letter to the White House on Oct. 1 spelling out their idea of how the President should tackle the country's economic woes. The professors, noting that they had been "conspicuously absent" from the inflation summits, stress that "the federal budget must be balanced now, next year and every year thereafter."

The massive budget deficits that loom for the current fiscal year and for 1975-76 indicate the attention that the President has given that suggestion far better than his polite response to the professors, which talked vaguely of a need for "hard work, sacrifice and cooperation" and expressed gratitude for "your thoughtful letter."

The letter contains additional advice. The Federal Reserve System, whose responsibilities include regulation of the country's money supply, is described as an "engine of inflation" that should be "inactivated, or better yet, abolished." Without monetary pump-priming by the Fed "to accommodate new deficit spending and credit expansion," the economists continue, "you will need to cut federal spending" and taxes. Only then, they assert, can the economy begin a "speedy recovery from the recession." Other suggestions include that "Federal Reserve money now in circulation must stay in circulation and be made fully redeemable in gold."

The professors concede that such measures "may not be popular." They admit that most economists prefer "the new economies of easy money and deficit spending." However,

the professors warn the President that to proceed "on the present road you will preside over an accelerating depreciation of the dollar and all the economic and social evils thereof."

Hans Sennholz, chairman of the Grove City economics department and a signer of the letter, expands on where current government policy may lead in a lengthy article in the January issue of *The Freeman*, a monthly publication devoted to the discussion of "ideas on liberty." The Sennholz scenario contrasts remarkably with the mildly optimistic forecasts beginning to emanate from many analysts as the recession deepens.

The government, Dr. Sennholz states, is "alarmed about the recession that is engulfing consumer goods industries" and obviously wants "to stimulate these industries once again." As he puts it, "by popular demand, the government is expected to cope with this recession with all means at its disposal." This assures intensified "deficit spending and credit expansion," the economist contends. And this, in turn, will lead eventually to an even "hotter boom" than the recent inflationary period. As a result, he warns that "two-digit inflation must rage on" and "the purchasing power of the dollar must fall at ever faster rates."

How does this gloomy scenario end?

"Two-digit inflation only comes to an end with the advent of three-digit inflation, which signals the approaching demise of paper currency," Dr. Sennholz writes. "When millions of consumers hurry to spend their monetary assets and use all their lines of credit in order to seek refuge in real goods, the end of the currency comes in sight (and) the dreaded depression that was so long delayed will finally make its entrance with irresistible force."

In the end, Dr. Sennholz claims, "the inexorable laws of economics will prevail over political intrigue."

It is possible to dismiss such commentary as simply out of touch with today's realities. Dr. Sennholz warns that triple-digit inflation may supplant the recent double-digit variety. But price trends seem to be moving in the opposite direction. In December consumer prices rose at the single-digit rate of slightly over 8% annually, down from a double-digit increase in November, and wholesale prices, on average, actually dropped for the first time in 14 months. The Federal Reserve, moreover, can hardly be accused of a recklessly inflationary policy when the nation's money stock over the past year has grown roughly 4%.

Altogether, the current business scene—the return to single-digit consumer price inflation, declining wholesale prices, the sluggish growth of the money stock, widespread joblessness and idle plant capacity—hardly suggests that the economy verges on a "hotter boom" and triple-digit inflation. Indeed, it is not at all surprising that the advice Mr. Ford has recently been getting—and seems to be following—largely involves ways to stimulate the economy. Recession-whipping has taken clear precedence over inflation-whipping, and very possibly for good reason.

Nevertheless, it doesn't necessarily follow that the fears of the Grove City professors should be totally disregarded. The idea of triple-digit inflation does seem unrealistic at the moment. However, how many forecasters several years ago foresaw that every major country in the non-Communist world, save West Germany, would suffer double-digit inflation in 1974? One of the precious few back then who did warn about such an eventuality was Hans Sennholz.

ALFRED L. MALABRE, JR.

STATEMENT ON PROPERTY TAX RELIEF FOR ELDERLY

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are finding it more and more difficult to cope with our present economic problems, but the effects of inflation and recession have been most devastating for the old and the poor. Especially hard pressed are those older Americans living on a fixed income who are forced to combat the same inflationary pressures as everyone else, but at a distinct disadvantage. Most people 65 or older are existing on a much lower income than the average individual and pay a disproportionately large percentage of their income for property taxes. In spite of repeated pledges to attack this problem, Congress has completely failed to do so.

In 1972, Congress attempted to respond to the property tax problem by enacting general revenue sharing, returning to State and local governments some \$5 billion per year. It was hoped at the time that general revenue sharing would allow State and local government to reduce the burden of property taxes which falls so heavily on those trying to live on fixed incomes. Unfortunately, this has proved, for the most part, not to be the case. Court interpretations and fine print in the Revenue Sharing Act have discouraged or made impossible the needed property tax relief Congress hoped to provide. Recently, the National Council on Aging stated that:

The neglect of the elderly in the use of general revenue sharing funds by state and local governments is evidence that, without safeguards, special revenue sharing laws will also prove ineffectual for the needs of older Americans. Despite the fact that programs and services for older persons is one of the eight priority areas in which local governments may spend their revenue sharing money, a study by the General Accounting Office revealed that only about two-tenths of one percent, or \$2.9 million, of the total monies authorized for expenditure by the local governments surveyed were directed to programs to benefit the aged. Only 28 local governments of the 250 surveyed had committed funds to such programs.

The general revenue sharing program expires at the end of 1976. In the discussions and debates which will surround its renewal, the Congress should investigate why the elderly have not received their fair share of these funds. To make matters worse, funds for many federal programs providing services to older persons were cut back at about the same time that revenue sharing funds were made available.

Today I am introducing legislation which I hope will make good on the promise that Congress has thus far failed to keep.

Mr. Speaker, some States have adopted a system of property tax relief for the elderly. These programs vary in amounts of relief, eligibility of recipients, and administration. I applaud those efforts and

strongly believe that the individual States are in a much better position than the Federal Government to design and prudently run the type of program that would best benefit the elderly. Since many States have established a mechanism to administer a property tax relief program for the elderly, I do not view the Federal role as one of establishing an imposing upon the States a national program with strigent guidelines. Rather, I feel that we can offer the type of Federal assistance that will encourage those States that have not adopted a program of relief for the elderly poor to do so and those that have to continue those efforts at an increased level. This is the goal of my legislation.

The Older Americans Assistance Act of 1975 which I introduce today is a program designed to provide property tax relief to renters and homeowners. Funding would be achieved, if necessary, by earmarking approximately 25 percent of the \$2 billion increase in general revenue-sharing recently proposed by President Ford.

In brief, the Older Americans Assistance Act:

Establishes a \$500 million per year trust fund within the U.S. Treasury and a funding allocation for each State based on the income and numerical population of elderly households—currently about \$71 per eligible household.

Requires the Secretary of Treasury to make grants, upon application, to individual States for the financial support of property tax relief programs for the elderly that are designed and run by each State.

Makes eligible for grants only those State programs, or portions thereof, which provide relief to moderate- and low-income homeowners and renters 65 and over—that is, "eligible households". Judicial review is provided for in the event of a dispute between a State and the Secretary.

In the past, two problems have particularly frustrated congressional efforts to enact an equitable and fair property tax relief program for the elderly. The first is the technical difficulty of developing a program that meets the tremendous differences of each State's circumstances and pre-existing programs. The Older Americans Assistance Act accommodates this problem by allowing within very broad guidelines each State to receive support for the program of its choice. The second question is how to encourage States which need, but do not have a program to establish one without penalizing those States which have existing programs.

The legislation provides for this necessary balance by limiting Federal assistance to 50 percent of what a State spent the previous year. To insure that States with existing programs which choose to participate improve assistance to eligible households, the bill contains a 1-year maintenance of effort provision.

An equitable distribution of aid among States is assured by an appropriate

formula designed to provide the proper ratio of the total funds appropriated to those States that have a high percentage of elderly poor according to numerical population weighted by income:

[In percent]

Income scale for households with:	Weight
Less than \$3,000.....	100
At least \$3,000 but less than \$5,000..	80
At least \$5,000 but less than \$7,000..	60
At least \$7,000 but less than \$10,000..	40
At least \$10,000 but less than \$15,000..	20

Since there are about 7 million eligible households at the present time, the average household allotment would be about \$71 per household. The exact amount will depend on the States' allotment and State effort in the preceding year. Regarding previous State effort, each State may receive up to 50 percent of their revenue loss for operating a qualifying property tax relief program in the year prior to the enactment of this bill. This would work as follows: If a State has expanded \$50 million for such a program in 1974, that State could be eligible for \$25 million—assuming this did not exceed the States total allotment—from the Federal Government in 1975 provided that they spend the same amount of State funds in 1975 as they did in 1974. Therefore, an additional \$25 million in extra revenue would be distributed among lower-income elderly.

Most States will be encouraged to use the Federal money to increase aid to those elderly with the greatest need since this legislation places income restrictions on what States may define as a qualifying revenue loss.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Federal Government to join the States in their efforts to reduce this economic hardship which has, unfairly, been placed on all older Americans. We must reaffirm our commitment to help the elderly poor who have suffered the most during this period when our national economy is on the decline. Therefore, I urge the President and my colleagues not to ignore the needs of the elderly or those States that have made a good faith effort to eliminate the impact that property taxes have had on older people. Immediate consideration of the bill I am today introducing would be a big step in the right direction.

GENERAL PENSION WOULD HELP VETERANS AND SPUR ECONOMY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, no group of patriots has been so often overlooked and so long neglected as those Americans who served, and served valiantly, during World War I.

These veterans had few educational opportunities, and very little help in finding employment. In return for offering their lives for their country, they have received pensions which just cannot meet their needs. Approximately 500,000 World

War I veterans live on annual incomes of less than \$4,000.

Mr. Speaker, about 1 million World War I veterans are alive today, and their average age is 80. How much longer will we delay the repayment of our debt to these deserving men and women?

Because of the injustices this group has suffered, throughout my tenure in the House I have worked for a more equitable pension system, one which would provide monthly benefits to World War I veterans or their widows regardless of need. Such a bill is the World War I Pension Act, which would add \$150 a month to the incomes of these citizens.

The Torch, the official publication of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., carried an article in the February 1975 edition supporting this type of legislation. Editor Harold B. Say discussed the dual benefits of a general pension plan which would serve to both insure coverage of veterans and spur the economy.

I hope that, after reading this editorial, more of my colleagues will join Mr. Say and the group's National Commander, Benjamin H. Byers, in their fight for a fairer pension system for World War I veterans.

At this point, I would like to include Mr. Say's article in the RECORD:

PENSION WOULD HELP NATION'S ECONOMY

Anyone who lived through the dark and bitter days of the depression of the thirties cannot but have uppermost in his mind the hope that the President and the Congress will without delay pitch into the problem of preventing another. In the depth of the great depression some 25 percent of the labor force of the land was out of work. Skilled men hungrily grabbed at any task that would pay for bread. Many men who held high salaried positions had gratitude for some more fortunate person who would pay 50 cents an hour for lawn mowing or garden work. Some who read these lines were among those selling apples on the street corner.

Leaders in the government tell us this will never happen again; that we may have a recession but not a depression in the sense we older ones knew it.

Yet, with 25 percent of the employees of one of the nation's largest automobile manufacturers off payrolls, the signs are ominous unless the President and the Congress working together move now and swiftly.

The World War I veteran has as much concern as any other citizen. Perhaps this year he has more. A great majority of World War I men with the gates of their earning years closed behind them are in dire straits. This we know from visits over the land and from piteous letters pouring into our headquarters. The recently passed pension bill upping income limitations by \$400 a year and pension rate by 12 percent for some will help those most in need and who were cruelly hit by Social Security increases causing cuts in their pensions or their complete elimination.

Only a general pension will genuinely aid the great majority of surviving veterans and their widows. A growing sentiment for such a pension was evinced among both House and Senate members last year. There is no reason to believe it will fade in this new session.

The unfavorable economy of the nation should not form an excuse for postponing action. The cost as we have pointed out to Congressional committees will drop very sharply every year. By 1990, 15 years hence, there will not be more than about 12,000 of the current 1,000,000 War I veterans alive. Some of the remedies proposed for meeting

today's recession are sharp tax cuts giving citizens more to spend. If this philosophy is correct, what could be more in order than a long deserved pension. Veterans and widows receiving such a pension would be spending it at home immediately. It would instantly flow into the blood stream of the nation's economy—to the farmer for food, to factory workers through purchase of needed items. World War I veterans are 80 years old. They are not inclined to foreign travel, so virtually none of any pension money would leave the United States.

In summary, a general pension for 1917-18 men and their widows would not only correct in part an appalling inequity they have suffered compared with benefits received by later veterans, but would be a stimulant to the nation's economy at a time when a bolstering element is a critical need.

CHRISTIANITY BRIDGES GAP BETWEEN CALIFORNIA TOWNS

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication of the Seventh-Day Adventist Review and Herald contained a very revealing, timely, and gratifying article written by Mr. Jerre K. Iverson, director of university relations at Loma Linda University in California.

I want to bring the contents of the article to the attention of my congressional colleagues in the hope that it might relate, in detail, what a community of dedicated Christians has done to improve the well-being of a number of unemployed and less-fortunate people. Their efforts truly bridged the gap in the cultural and economic sense.

At a time when people seem to be "miles apart" in far too many communities of America, it seems this example could serve as an inspiration for other people and other communities to follow. In this day and age, we seem to have far too many people talking about helping their fellow man. These people are doing something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope "Christianity Bridges Gap Between California Towns" will be read by all Members of the House and Senate and, more importantly, used as a guideline for similar action in all the communities of America.

The article tells of the effort by Loma Linda to assist its neighbors through cultural, economic, and spiritual assistance and should be of interest to all Members of Congress to demonstrate what can be achieved through commitment and dedication to help others.

The Loma Linda concept is based upon the adage that it is better to teach a hungry man to fish than to give him a fish. Elder Gary Stanhiser, Donald Melnick, and John Duge are to be highly commended for their leadership in bringing this program about.

This article should be inspirational to all who read it:

CHRISTIANITY BRIDGES GAP BETWEEN CALIFORNIA TOWNS

(By Jerre K. Iverson)

They live only two miles apart. But their worlds are separated by light-years of mis-

trust and disinterest. About half the people that live in the Mill Valley area of south San Bernardino, California, are on welfare, living on less than \$5,000 a year. Almost half of them are unemployed, with their average level of education stopping at sixth grade.

On a clear day, many of the 5,000 people in the four-square-mile section can see the gleaming yellow towers of Loma Linda University Medical Center nestled atop a hill a couple of miles away.

The people in Loma Linda are well-educated, almost unanimously employed, and relatively affluent. The only common bond between the two worlds was the smog that obscured their long-range view of each other.

Then, three years ago, the pastoral staff of the Campus Hill church of Seventh-day Adventists in Loma Linda decided to demonstrate that Christianity could be the great equalizer, that it could bridge cultural and economic gaps, that it could help people learn to love one another.

Gary M. Stanhiser, of the Campus Hill church staff, was asked to develop a comprehensive evangelistic campaign in Mill Valley. Renting a small Pentecostal church, he began holding services every Sabbath. He was joined by 30 white members of the Campus Hill church and by about 20 Mill Valley residents, mostly black, who were already Seventh-day Adventists.

"The only way a large, mainly middle class church can help in a lower income area," says Elder Stanhiser, "is to go where the people are. Do not wait for them to come to you."

He also maintains that Christianity must become relevant to the needs of the people it is trying to reach. "When a person is hungry," he says, "a tract on the 2300-day prophecy, by itself, won't make him very receptive to your message."

So Elder Stanhiser and his small congregation began developing programs that would be relevant to the needs of the Mill Valley people. One of their first acts was to initiate a weekly free medical clinic. Loma Linda University medical students Donald E. Melnick and John F. Duge (both have now graduated) had been wanting to experiment with various concepts of the medical ministry, and this looked like a good opportunity.

"From the start, our approach was to implement, as completely as possible, what Ellen White had said about the medical ministry of the gospel," says Duge. For six months prior to the opening of the clinic, the two medical students, joined by classmates and nursing and physical therapy students, met every Friday night to study the Spirit of Prophecy.

"For the first three months," says Melnick, "we were mainly concerned with Mrs. White's teachings on medical missionary work, particularly in the inner city."

Melnick and Duge joined the Mill Valley church company and strongly urged all other students who came to help at the clinic also to join the company, which by now had been meeting for almost a year. Setting the example, both Melnick and Duge are officers in the Mill Valley church.

The medical clinic today is staffed by students and employees from many health disciplines of Loma Linda University. Six or seven medical students, under the supervision of a School of Medicine physician, see cases ranging from head colds to cancer. Nurses from the hospital volunteer time from their off-duty hours. Health and nutrition students give lectures and offer counseling in the waiting room. And physical therapy and occupational therapy students often are called in on specific cases.

Administrative and legal support comes from the Social Action Corps of Loma Linda University, the agency that coordinates a number of other free medical clinics in impoverished areas around Loma Linda. In addition to the Mill Valley clinic, more than 125 Loma Linda students run five other clinics

each week on a volunteer basis—no pay and no class credit is given.

While the free medical clinic in Mill Valley is important, it is only part of a multifaceted program sponsored by the Mill Valley church in an effort to witness for Christ through the needs of others.

CHRISTIANITY BECOMES REALITY

"When people know that you are concerned with helping them," says Elder Stanhiser, "they start seeing Christianity not as cold doctrines but as living realities. It's the gospel message embodied in people."

One of the church members' largest projects is their Family Education Center, operated jointly with Loma Linda University School of Health and funded with a State grant obtained by the university. It is similar to a day-care center program. The program coordinator is Kay Kuzma, assistant professor of maternal and child health in the School of Health. But the goal at Mill Valley is not to take children out of the home and become a professional baby-sitting service, says Stanhiser. Its primary function is to educate mothers.

"We hired 15 mothers in the area who had wanted us to care for their children during the day," says Elder Stanhiser. "We told them we wouldn't take care of their children ourselves. We would teach them how to be better mothers."

Today, the small group of Adventists in the Mill Valley company, along with the School of Health, administer the central Family Education Center plus eight satellite day-care centers. The program takes care of 85 children each day and has a number of mothers enrolled in education programs. Twenty-five others attend an after-school tutoring program.

For two years a Redlands attorney, Carol Lawson, has donated one night a week to giving free legal advice to any Mill resident who needs it. He helps them in everything from lawsuits to landlord-tenant difficulties. He now handles about ten legal problems a week, taking them to court when necessary. He attends the local church and lives in the community. The legal-aid program has received referrals and commendations from area judges. It is the only service of its kind in south San Bernardino.

VACANT LOT IS A GARDEN

One of the most interesting projects in the church is the garden program. A vacant tract of land in Mill Valley that is owned by Loma Linda University was donated to the church to use as a garden. The land on the 28-acre lot was subdivided into 20-foot-by-100-foot plots. Using seeds and seedlings given by Loma Linda University and individuals who were interested in the project, 65 families now grow their own vegetables.

San Bernardino mayor Bob Holcomb became so interested in the garden that he now has his own plot and regularly works to keep the weeds out of it.

"The first year we were here," says Elder Stanhiser, "we gave away food and clothes. The next year we taught cooking and sewing classes. This year we have the farm so that everyone can grow some of his own food. And we've just purchased ten sewing machines and 1,000 yards of material. It's the best way we know of to help people help themselves."

This total involvement with the community works both ways. It is not just the residents who benefit. Don Melnick says that working in the clinic gave him the chance to apply his education in a practical way before he was scheduled to.

Elder Stanhiser believes this kind of total approach to Christian witnessing is the only way to reach millions of people who are rarely exposed to religion.

"If the Adventist Church wants to reach the 40 per cent of the American population in low-income areas of large urban centers, we

must find ways to make Christianity significant to those people," he says. "When religion cares first about a person's physical needs, and takes an active interest in fulfilling those needs, that person will then be much more ready to take care of his spiritual requirements."

This kind of approach works. It has been proved in the Mill Valley area of San Bernardino. After two and a half years of this inner-city program, more than 50 people have been baptized into the Adventist Church.

The small Adventist company with the big ideas is now officially the Mill Valley Fellowship of Seventh-day Adventists, a happy blend of races and cultures where color and money aren't important—only people are.

THE PLIGHT OF MIKHAIL LEVIEV

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the second section of a three-part legal memorandum on behalf of the Soviet Jew, Mikhail Leviev:

THE PLIGHT OF MIKHAIL LEVIEV

B. The death penalty decreed upon Leviev must be commuted because such punishment is inhumane, immoral, and shocks the conscience of mankind.

Article 22 of the General Principles of the Soviet Union, enacted in December 1958, provides that the death penalty will be used only exceptionally and for the most serious offenses, with a view eventually to abolishing it entirely. Similarly, Article 23 of the 1960 Criminal Code of the RSFSR provides that the "[a]pplication of the death penalty—by shooting—is admitted as an exceptional penal measure, pending its final abolition . . ." This Article suggests the highly restricted nature of the death penalty in the Soviet Union and its temporary application:

"In terms of the basic principle of Marxist ideology, punishment by death has no room in Soviet society as a regular instrument of penal policy. There may be some justification for it in the period of revolutionary struggle with the class enemy. Once, however, the socialist order is established and the demoralizing effects of private ownership of a means of production disappears as a social and economic phenomenon, it is only a question of time before all moral and social illnesses of the capitalist order of things disappear. The state monopoly of education, in formulating the moral code, the healing effects of socially useful labour, all contribute to the gradual restriction and eventual disappearance of criminal activity." [Emphasis added] Staff Study, "Economic Crimes in the Soviet Union," Journal of the International Commission of Jurists 10 (Summer 1964).

One need not look only to Marxist history in order to elicit the fact that no room exists in a civilized society for the imposition of the death penalty. Camus described the abolition of the death penalty as a "great civilizing step." A. Camus, "Reflections on the Guillotine," in *Resistance, Rebellion, and Death* 232 (1961). Upon any humane standard:

"If people were to witness the decay of the waiting man, to hear his cries and watch his final struggles, they would be affronted in their consciences, and in their standards of human dignity and decency. G. Gottleib, *Capital Punishment* 6 (1967)."

The United States Supreme Court, in *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86 (1951), grappled with

the morality and propriety of the term "cruel and unusual punishment." The Court looked to "... evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society." *Id.* at 101. The Court added that a challenged punishment must be examined "in light of the basic prohibition against inhuman treatment." *Id.* at 100 n.32:

"At bottom, then, the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause prohibits the infliction of uncivilized and inhuman punishments. The State, even as it punishes, must treat its members with respect for their intrinsic worth as human beings. A punishment is 'cruel and unusual,' therefore, if it does not comport with human dignity." *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, 270 (1972).

In the development of both English and American Common Law, one finds a particular concern for the establishment of a safeguard against arbitrary punishments. See Granucci, "Nor Cruel and Unusual Punishments Inflicted: The Original Meaning," 57 Calif. L. Rev. 839, 857-860 (1969). No State should "engage in a reign of blind terror." *Furman v. Georgia*, *supra*, 281. Nor should the legislature authorize the infliction of a severe punishment "that is clearly and totally rejected throughout society" *Id.* Finally, it should be noted that, in the United States Supreme Court's view, "no State today would inflict a severe punishment knowing that there was no reason whatever for doing so." *Id.*

In the case at bar, the punishment imposed upon Leviev for the non-violent, economic crime allegedly committed by him is inordinately severe, has been inflicted arbitrarily, is one which is substantially rejected by contemporary society, and accomplishes no penal purpose more effectively than another, less severe, punishment.

The punishment of death is rare in the modern, civilized world:

"Death is today an unusually severe punishment, unusual in its pain, in its finality, and in its enormity. No other existing punishment is comparable to death in terms of physical and mental suffering. . . . [I]t appears that there is no method available that guarantees an immediate and painless death." *Furman v. Georgia*, *supra*, at 287.

Also see *Report of Royal Commission on Capital Punishment*, 1949-1953, paragraphs 700-789, pp. 246-273 (1953); H. Barnes and N. Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology*, 306-309 (3d ed. 1959); C. Chessman, *Trial by Ordeal*, 195-202 (1955); M. DiSalle, *The Power of Life and Death*, 84-85 (1965); R. Hammer, *Between Life and Death*, 208-212 (1969); K. Lamott, *Chronicles of San Quentin*, 228-231 (1961); and L. Lawes, *Life and Death in Sing Sing*, 170-171 (1928). Recently, the Supreme Court of the State of California addressed the same issue as follows:

"[T]he process of carrying out a verdict of death is often so degrading and brutalizing to the human spirit as to constitute psychological torture." *People v. Anderson*, 6 Cal. 3d 628-649, 493 P. 2d 880-894 (1972).

Mankind and society strongly affirm the sanctity of life. In response to this truism, some posit the argument that the threat of death prevents the commission of crimes because it deters potential criminals who would not be deterred by the threat of imprisonment. Yet, there exists no conclusive proof that the threat of death has greater deterrent effect than the threat of imprisonment. As Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter has written: "I think scientifically the claim of deterrence is not worth much." F. Frankfurter, *Of Law and Men*, 81 (1956).

Moreover, the presence of the death penalty as a keystone of a state's penal system must inevitably sabotage a social or institutional program of reformation. B. Eshelman and F. Riley, *Death Row Chaplain*, 222 (1962). Certainly, it is in the interest of the Soviet Union to reform an individual convicted of a crime. A society's wish to prevent

crime is understandable; its desire to kill alleged criminals in lieu of retraining and reforming them is incomprehensible.

Finally, it is submitted that capital punishment is shocking to the conscience and sense of justice of world humanity. In recent United Nations studies, in 1964 and 1967, evidence was adduced that there exists a distinctive trend toward the abolition of the death penalty throughout the world. In those few countries that retained the death penalty, such retention was only with regard to premeditated murder or, in the case of the Republic of China, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and the Republic of South Africa, with regard to non-homicidal rape. United Nations Report, *Capital Punishment* (ST/ SOA/SD/9-10) page 64; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Capital Punishment* 5-7 (United Nations 1967); and Goldberg and Dershowitz, "Declaring the Death Penalty Unconstitutional," 83 Harv. L. Rev. 1773, 1781 (1970).

In Western Europe, only France, Spain and Greece have retained the death penalty, solely with regard to premeditated murder. The post-World War II Constitutions of West Germany, Austria and Italy specifically exclude the imposition of capital punishment in all cases. *Report of Secretary General on Capital Punishment*, February 23, 1973 (E/5242). In fact, the United Nations General Assembly, in 1971, specifically affirmed that—

"In order to fully guarantee the right to life, provided for in Article 3 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the main objective to be pursued is that of progressively restricting the number of offenses for which capital punishment may be imposed with a view to the desirability of abolishing the punishment in all countries." United Nations Resolution 2857 [XXVI], December 20, 1971.

The Soviet Union, along with all other European socialist countries (except for Albania, which was not present), voted in favor of the resolution.

Given Article 22 of the General Principles and Article 23 of the 1960 Criminal Code of the RSFSR, which suggest that the abolition of the death penalty in the Soviet Union is the desired objective, along with the overwhelming negative view toward the death penalty taken by courts, jurists, international bodies and commentators throughout the world, it is submitted that the Procurator General of the Soviet Union should urge the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union to abolish the death penalty. In the alternative, given the recognition in Article 23 that the death penalty is an "exceptional penal measure," it is submitted that the Procurator General should adjure the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union to commute the death sentence in Leviev's case on the grounds that the crimes allegedly perpetrated by him were not of such severe nature so as to justify the assessment of such an "exceptional penal measure" herein.

C. The death penalty decreed upon Leviev must be commuted because the imposition of such penalty with regard to the alleged perpetration of an economic, nonviolent, crime shocks the conscience of mankind.

In the case at bar, Mikhail Leviev was charged and convicted of bribery and having been an intermediary in the illegal sale of gold. These charges and convictions, even if upheld, merely relate to non-violent, economic crimes.

As has been shown, *supra*, there has been almost a uniform rejection by the nations of the world of the use of capital punishment even with regard to the most egregious of crimes, e.g., premeditated homicide, homicidal rape and/or non-homicidal rape. *A fortiori*, the imposition of a death sentence upon an individual guilty of an economic crime must be viewed as a punishment wholly out of proportion to the crime committed.

Even with regard to the imposition of the

death sentence upon those who are convicted of murder and/or rape:

"[T]he unusual severity of death is manifested most clearly in its finality and enormity. Death, in these respects, is in a class by itself. . . . Although death, like expatriation, destroys the individual's 'political existence' and his 'status in organized society' it does more, for, unlike expatriation, death also destroys '[h]is very existence.' There is, too, at least the possibility that the expatriate will in the future regain 'the right to have rights.' Death forecloses that possibility.

"Death is truly an awesome punishment. The calculated killing of a human being by the State involves, by its very nature, a denial of the executed person's humanity." *Furman v. Georgia*, *supra*, at 289-290.

Given "the unusual severity of death," the civilized world has reserved such a punishment "for the most heinous crimes." No other developed country, other than the Soviet Union and perhaps one or two Eastern European States, have imposed the sentence in crimes of an economic nature.* Certainly the Soviet Union does not seek uniqueness in this area of endeavor:

"The disproportionate hardship principle clearly invalidates some grossly disproportionate applications of capital punishment. The harm done by simple unarmed robbery or by any economic crime, for example, is surely not equal to the hardship that would be imposed by execution of the robber. Even if the deterrence of future robberies that might be achieved by execution of convicted robbers is taken into account, a society that values human life over material possessions cannot find capital punishment for economic crimes to be justified by the principle of proportionality." Goldberg and Dershowitz, "Declaring the Death Penalty Unconstitutional," *supra*, at 1796.

Of course, even with regard to a person convicted of homicide and/or rape, the propriety of the death penalty "must depend upon the state's ability to demonstrate a compelling justification for using it instead of a less severe penalty." *Id.* Also see, *Weems v. United States*, 217 U.S. 349, 381 (1910). The Soviet Union is unable to show that the death penalty is any more effective a deterrent than life imprisonment. The sole purpose of such penalty with regard to an economic crime appears to be retributive in nature. Surely, the Soviet Union does not want to encourage primal revenge of this form.

If the Soviet Union is to be regarded as a civilized society, it must abolish the death penalty for economic crimes of the like allegedly perpetrated by Mikhail Leviev. This abolition would be in accordance with Article 22 of the General Principles and Article 23 of the 1960 Criminal Code of the RSFSR. Accepting the view taken in Article 23 of the Code that the application of the death penalty is an "exceptional penal measure," such penalty should not be imposed in the present case. Even if he were guilty of the alleged crimes, which guilt is specifically denied, Mr. Leviev's acts cannot be viewed as unusual or exceptional but, rather, extremely human. The human element is one which must be taken into account in the sentencing of an individual and it is this human element which is specifically lacking in the sentence imposed upon Mr. Leviev.

For all of the reasons presented above, it is urged that the Procurator General present the arguments contained herein before the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union and urge said Court to commute the sentence imposed upon Leviev both on the grounds that said sentence is unjustifiably severe and on the grounds that it shocks the moral conscience of mankind.

*Bulgaria, in its 1968 Criminal Code, abolished capital punishment for economic crimes. Book Review, Bedau, *Challenging the Death Penalty*, 9 Harv. Civ. Rights-Civ. Lib. L. Rev. 624, 636 (1974).