

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Syracuse, N.Y., Post-Standard has, over the years, established a fine tradition of honoring women who have made outstanding contributions to their communities. Every year, the Post-Standard names an all-time woman of achievement and 10 annual women of achievement.

As the newspaper article honoring these women states:

There is only one criterion for determining Women of Achievement. It is excellence . . . Competence is not enough. Extraordinary performance, unusual dedication, innovative approaches are standards used by the jurors. . . .

It becomes very obvious when listing their achievements that these 11 women have more than met those standards.

The all-time woman of achievement, Mrs. Ruth Sherwood, has been instrumental in promoting professional standards among volunteer agencies in central New York and all across the State.

Ruth Sherwood first came to Syracuse in the early 1940's as a volunteer at the old Victory Center. In 1947 she became executive director of that organization which changed its name to the Volunteer Center.

It was Ruth Sherwood who first became aware of the substantial changes in the age, role, and aims of the volunteer. In the 1940's and 1950's, the typical volunteer was the middle-aged housewife who had time to contribute, because her children were in school. At that time it was a new thought, and Ruth Sherwood's thought, that volunteers must be recruited from the young and the retired, because the middle-aged housewife was about to go back to work.

In the area of communications, the Post-Standard has honored the young and attractive Mrs. Ann G. Higbee. Mrs. Higbee is presently an account executive and vice president of T. A. Best, a public relations agency in Skaneateles, N.Y. She broke into the public relations field some years ago when there were almost no women in substantive positions in that field. Her career has blossomed from that date.

As if being a public relations agency vice president was not enough, Mrs. Higbee is raising a 3-year-old son and acting as president of the Junior League. And when she has some spare time, she divides that between the Literacy Volunteers, United Way, American Red Cross, Priority One, and the Syracuse Downtown Promotion Committee.

Miss Eleanor Ludwig has been named the Post-Standard Woman of Achievement in Citizenship, because of her people-related activities. Miss Ludwig is

presently director of alumni programs at Syracuse and is doing an innovative job.

As director, she is in charge of all the programs that relate to the 140,000 alumni of the university. She runs about a dozen tours a year and handles continuing education for alumni.

Her pet project is the creation of an undergraduate alumni office which would attempt to work with students in terms of their preparation as alumni. According to Miss Ludwig, the undergraduates would also be the "eyes and ears" of the alumni.

Her work with people extends far beyond the boundaries of the university to almost a dozen civic and community agencies whose concerns range from literacy to health to the aged.

"I'd like to teach the world to sing" is the theme of Mrs. Herman Beyle who has been chosen as the woman of achievement in music. Mrs. Beyle began directing the "Music Men of Syracuse," a group started by her young sons. Today, although all the original members of that troupe have gone, Mrs. Beyle remains and continues to donate her living room for the group's practice on Sunday morning.

Madelon Beyle has been director of music at Danforth United Church and the Plymouth Congregational Church and twice president of Civic Morning Musicals.

For the past 10 years, Mrs. Beyle has been involved in a representative of children's musical theater organizations and has been responsible for bringing live theater to all corners of America.

In the area of career, Mrs. Edna Anderson has been honored as a woman of achievement, because of her ability to pursue a career and still devote time to a growing family.

Edna Barrie Anderson graduated from law school as her daughter was graduating from medical college. She is a pilot, an attorney with a court position, a volunteer with substantial responsibilities with the League of Women Voters, her church, the bar association, and many other groups.

If you ask Mrs. Anderson how she crams so much activity into a 24-hour day, she cites her mother's motto:

You can do anything you want to, if you try hard enough.

The woman of achievement in the area of religion is Mrs. Llois W. Affolter whose interest has been centered in the Church Women United of Syracuse and vicinity. As a member of that organization she has focused her efforts to break down barriers, develop a warm sympathetic understanding of the women involved, not only to be aware of the racial differences, but to appreciate differences and recognize the value of each. She did this at a critical time when churches were being criticized for being decidedly segregated.

Out of this effort has come the plan to ride with the police on calls involving juvenile misdemeanors, an attempt to show that the power of love was greater than hate.

Dr. Mary Marshall has been contributing to cultural development for most of her life and it is for this contribution that she is being honored as a 1974 Post-Standard Woman of Achievement.

Dr. Marshall is a graduate of Vassar College, Phi Beta Kappa, with a Ph. D. from Yale University. She is a Guggenheim Fellow for research in medieval drama and has earned honorary degrees at numerous colleges and universities. She was a professor of English literature at Syracuse University from 1948 until her retirement in 1970.

According to her students, Dr. Marshall does more than just teach. She opens minds, stimulates thinking, and stirs the imagination.

Mrs. Davice Chimene has been named a woman of achievement for her endeavors in the area of community leadership. Mrs. Chimene's favorite activity is working with the Girl Scouts and work she does, spending at least 2 to 3 hours two nights a week on scouting.

She is a member of the Board of Directors of the Central New York Scout Council, was a member of the day camp staff 6 years, a director for 5 years, and is a council trainer.

She is heavily involved in the American Field Service, local politics, and still manages to find time to take good care of a husband and three sons.

The choice for the Woman of Achievement in volunteer service, Mrs. Nannae Daniel, says volunteering is a two-way street, you get even more than you give. According to Mrs. Daniel:

Inside I'm a millionaire; I have peace of mind.

If Mrs. Daniel is a millionaire then so are hundreds of other people, because of her work with volunteer activities. Perhaps her most outstanding work is as coordinator of the Telephone Life Line which provides elderly persons with daily security calls.

She is also a former president of the Syracuse section of the National Council of Negro Women where she helped form Women in Community Service which helped young girls "break the poverty cycle" by finding them meaningful employment.

The Social Service Woman of Achievement Award goes to Mrs. Jean A. Young who, according to the Post-Standard article, "has truly given a lifetime of service to Syracuse."

She began her professional career as a caseworker in the Onondaga County Department of Public Welfare and since then her "causes" have included the Syracuse Peace Council, the Jewish Community Center, the Heart Association, Head Start, and the Consortium for Children's Services.

In the fall of 1973, Mrs. Young became ill with terminal cancer. Rather than curtailing her activities, she has now centered her efforts on Alethea, the Center on Death and Dying. She was the first patient to become active in the development of the center and her 30 years

of contacts in Syracuse has aided in the development of the organization.

Dr. Jane L. Byrnes, principal at Syracuse's Salem Hyde School, has been chosen as the Woman of Achievement in education. Dr. Byrnes thinks urban education offers a special challenge and she has more than met that challenge. Programs she has established at Salem Hyde have twice earned her recognition from the Freedoms Foundation in Valley Forge.

Believing that "education is never confined to hours per day in a building, rather that education is an all-pervading, life-enriching experience," she is active in the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce and the Business and Professional Women's Club of Syracuse.

Dr. Byrnes has served as president of the New York State Association of Elementary School Principals and president of the Syracuse Association of Administrators. In addition, she sits on the Board of Directors of Maria Regina and Onondaga Community Colleges.

These 11 women certainly deserve the congratulations and thanks of their community for their outstanding contributions. Also to be congratulated are the Syracuse Post-Standard and its excellent family living editor, Lois Vosburgh, for their effort to afford these women the public recognition they so richly deserve.

THE LINCOLN DAY RECESS

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, until this week both the House and the Senate planned a 10-day recess, from February 7 to February 17. The purpose of the recess was, of course, most laudable: commemoration of the birth of one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. Ordinarily, Members of Congress return to their districts to talk with constituents and to speak of the accomplishments and contributions of the 16th President. It is usually a valuable time for interchange between the folks at home and their representatives in far-away Washington. We all know that recesses are important so that we can take the time to refresh our ideas at the grassroots level.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are not ordinary times. The 94th Congress has been in session for less than a month. We have recently returned to Washington after a November election in which the people clearly expressed their preference for changes from Washington. We know what the voters want. They want action from Congress and the President on energy, unemployment, taxes, and inflation. They do not want a perpetuation of the old attitude of "business as usual" and it has been my hope in the past weeks that this would indeed not be an ordinary Congress.

The President has asked that we act on his complex tax and energy proposals. He has said that if Congress does not like his plan to come up with one of its own. Whether we support the President's plan or one of a number of other economic recovery plans, it is our responsibility to stay here and begin to work out a solution to our troubles. Although Congress will not take a formal recess, the Democratic leadership has announced that there will be two 3-day adjournments, with only pro forma sessions on those days. This ruse will not fool our constituents into believing we are here working hard.

Mr. Speaker, this situation reminds me—appropriately—of an anecdote which is often told of President Lincoln. At one time General George B. McClellan, then Commander of the Union forces, was conducting a waiting campaign. He was so careful to avoid mistakes that little headway was evident. President Lincoln wrote him a letter which said:

My Dear McClellan . . . if you do not want to use the army, I should like to borrow it for awhile . . . Yours Respectfully, A. Lincoln.

Let us not also conduct a waiting campaign. Let us get down to the job before us. That in itself will be an appropriate tribute to Mr. Lincoln.

THE LATE JUDGE EUGENE WORLEY

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 30, 1975

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Judge Eugene Worley is a great loss to me personally and to the Nation. He and his devoted wife, Ann Spivey, were warm and steadfast friends from the beginning in our days at the University of Texas.

He was genuine and sincere and ever willing to give one of the benefits of his solid judgment when asked. During his stay here in Washington, he gave valuable counsel to many in all walks of life, especially friends from his native Texas, which he loved.

Whatever he undertook to do, Gene Worley did it well. He knew only success. His illustrious career started in 1935, as a member of the Texas Legislature. After 5 years of service in that body, Eugene Worley was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Texas' 18th Congressional District.

After leaving Congress to serve as a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve during World War II, he was again elected to Congress. During nearly a decade in the House, Congressman Worley served with distinction and with dedication to the public interest. He was a hard-working and effective legislator whose honor and integrity were without question.

Through much of his House tenure, he was an influential member of the Agriculture Committee, although during his first two terms he served on the Committees on Coinage, Weights and Measures; Irrigation and Reclamation; Labor; War Claims; Insular Affairs; Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; and was chairman of the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

The Federal judiciary became the beneficiary of Eugene Worley's skill and wisdom when President Truman appointed him to the U.S. Court of Customs and Appeals. President Eisenhower selected him as chief judge of the court in 1959. Despite this high office which he held, Judge Worley was the same warm friendly individual he had always been.

Judge Worley enhanced the reputation of that court with his able, scholarly, and constructive leadership. He continued to serve after becoming a senior judge in 1972, despite illness which would have sidelined a lesser man.

Until his death, Judge Worley remained both cheerful and accessible to his many friends. I am proud to have been one of them.

Mrs. Roberts joins me in extending deepest sympathies to Judge Worley's lovely family.

LAWSUIT TO ENJOIN FURTHER U.S. MILITARY PARTICIPATION IN CAMBODIA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I informed my colleagues that 20 Members of Congress and myself have filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts a lawsuit which would seek a preliminary injunction to halt further U.S. military operations in Cambodia. The first half of the complaint in the suit was printed in yesterday's RECORD for February 4, 1975, on page 2262 through 2264. Today, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the second half of the complaint which was filed last Friday in Boston.

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Robert F. Drinan, Michael J. Harrington, John Joseph Moakley, Bella S. Abzug, Herman Badillo, George E. Brown, Jr., Yvonne B. Burke, Bob Carr, Ronald V. Dellums, Don Edwards, Donald M. Fraser, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, George Miller, Richard L. Ottinger, Frederick W. Richmond, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Edward R. Roybal, John F. Seiberling, Fortney H. Stark, Henry A. Waxman, and David E. Lowry, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. Gerald R. Ford, individually and in his capacity as President of the United States; James R. Schlesinger, individually and in his capacity as Secretary of

Defense; John L. McLucas, individually and in his capacity as Secretary of the Air Force; Henry A. Kissinger, individually and in his capacity as Secretary of State, and John Gunther Dean, individually and in his capacity as United States Ambassador to Cambodia; William L. Colby, individually and in his capacity as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Defendants.

* * * * *

VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

First cause of action

26. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-25.

27. Defendants' actions in financing and carrying on military and paramilitary activities in, over, from off the shores of and respecting Cambodia, and furnishing direction, advice, support, training and intelligence to the military forces of the Lon Nol regime, have not been authorized by Congress.

28. Defendants' aforesaid activities are all being conducted in violation of specific Congressional prohibitions, and are in violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution, which confers exclusive power to authorize war upon the Congress.

29. Wherefore the aforesaid activities of defendants are illegal and unconstitutional.

Second cause of action

30. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-29.

31. Defendants' actions in financing, directly or indirectly, military and paramilitary activities in, over, from off the shores of and respecting Cambodia, and furnishing direction, advice, support, training and intelligence to the military forces of the Lon Nol regime, have been specifically prohibited by Congress.

32. Defendants' aforesaid activities are all being financed and conducted in violation of specific Congressional prohibitions and are in violation of Article I, Section 9, Clause 7; and Article I, Section 7, Clause 1, which confer upon the Congress exclusive power to appropriate monies for use by the Executive generally and with respect to the Armed Forces of the United States.

33. Wherefore, the aforesaid activities of defendants are illegal and unconstitutional.

Third cause of action

34. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-33.

35. The aforesaid acts of defendants complained of constitute both the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia and the provision of United States advisors to or for military, paramilitary, police, or the security or intelligence forces.

36. The Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2411n provides:

Section 7 of Pub. L. 91-652, as amended by Pub. L. 92-226, Pt. IV § 408, Feb. 7, 1972, 86 Stat. 35 provided that:

"(a) In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used to finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, or to provide United States advisors to or for military, paramilitary, police, or other security or intelligence forces in Cambodia.

"(b) Military and economic assistance provided by the United States to Cambodia and authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Cambodia for its defense."

37. Wherefore, the aforesaid acts of defendants complained of constitute a violation of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2411n.

Fourth cause of action

38. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-37.

39. The aforesaid acts of defendants complained of involve the use of funds to finance military or paramilitary operations by the United States.

40. Section 30 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, 22 U.S.C. § 2151n, provides:

"No funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other law may be expended to finance military or paramilitary operations by the United States in or over Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia."

41. Wherefore, the aforesaid acts of defendants complained of constitute a violation of Section 30 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, 22 U.S.C. § 2151n.

Fifth cause of action

42. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-41.

43. The acts of defendants complained of involve the expenditure of funds to finance, directly or indirectly, combat activities by United States military forces in, over, from off the shores of and respecting Cambodia.

44. Section 108 of the Continuing Appropriations Act of 1974, P.L. 93-52, 87 Stat. 134 provides:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over from off the shore of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Cambodia."

45. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of constitute a violation of the Continuing Appropriations Act of 1974, P.L. 93-52, 87 Stat. 130.

Sixth cause of action

46. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 1-45.

47. Section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1973, P.L. 93-50, 87 Stat. 99, provides as follows:

"None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated, under any other act may be expended for such purposes."

48. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of constitute a violation of Section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1973, P.L. 93-50, 87 Stat. 99.

Seventh cause of action

49. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-48.

50. Section 806 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Authorization Act of 1974, P.L. 93-155, 87 Stat. 605, provides:

"Sec. 806. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon enactment of this Act, no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance the involvement of United States military forces in hostilities in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia, unless specifically authorized hereafter by the Congress."

51. Congress has not, since the enactment of the aforesaid Appropriations Act of 1974 specifically authorized the commitment or expenditure of any funds to finance the involvement of United States military forces in hostilities in or over or from off the shores of Cambodia.

52. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of are in violation of Section 806 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1974, P.L. 93-155, 87 Stat. 605.

Eighth cause of action

53. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-53.

54. Section 13 of the Department of State Appropriation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-126, provides in pertinent part:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance the involvement of United States military forces in hostilities in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia, unless specifically authorized hereafter by the Congress."

55. Congress has not since the enactment of the aforesaid Department of State Appropriations Act of 1973 specifically authorized the commitment or expenditure of any funds to finance the involvement of United States military forces in hostilities in or over or from off the shores of Cambodia.

56. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of are in violation of Section 13 of the Department of State Appropriation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-126.

Ninth cause of action

57. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-56.

58. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2146 provides in pertinent part:

"The total number of civilian officers and employees of executive agencies of the United States Government who are citizens of the United States and members of the Armed Forces of the United States (excluding such members while actually engaged in air operations in or over Cambodia which originate outside Cambodia) present in Cambodia at any one time shall not exceed two hundred. . . . For purposes of this section, "executive agency of the United States Government" means any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment within the executive branch of the United States Government."

59. As alleged in paragraph 23(a), the total number of United States civilian and military personnel present in Cambodia at one time has, since the passage of § 2416, exceeded 200.

60. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of violate the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2416.

Tenth cause of action

61. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraph 1-60.

62. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2416, provides in pertinent part:

"The United States shall not, at any time, pay in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, the compensation or allowances of more than eighty-five individuals in Cambodia who are citizens of countries other than Cambodia or the United States."

63. As alleged in paragraph 23(b), defendants are employing and compensating directly or indirectly, individuals and citizens of countries other than the United States and Cambodia, as mercenaries, to carry on supply missions and other military and paramilitary activities and the number of such individuals and citizens exceeds 85.

64. Wherefore, such acts of defendants complained of violate the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2416.

Eleventh cause of action

65. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-64.

66. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, P.L. 93-559, Sec. 29, provides in pertinent part:

ACCESS TO CERTAIN MILITARY BASES ABROAD

Sec. 29. (a) Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 659. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for foreign assistance (including foreign military sales, credit sales, and guarantees) under this Act may be used to provide any kind of assistance to any foreign country in which a military base is located if—

"(1) such base was constructed or is being maintained or operated with funds furnished by the United States; and

"(2) personnel of the United States carry out military operations from such base; unless and until the President has determined that the government of such country has, consisted with security, authorized access, on a regular basis, to bona fide news media correspondents of the United States to such military base."

67. Cambodia and Thailand receive foreign assistance, as described in Sec. 29(a), and have located within their boundaries military bases which were constructed or are being maintained or operated with funds furnished by the United States and from which personnel of the United States carry out military operations. As heretofore alleged in paragraph 25, *bona fide* news media correspondents of the United States have been and are being denied, by defendants and/or representatives of foreign powers, access to such bases on a regular basis.

68. Wherefore, the acts of defendants complained of violate Section 29(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, P.L. 93-559.

Twelfth cause of action

69. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-68.

70. Neither a Congressional declaration of war, a specific statutory authorization nor a national emergency as defined in 50 U.S.C. § 1541 exists with respect to Cambodia.

71. Wherefore, the use and threatened increased use by defendants of United States Armed Forces, both unarmed and equipped for combat, in hostilities or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances in, over, from off the shores of and respecting Cambodia are in violation of the 1973 War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548.

Thirteenth cause of action

72. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-71.

73. On information and belief, defendant Ford as President did not consult with Congress before or since taking the aforesaid actions with respect to Cambodia.

74. Wherefore, the aforesaid activities of defendants are in violation of the 1973 War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548.

Fourteenth cause of action

75. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-74.

76. On information and belief, defendant Ford as President of the United States, like his predecessor Richard M. Nixon, has not submitted any report in writing, as required by 50 U.S.C. § 1544, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate within 48 hours after taking the actions complained of, which involve introducing United States Armed Forces, both unarmed and equipped for combat, into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.

77. Wherefore, defendant Ford's aforesaid failure to report is a violation of the 1973 War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548 and specifically § 1543.

Fifteenth cause of action

78. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-77.

79. Article 20(b) of the Agreement On Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam obliges the United States to cease military activities in Cambodia.

80. Wherefore, the actions of defendants complained of violate the aforementioned treaty provision.

81. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until this Court issues a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining defendants from the complained of activities, plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury.

VII. RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiffs respectfully request that the following relief be granted:

1. That the Court issue a declaratory judgment that the defendants' contingency plan to finance and/or employ the United States Air Force or any branch of the United States Armed Forces, its agents, employees or servants, and equipment and materiel to airlift or otherwise transport supplies to Phnom Penh, Neak Luong or any other embattled area in Cambodia, without prior Congressional authorization is in violation of:

a) Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution;

b) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution;

c) Section 7(a) of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2411 n;

d) Section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, 22 U.S.C. § 2151 n;

e) Section 108 of the Continuing Appropriations Act of 1974, P.L. 93-52, 87 Stat. 134;

f) Section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1973, P.L. 93-50, 87 Stat. 99;

g) Section 806 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act of 1974, P.L. 93-155, 87 Stat. 605;

h) Section 13 of the Department of State Appropriation Authorization Act of 1973, P.L. 93-126;

i) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2416;

j) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, P.L. 93-559, Sec. 29(a);

k) the 1973 War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541, *et seq.*; and

l) the Agreement On Ending The War And Restoring Peace In Vietnam.

2. That this Court issue a declaratory judgment that defendants' actions in carrying on military and paramilitary activities, in, over, off the shores of and respecting Cambodia and furnishing direction, advice, support, training and intelligence to the military forces of the Lon Nol regime and that the commitment and expenditure of funds in connection with the foregoing are in violation of:

a) Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution;

b) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution;

c) Section 7(a) of the Special Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2411n;

d) Section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, 22 U.S.C. § 2151n;

e) Section 108 of the Continuing Appropriations Act of 1974, P.L. 93-52, 87 Stat. 134;

f) Section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1973, P.L. 93-50, 87 Stat. 99;

g) Section 806 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act of 1974, P.L. 93-155, 87 Stat. 605;

h) Section 13 of the Department of State Appropriation Authorization Act of 1973, P.L. 93-126;

i) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, 22 U.S.C. § 2416;

j) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, P.L. 93-559, Sec. 29(a);

k) the 1973 War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541, *et seq.*; and

l) the Agreement On Ending The War And Restoring Peace In Vietnam.

3. That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin the defendants from employing the United States Air Force or any other branch of the United States Armed Forces, its agents, employees, servants and equipment and materiel to airlift or otherwise transport supplies to Phnom Penh, Neak Luong or any other embattled area in Cambodia without prior Congressional authorization.

4. That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin the defendants from carrying on military and paramilitary activities in, over, off the shores of and respecting Cambodia and furnishing direction, advice, support, training and intelligence to the military forces of the Lon Nol regime.

5. That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin the defendants from committing or expending, without prior specific authorization by Congress funds to carry on military and paramilitary activities in, over, off the shores of and respecting Cambodia and furnishing direction, advice, support, training and intelligence to the military forces of the Lon Nol regime.

6. That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin the defendants from violating, overtly or covertly, directly or indirectly, the ceiling of 200 United States personnel authorized to be in Cambodia at any one time.

7. That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin the defendants from compensating, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, more than 85 individuals in Cambodia who are citizens of countries other than Cambodia or the United States.

8. That this Court preliminary and permanently enjoin the defendants to cease and desist from impeding and to assure regular access by *bona fide* news media correspondents of the United States to all military bases in Southeast Asia which were constructed or are being maintained or operated with funds furnished by the United States and from which United States personnel carry out military operations or in the alternative to enjoin the defendants from expending any funds appropriated for foreign assistance (including foreign military sales, credit sales, and guarantees) under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, to assist any country of Southeast Asia, wherein access to military bases as heretofore described is not guaranteed.

9. Grant such other and further relief as to this Court may appear proper and just, including reasonable costs and attorney's fees.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER WEISS,
RHONDA COPELON,
DORIS PETERSON,

Center for Constitutional Rights,

NANCY GERTNER,
Boston, Mass.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Dated: New York, New York, January 31, 1975.

[United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts]

VERIFICATION

Robert F. Drinan, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Gerald R. Ford, et al., Defendants.

State of New York, County of New York, ss: Rhonda Copelon, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am one of counsel in the above-captioned matter.

2. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof and that the same are true of my own knowledge, except as to

the matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

3. I make this verification in lieu of plaintiffs in this action because no plaintiff is presently accessible to counsel or available in the present District to make this verification at this time.

RHONDA COPELON.

Sworn to before me this 31st day of January, 1975.

ELIZABETH BOCHNAK,
Notary Public.

END THE TAX ON MARRIAGE

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 Congress enacted a comprehensive tax reform measure in an effort to minimize or eliminate many of the inequities which had developed. The tax on single taxpayers was one of these inequities which was supposedly eliminated by the Tax Reform Act. Critics contended that the tax differential between single and married people was too great because a married couple could utilize income splitting to reduce their tax and because it was assumed that, on a per capita basis, single people had higher living expenses than married couples.

This adjustment was fair if the single person living alone were compared with

the traditional family situation involving a working, income-splitting husband and a housewife with no outside income. This solution overlooked the problem of the tax payments when the wife did work and contribute to the family income. In this situation, the income-splitting advantages of marriage decline as the man and woman's incomes become increasingly the same. When the two family incomes are at the same level, there are no advantages to income splitting. Couples in this situation will have to pay a higher tax than if they had stayed single.

The accompanying table, prepared by Prof. Oscar S. Gray of the University of Maryland School of Law, shows the very steep penalty imposed on married couples. For example, with a gross income of \$30,000—\$15,000 derived from each spouse—a married couple will pay \$1,155 more in taxes than if they were single. This is clearly a subsidy for single individuals.

This unjust tax has other manifestations, however. As can be seen from the table, the penalty falls hardest on lower income couples. For instance, if two people each earn \$2,000—for a total of \$4,000—they pay a \$170 marriage tax penalty at 1972 rates, 100 percent of their joint tax return. If together they make a total of \$8,000, they pay a \$245 marriage tax penalty—or nearly 29 percent of their total tax—if their incomes are substantially equal.

This same couple would pay a \$168 marriage tax if their incomes are in the ratio 75 percent to 25 percent. The tax also encourages the employment of married women at income levels below that of their husbands. The penalty remains small as long as one spouse earns a small fraction of family income. Since wives earn less than their husbands in most cases, the incentive for her to increase her income is stymied by this "tax on marriage."

We are all acquainted with the hidden tax which inflation imposes on Americans. Although a family's overall income may increase in a year, that income will be subject to two taxes. First, the family will have to pay a higher share of their income in State and Federal taxes. Second, the 12-percent rate of inflation will eliminate many of the economic benefits which have traditionally been associated with a higher salary. The additional "tax on marriage" provides a real disincentive for a wife to help the family financially at a time when real earnings are declining.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which amends the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate this tax on marriage and equalize tax burdens. As the Ways and Means Committee undertakes its review of the tax code this year, I urge my colleagues on that committee to give full consideration to this proposal.

The table follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TAX OF A MARRIED COUPLE FILING A JOINT RETURN AND THE COMBINED TAX OF 2 SINGLE PERSONS WITH THE SAME COMBINED INCOME AS THE MARRIED COUPLE, PRESENT LAW (1972)

[Assumes deductible expenses never exceed the standard deduction]

Adjusted gross income (wages)	Excess of the joint return tax over the tax of 2 single individuals with the same combined income													
	Income split 100 to 0 percent		Income split 75 to 25 percent		Income split 67 to 33 percent		Income split 60 to 40 percent		Income split 55 to 45 percent		Income split 50 to 50 percent			
	Joint return tax	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax	Amount	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax	Amount	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax	Amount	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax	Amount	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax	Amount	Amount as a percent of the joint return tax		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	
\$3,000	\$28	—\$109	—389.29	0	0	\$28	100.00	\$28	100.00	\$28	100.00	\$28	100.00	
\$4,000	170	—131	—77.06	\$33	19.41	82	48.24	121	71.18	149	87.65	170	100.00	
\$5,000	322	—168	—52.17	63	19.57	132	40.99	184	57.14	194	60.25	196	60.87	
\$6,000	484	—196	—40.50	89	18.39	182	37.60	201	41.53	206	43.56	209	43.18	
\$7,000	653	—231	—35.11	120	18.24	191	29.03	212	32.22	221	33.59	224	34.04	
\$8,000	848	—251	—29.60	168	19.81	207	24.41	226	26.65	238	28.07	245	28.89	
\$9,000	1,029	—297	—28.86	164	15.94	211	20.51	229	22.25	238	23.13	238	23.13	
\$10,000	1,190	—340	—28.57	133	11.18	180	15.13	208	17.48	209	17.56	209	17.56	
\$12,000	1,534	—419	—27.31	70	4.56	133	8.67	150	9.78	162	10.56	173	11.28	
\$14,000	1,930	—497	—25.75	79	4.09	109	5.65	131	6.79	151	7.82	151	7.82	
\$16,000	2,385	—607	—25.45	131	5.49	162	6.79	173	7.25	168	7.04	186	7.80	
\$18,000	2,885	—712	—24.68	197	6.83	252	8.73	256	8.87	253	8.77	233	8.08	
\$20,000	3,400	—855	—25.15	207	6.09	333	9.79	348	10.24	334	9.82	340	10.00	
\$25,000	4,860	—1,230	—25.31	298	6.13	496	10.21	627	12.90	707	14.55	742	15.27	
\$30,000	6,560	—1,592	—24.27	426	6.49	775	11.81	1,010	15.40	1,130	17.23	1,155	17.61	
\$35,000	8,465	—1,950	—23.04	600	7.09	1,132	13.37	1,437	16.98	1,545	18.25	1,580	18.67	
\$40,000	10,565	—2,350	—22.24	883	8.36	1,561	14.78	1,867	17.67	2,007	19.00	2,050	19.45	
\$50,000	15,310	—2,605	—17.02	1,586	10.36	2,472	16.15	2,902	18.95	3,080	20.12	3,130	20.44	
\$75,000	27,810	—2,605	—9.37	2,940	10.57	3,805	13.68	4,242	15.25	4,430	15.93	4,480	16.11	
\$100,000	40,310	—2,605	—6.46	3,805	9.44	4,409	10.94	4,480	11.11	4,480	11.11	4,480	11.11	

Note: In this table the "marriage tax" penalty is shown by positive numbers.

BOY SCOUTS HEROISM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the pleasure to relate to Congress an account of the exemplary actions of

three young men who deserve, I am certain all will agree, our praise and admiration. So that my colleagues can fully comprehend exactly what these three young Eagle Scouts accomplished, I would like to insert a brief summary of their action into the RECORD. We can all benefit from their example.

Last fall, on October 12, the Scouts of Troop 1, Eastchester, N.Y., were camped in the Copake Falls area of the Taconic

State Park. The troop led by Scoutmaster Tom McIntyre and Senior Patrol Leader Mark Dobriner set out on a hike to the ridge of Cedar Mountain which overlooked the Bashbish Falls. Upon arrival the troop was startled by a female voice requesting aid for a man who had fallen off the cliff.

Eagle Scouts Bill Richter, Mark Dobriner, and Mitchell Rubin began a descent of the almost perpendicular cliff

despite the risk to their own lives to provide assistance to the injured man.

Two other hikers already on the scene were making preparations to move the victim. The Scouts, realizing the severity of the victim's injuries which included multiple skull lacerations and possible hip breakage, prevented the hikers from moving the victim. Instead, they treated him for shock and bandaged his head wounds to constrict bleeding. They thus prevented "inestimable further injury, if not death" to the victim.

These young men coolly ascertained the extent of the victim's other injuries and attempted to keep him calm by their constant assurances. Since they had to wait nearly an hour for rescue parties, the psychological comfort afforded to the victim by these young men cannot be under-emphasized.

Once the rescue parties arrived, these three Scouts were crucial in the effort to remove the victim by stretcher. The stretcher had to be carried across the waist-deep icy stream to the other more accessible bank.

For their heroic actions, the Boy Scout National Court of Honor is conferring upon the three Scouts the "Honor Medal," the highest award in Scouting "awarded to Scouts who have saved life or attempted to save life at the risk of their own. They must have shown heroism, resourcefulness, and skill." Mark Dobriner, Bill Richter, and Mitchell Rubin unquestionably deserve this honor, as they deserve the respect and admiration of the Congress.

DAVID RAGUSA

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you the story of one of my district neighbors, David Ragusa, who was shot to death last Saturday night.

David was an electrician for the New York City Fire Department. He had worked hard to buy a home in a good neighborhood. He wanted to raise his three children in a safe and peaceful environment. He and his wife returned home at 1 a.m. after an evening with friends, parked their car in the driveway of their ranch style house and started to walk to their front door. Two men accosted them and demanded money. Ragusa offered no resistance. He gave them his wallet. Thereupon one of the two men took a few steps back, lowered his rifle and shot David Ragusa. As his killers fled, David died.

It is the story of a murder and a tragic illustration of the quality of life—and death—in urban America. The vicious and mindless act which took the life of a fine and good member of society, David Ragusa of Rosedale, N.Y., is not a unique one: Americans can no longer walk the streets of our large cities in safety. And if we cannot be assured of a reasonable degree of physical safety in and around our homes, is this not the moment to

reflect upon the diminishing quality of our personal freedom.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the major national and international economic crisis facing us in this Congress, we must address ourselves to our steadily deteriorating law enforcement and criminal justice systems.

To the families of urban America, our criminal justice system does not seem to work. The law-abiding citizen finds himself neglected: Law enforcement appears casual and urban-safety planning seems haphazard.

In memory of David Ragusa, I urge my colleagues to make crime control and personal safety a major item on the agenda of the 94th Congress of the United States.

WE MUST SAY "NO MORE"

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues an editorial from the February 2d edition of the Home News of New Brunswick, N.J. The thrust of the editorial is that no more taxpayer's money should be sent to South Vietnam and Cambodia in the form of military assistance.

I think it is particularly appropriate that this sentiment—which coincides with my own feelings—has been expressed by a distinguished New Jersey newspaper, for it was in our State that the Vice President quite recently saw fit to declare that the Congress will be culpable if additional military aid is not sent immediately to Southeast Asia. I reject the Vice President's statement and I think it is even more eloquently rejected in the Home News editorial. It reads as follows:

WE MUST SAY "NO MORE"

Almost unbelievably, the old arguments and rationales are being rolled out and repeated. If only we will do just a little more, spend just a little more, South Vietnam and Cambodia will be able to "hold their own." If we give them more military aid now they can continue fighting the war that drags on in spite of our declaration of "peace with honor" two years ago.

But the old arguments have lost their power to convince and the old rationales have crumbled under the weight of history and experience.

A little more now will inevitably mean a lot more later. And for what purpose? To win the war? With all our military might, with billions from our treasury and with a toll of young lives still so achingly tragic, we could not "win" the war. Can we seriously expect to buy a victory now?

In fact, we're not promised that. We're promised rather directly that the additional \$300 million requested for South Vietnam is just the beginning. It "does not meet all the needs of the South Vietnamese Army," it will not allow for "replacement of equipment lost in combat," and "our intelligence indicates, moreover, that (North Vietnam's) campaign will intensify further in coming months."

And so the spiral will begin anew. And where will it end?

It is not that we are more selfish now, although we have a right and a responsibility to insure our own fiscal well-being in these perilous economic times. The fact is that we are wiser now. We cannot buy a victory and we cannot purchase the peace.

This time we have to say no and no more

WE COULD ALL HELP TO SAVE OURSELVES

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, our economic woes have been increasing at an uncomfortable rate and with them the everdarkening mood of pessimism that threatens to engulf the Nation.

I won't deny that our economic problems are serious. What I will deny is that they are insurmountable. We have faced and conquered more serious crises and we will do it again.

What we need is a slightly more optimistic, less emotional approach to these problems. Such an approach was, I think, very aptly depicted by a well-known businessman in my home city of Syracuse, N.Y.

Ted Pierson of the Onondaga Supply Co., Inc., recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Syracuse Post-Standard entitled "We Could All Help To Save Ourselves." I would like to share that letter with my colleagues:

To the Editor:

Wouldn't the fact that 95.7 per cent of the work force in the Syracuse area was employed in October be far more significant than the fact that 4.3 per cent were unemployed? Wouldn't the fact that no estimate I have seen of future prospects shows employment falling below 93 per cent be significant? Isn't it true that even today at least half of the employment represents a normal situation of unemployables and job changing in a free economy? That's why I am disturbed by news reports that are slanted to paint the darkest picture at a time when we need a more evenhanded presentation of our economic facts of life.

Last week a local businessman was interviewed by the newsmen from a TV station, and when he said that his business was not as good as last year but better than average, and the reporter tried to convince him he must be wrong or overly optimistic and left. On the news that night this businessman saw a relatively new competitor with little experience in the business on that station's TV news reporting on how bad their business was.

This ties in with the report of an automobile dealer whose business admittedly is not good pointing out that the TV news reporters deliberately film automobile showrooms when they are empty of customers.

Having just heard these reports I was disturbed to see page 21 of the Post-Standard of Dec. 12th completely dominated by a feature story on how bad unemployment is and how much worse it is going to be. I do not minimize the hardship of unemployment, but I think it is more important to overcome the problem rather than to bemoan the fact and frighten the public into reactions that can only increase unemployment. Some of the facts that should be stressed are that much of the unemployment is seasonal in nature although per-

haps of slightly longer duration because of economic conditions. Many of the unemployed receive substantial insurance benefits running as high as 95 per cent of their normal pay. Social Security and other retirement benefits that did not exist in the 30's are a substantial prop to a lagging economy. There is no question that employed and unemployed alike are hurt more by the inflation than the unemployment, that some of the advice we have been given by government and media has been counterproductive.

For instance, when the economy was rising at a healthy rate, people were encouraged to spend rather than save. Despite this, substantial savings accumulated which can help us today if they are used wisely. The President's recent advice to avoid purchasing certainly oversimplifies the problem and can only accelerate unemployment. In my opinion the American public has the desire and sacrifice from the government, industry, labor, and the media, and in my opinion the media can provide real leadership.

First, the public should be encouraged to spend wisely, cut back on things that are not needed and that seem to be priced unrealistically high, and take advantage of the many good buys on things that are needed.

Industry can do its part by channeling its purchases to suppliers who are making an effort to hold the line on prices, by resisting cost increases, passing along windfall profits and other savings to their customers.

Labor has won some striking gains at a time of falling production and productivity. Much of what labor has achieved has been more than earned, but some gains have been made by literally holding the country hostage, and these gains should be re-evaluated by labor itself. For instance the construction industry is sick, and a voluntary move to reduce slightly the cost of labor could have tremendous impact. Wouldn't it be better to work at 90% of a high labor rate than to sit idle at the high rate?

National TV carried the story of the meeting of the auto industry and labor with President Ford last week. The manufacturer claims he needs still higher prices to cover his high labor costs and government-mandated emission requirements. Labor is seeking more government subsidies which certainly seem the wrong thing for today's conditions. Government is listening as it has for over a year with a minimum of action.

Just think how much labor could gain if they rolled back a part of their last wage increase in return for fuller employment.

Just think how car sales would improve if this saving went into automobile price rollbacks.

Just think what the government could do if emission standards were even slightly modified as part of a program in which manufacturers were forced to recognize the 55-mile national speed limit and build cars that would not go much faster and would, in turn, save on gasoline consumption, cut emission, reduce costs and even save lives.

America has the greatest industrial development and a way of life for its people that is the envy of the world. It has been built on individual initiative and a free economy based on profits for all. In recent years we have drifted into a situation where we expect the government to solve our problems, but it is obvious that the public, industry, labor and the government must all cooperate to get this job done. If you think there is a better system than the American system, just rent a car and take an uncondemned tour behind the Iron Curtain there is no private enterprise and the government makes all the decisions. I have done it, and I saw people who would give all they have for the freedom that even the unemployed have in the United States. As we drove out of East Germany, I said I would be glad to kiss the ground when I got home.

In a situation more serious than we face today, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." So, let's forget fear and forget despair and ask our President to tell us what we can do today for our country as well as for ourselves.

ONANDAGA SUPPLY CO., INC.,
THEODORE PIERSON.

SYRACUSE.

A NATION OF (TOO MANY) LAWS

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Amitai Etzioni, a distinguished professor of sociology at Columbia University, is a gentleman with whom I have had occasion to disagree in the past. When he writes an article with which I am in substantial agreement, as he did in the January 12 edition of the Washington Post's Outlook section, I can only say, "Right on," and express the hope that he will extend his analysis a little further.

In the article, "A Nation of (Too Many) Laws," Professor Etzioni notes that "It may spoil the fun of some new members hoping to stamp their names on 'landmark legislation,' but new laws frequently create rather than solve problems, chiefly because so many are so poorly enforced." He cites antitrust laws, wage-price controls, equal opportunity legislation, and various safety inspection agencies as examples of legislation whose implementation has been disappointing when compared to the rhetoric and fanfare which accompanied their passage.

I commend Professor Etzioni and others in the academy and public policy establishment for this partial realization of the fact that it is not so easy to bring about the millennium of social justice and individual fulfillment through legislation in practice as it is in rhetoric.

I would hope that the good professor and others might consider extending their analysis a little further. Perhaps it is not simply because laws are poorly enforced that the mere passage of laws does not guarantee the results which are often promised. Perhaps it is also true that many of the laws which Congress passes each year are poorly conceived and inappropriate.

As society grows increasingly complex, it is increasingly difficult to direct and monitor it from a centralized source of power and authority. Such an effort also brings on a tendency to gather all authority to the central government which has disturbing overtones for anyone who cares about a free society.

With the hope that Mr. Etzioni will begin to take a few more steps along the path which he has begun, I here insert his thought-provoking article for the study of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 12, 1975]

A NATION OF (TOO MANY) LAWS

(By Amitai Etzioni)

The Congress officially returns again next week, bringing back some tired old faces, many eager new ones, most of our continuing

battles and one of our favorite American illusions: that passing laws solves problems. It may spoil the fun of some new members hoping to stamp their names on "landmark legislation," but new laws frequently create rather than solve problems, chiefly because so many are so poorly enforced.

One doesn't need to be a legal scholar to know that hundreds of laws and thousands of regulations are weakly applied, if they are applied at all. Instances abound in all areas of our lives.

Consider, for example, antitrust. In 1950, 200 of the largest corporations controlled 47 percent of all U.S. manufacturing; by 1967, their share had risen to 67 percent. Indeed, in the antitrust area one need only recall the breakup of the oil trust in bygone days and then look at the concentration of power in the oil industry today and the clamor in some quarters—again—to break it up. Clearly, despite the pending cases against IBM and AT&T—the type of selective, long and "big" cases with the secondary aim of scaring other corporations that know they never will be taken to court—the government has not been very successful at enforcing antitrust law.

Or take wage-price controls. A Council of Economic Advisers study has shown that from the time controls were begun in August, 1971, until Phase II ended in December, 1972, average hourly wages in manufacturing rose 10 percent—though pay was supposed to be frozen at first and then allowed to rise only 5.5 percent annually in Phase II. By the time controls were lifted entirely, the wage increase was 17.2 percent and the price rise 13.4 percent.

Or consider the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission. As of last October the agency, entrusted with enforcing statutes against racial, sex and other forms of job discrimination, had a backlog of 100,000 complaints that hadn't yet been examined. Or the Federal Railroad Administration; Although it sends inspectors to check tracks and trains, collisions were 23 per cent higher in 1973 than in 1972 and derailments were up 34 per cent in the same period. The agency claims the law is vague as to whether the unit is merely supposed to monitor or to enforce rail safety, but its budget speaks more clearly. The budget allows for only 136 inspectors to cover 320,000 miles of tracks, 27,000 locomotives, 1.7 million freight cars and untold thousands of grade crossings.

Wherever one turns, the story is similar. A recent check of interstate highways in 12 states found that when traffic permits, at least 70 per cent of the cars zoom by at speeds exceeding the legal limit. The case of marijuana laws has been widely noted: After years of outlawing possession of the drug, the number of American users is steadily growing, reaching, by the users' own account, 20 million people—and that is almost certainly a conservative estimate. (The impossibility of applying marijuana possession laws even prompted the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, Earl J. Silbert, to declare late last year that he would no longer enforce them, but he was forced to back down by the local police.)

The situation with illegal aliens is also familiar. According to one reliable estimate, 1.5 million illegal aliens are in District 3 of the immigration service (which encompasses New York City) alone. Over the last five years, 5,300 were deported and 55,000 were allowed to leave voluntarily, but the annual increase seems to keep exceeding the number deported or forced out under other circumstances.

And the same theme runs through practically all the post-mortems on the myriad New Frontier and Great Society programs—the difficulty trying to make their strictures stick. So we revise old programs and launch

new ones and talk about making existing laws work. But still there is no significant level of success.

TEARING THE FABRIC

Despite recurrent publicity, for example, nearly 1 out of every 4 recipients under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program is still being paid more than they are entitled to, while 1 out of every 10 is ineligible. At the same time, many who are eligible are not getting anything or not what they are entitled to. A recent study by the General Accounting Office shows that a large proportion of children of welfare mothers have fathers who could afford to support the children, but even many of the fathers who voluntarily agreed to pay do not do so. Only one-quarter were found to pay 90 per cent or more of what they agreed to pay.

The problem in all this is not just that particular offenders go uncaught or unpunished. Something much more fundamental to our society is at stake. One of the most accepted sociological facts is that infrequent, arbitrary or half-hearted sanctions against rule-breakers produce a weakening of commitment among all members of the community. Laws are essentially expressions of intentions, of beliefs about what is right and wrong. But the social contract is never sealed, the collective agreement never affirmed, until offenders are punished. Any regulation poorly enforced is an object lesson for all in civic immorality, and those who pass laws which they know cannot or will not be adequately applied are doing far more to tear the social fabric than to mend it.

This is precisely what many who make and influence the law have been doing. The reasons they do so are numerous. One major cause lies in the theater of politics, the unreal world of token gestures and threats which mask very different faces and forces. Legislatures are said to be in the business of reconciling the interests of various groups to yield agreed-upon national policy. A common way to please opposing camps is to give the law to one side (say, a tough anti-pollution bill to the ecology movement) and a vague set of regulations with weak enforcement mechanisms to their opponents (the polluters).

One result is sanctions that are trivial in magnitude compared with the offense involved. Thus corporations caught with major violations of the campaign contributions law may be deterred by the adverse publicity, but the \$5,000 fine (charged to business expenses) would not likely give pause even to modest businesses, let alone to multi-billion dollar corporations. Similarly, in 1973-'74 the Atomic Energy Commission found more than 1,000 safety violations at nuclear facilities, 98 of which were defined by the AEC as "severe," or as posing serious health threats. But only eight were ever penalized, and the penalties assessed against six of these eight were miniscule.

Another result is regulations that are so intricate, vague and inconsistent that they are difficult to comply with even if one wishes to do so. Discussions with officials of a State Health Department quickly reveal that their own experts differ as to the meaning of the various federal and state clauses hospitals and nursing homes must heed. The Occupation Safety and Health Administration's standards run to more than 300 tightly printed pages; a small business seeking to adhere to all of them (by no means a universal urge) may well require both a lawyer and a technical aide to interpret their meaning.

THE LIBERALS' WAY

This is not meant to suggest that weak laws are always designed as a sop for "special interests"; they work for liberals, too. For example, few of those who violate laws against gambling, homosexuals, or prostitution—and that means many millions of

Americans—are ever arrested. Here, the liberals go along with the laws to please the "moralist" members of the community, but they are happy to see them unenforced so that those whose preferences run in such directions can engage in these "crimes without victims."

Indeed, well-intentioned reformers are a major source of weak laws. For them, passing a law has a number of rewarding attributes, particularly the satisfying sense of drama involved in working for its passage: the marshalling of support, the clear target, the excitement of making progress, the sense of elation when a measure is finally enacted. In the process, details concerning enforcement are often sacrificed and the movement, either in exhaustion or delight, turns to campaign for the next bill.

While some public affairs-minded groups monitor the enforcement of some bills (Nader's groups are particularly aware of this aspect), most civic groups find the mundane, complicated, frustrating details of implementation unappealing. They do give them sporadic attention, but more often they would rather fight for the next bill than figure out how to get the existing ones to work.

Two other factors also contribute to the poor enforcement of laws. One is that many so-called average citizens still seem to harbor an odd ambivalence about law enforcement, a mixture of the heritage of lawlessness from the celebrated day of the Wild West and a libertarianism which assumes that strong government is *ipso facto* bad government.

Travel the country asking about police use of radar to catch traffic violators and you will be told it's not "sporting." When a building inspector in the San Francisco area used a helicopter to try to enforce building codes more effectively, the outcry was so vehement that he quickly dropped the practice. People say these devices smack of Big Brother, of snooping, of tyranny. Actually, the radar snuffs out nothing more sacred than excessive speed, while a helicopter is scarcely more of an invasion of privacy than a passing car.

The final and perhaps most frequently cited factor is expense. Thus the Justice Department's antitrust division would need far more than the mere \$16.7 million it now gets if it were to strenuously apply antitrust statutes across the board. On a lesser level, those currently interested in controlling stray pets might think twice about this worthwhile idea if they considered the cost. The price tag, according to one source, for "capturing and killing these [uncontrolled] dogs, animal shelter services, and other related public and private activities, comes to about \$450 million annually." Is it worth half a billion dollars a year? In short, if even most of the country's laws were enforced, we would require at least 210 million police officers, inspectors and court clerks, and then we would still need a small nation of enforcers to see that the first layer of enforcement did not violate scores of laws while seeking to apply the others. We are a nation not only of laws, but of too many laws.

WHAT TO DO?

What is to be done? It has been suggested that every law should be reviewed once every 10 years and, if it has not been adequately enforced, be stricken from the books. Admittedly, that is a far-fetched notion. But it would not be so far-fetched to begin with a major examination of the country's unenforced or poorly enforced laws, similar to the study Congress did in its last session on outdated emergency power still available to the President. That, at least, would give us a truer picture of who we are and what we really believe, as well as providing a basic blueprint for those concerned about such matters.

Then one might hope that as various civic groups become aware of the frequent futility of adding laws to laws, they will become more

concerned with what makes a law "work." They should direct more of their efforts away from promoting new bills and toward greater enforcement of relevant existing ones (as well as toward repeal of deadwood laws and regulations, to prevent arbitrary enforcement). These goals can be accomplished in numerous ways, none unknown but all insufficiently used. The very knowledge that a civic group is regularly monitoring enforcement and will publicize its finding will help.

Unnecessary surgery is a case in point. It is dismayingly prevalent in the United States and wastes not only billions of dollars but sometimes lives and limbs, in addition to violating federal regulations whenever public funds are so misused. However, when a labor union began submitting proposals for non-emergency surgery for its members to "second opinions," much of the unnecessary surgery and eliminated. In one hospital studied, the very fact that an external audit was being conducted reduced unnecessary surgery by half during the first 13 weeks of the post-audit period.

Lawsuits have already been used, and could be used more frequently, to force the enforcers to be more forceful. Strict enforcement is also contingent, however, on the way the law is written and how legal traditions evolve. Basically, American legal tradition does not leave much room for collective action; each injured party has to act on its own behalf. Thus, after a court decided in favor of parents in one town by ruling that prayer in the public schools was in principle unconstitutional, a follow-up study found that praying nevertheless continued in numerous schools across the nation. While the precedent would help other parents who could bring suit to stop the practice, each school would have to be taken to court.

Counter-measures include class-action suits, which recognize that the citizen *per se* is an injured party and reward him if he forces action. The first idea is that one person could bring suit for all similarly injured parties, especially in consumer action. Recently, however, the courts have been less rather than more supportive of this approach. The other avenue, used in pollution cases, allows a citizen who cannot prove that he was specifically damaged to bring suit against a polluter of a common well, lake, or air and collect part of the fine. But so far most laws do not allow for such citizen involvement.

Probably the most consequential avenue is for concerned civic groups to put more pressure on congressional committees to write fewer laws but to be sure that those written are more effective, more easily enforceable, and backed up with a larger enforcement budget and more personnel. Ultimately, only when it becomes less rewarding politically to pass anemic laws, while simultaneously more so to enact fewer but more vigorous ones (which cannot happen until the public and those who mobilize on the side of social improvement are more aware of the state of the law in this country), will the nation have the more enforceable and more effective legal system a just society desires.

IDENTIFICATION OF ARTICLE PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 of this year under extension of remarks I referred to an article recently published in Newsweek magazine regarding the imminent trial of Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin for

violation of abortion laws in Boston. Unfortunately, no specific identification of the article was made. This is simply to call to your attention the fact that the article appeared in the January 27 issue of Newsweek magazine. I regret any confusion that may have occurred regarding the origin and authorship of the article.

RECALLING THE GREAT DEPRESSION

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "The Great Depression." It was published on January 19, 1975, and was written by Samuel G. Blackman. I feel that it should be called to the attention of the House, as it describes in vivid detail, the conditions that existed at that time in our history.

I am aware that many of us can personally recall the effects of this tragedy. But, in this period of increasing economic disruption, it is imperative that we are reminded again of the hardships the Depression created for this Nation, and the world. I feel that it is important that we do everything in our power to prevent any recurrence of that national horror. The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Jan. 19, 1975]

THE GREAT DEPRESSION

(By Samuel G. Blackman)

For years Americans have been told that it could never happen again—a repeat of the Great Depression.

The reasons: the many protective laws enacted since the tragic days of the 1930's, and the memory of those years.

"A good knowledge of what happened in 1929 remains our best safeguard against the recurrence of the more unhappy events of those days," John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist, wrote in his book, "The Great Crash 1929." The 1929 experience, he added, burned itself "deeply into the national consciousness."

The Great Depression followed "Black Thursday" of Oct. 24, 1929, and an even blacker Tuesday, Oct. 29, when stocks went down, down, down after having tripled in value during the wild speculation of the late 1910's. By the end of 1931, stock losses were an estimated \$50 billion.

Only 30 percent of the U.S. population today—those over 45—lived through the Depression that followed the market crash and know what it was like.

It was like this:

In March 1933, the month that Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated President, unemployment reached its peak, 14,706,000. These were industry figures; labor's were slightly higher. This meant that one of every four of the work force was out of a job.

By comparison, in December 1974, there were 6,500,000 unemployed—one of every 14 of the work force.

Bank suspensions closed temporarily or permanently totalled 4,004 in 1933, up from 659 in 1929; 1,352 in 1930; 2,294 in 1931; and 1,456 in 1932. In 1934 the number of suspensions had dropped to 57.

And in the years since 1941, when there were nine suspensions, the number of Ameri-

can bank failures each year had been two or three. In 1974, four failed.

Runs on many banks were the result of rumor and panic. Seeing a line in front of one bank, people would run to another to withdraw their funds, out of fear and often without reason.

The failure of the bank of the United States in December 1930 contributed to the panic. Although it was a commercial bank, many people wrongly associated it with the federal government.

In the summer of 1932, an army of jobless World War I veterans, calling themselves the Bonus Expeditionary Force, marched on Washington to demand that Congress make available immediately the balance of a bonus not due to them until 1945. The cost was approximately \$2 billion.

They built a crude city on the Anacostia Flats. When living conditions became intolerable and the bonus bill was defeated in the Senate, President Herbert Hoover ordered the area cleared. Army troops under the direction of Gen. Douglas MacArthur did so.

The veterans departed the city, singing: "My bonus lies over the ocean; My bonus lies over the sea.

"They gave all the dough to others; "But they won't give my bonus to me." Farmers revolted over low prices. Corn, for example, brought 10 cents a bushel. Today, it brings around \$3.50.

At farm foreclosure sales, farmers often threatened auctioneers and conspired to thwart them. A few would bid low often \$1 or \$2 for a farm or furniture and then give it all back to the farmer about to be dispossessed.

Thousands of families, unable to meet mortgage payments or monthly rents, were evicted.

Breadlines and soup kitchens to feed the hungry were set up by churches, Communities and relief agencies. On street corners, and even in the shadow of the Capitol at Washington, men stood with signs: "Unemployed. Buy apples, 5 cents." Apples sold for 75 cents a bushel.

Municipalities set up welfare organizations—and urged anybody in distress on account of hard times to seek relief "in confidence and without embarrassment."

Millions wandered aimlessly in the nation, looking for food or work. Men who once held good jobs became door-to-door salesmen for whatever seemed saleable. In railroad towns, hoboes who rode the rails begged for food and some marked an "X" with chalk on curbs in front of houses where they had received a handout—a sign to the next man looking for a piece of bread.

Many of the young stayed in school, despite the fact that school facilities were reduced by lack of funds and many teachers went payless.

Prof. David Shannon says in his book, "Twentieth Century America," that when a job opened up during the Depression, young people found that it went to a person with a high school education.

A Yale graduate, Class of '32, now a college professor of English in Connecticut says, "All of my age group knew hard times. All of us had to take jobs and do things for a living that we had not intended to do.

"I suppose some were damaged by discouragement, but I knew a great many others who learned to fall on their feet and discovered abilities, talents even, that they never would have found had they been allowed to pursue the lines of activity they intended."

His first job was as an unsalaried radio writer for a community program, "Adventures in the Use of Spare Time." The program gave the unemployed suggestions on how to make the most of their opportunities.

A retired college executive, once an agricultural specialist: "I still recall a most de-

pressing experience. I was in South Jersey, where vegetable prices had dropped to such a low level that the growers could not recoup the price of containers to ship them to Philadelphia and New York—let alone pay for transportation and sales commissions. So those crops, good quality and good food, were being plowed under.

"The same day I drove to New York City, 140 miles away. There in Times Square, the Hearst Newspapers' truck was dispensing food to a long line of men who apparently had no other prospects for a meal. That was one hell of a contrast in one day."

A retired California news editor: "What I remember most about the Depression is that we were forced to accept a different set of values. The simple things, the inexpensive pleasures, penny ante card games, picnics seemed to be more worthwhile, of greater value."

Some prices from 1932 newspaper advertisements: butter 19 cents; spring lamb chops 24 cents; two dozen eggs 25 cents; potatoes, 100 pounds, 1.35; 24½ pounds of flour and one package of cake flour 99 cents; pork and beans, 20 large cans, \$1; coffee 27 cents; cigarettes, 2 packages, 25 cents, carton \$1.17.

Restaurant meals were cheap. Deviled crabs were offered for 15 cents each and chicken dinners for \$1. A special Friday dinner for \$1 included steamed clams, oysters or clams on the half-shell, choice of fish, vegetables, potatoes and cole slaw, dessert of pie or ice cream, and beverage.

That's the way it was on March 4, 1933 when Roosevelt was inaugurated President and tried to calm the nation with his statement that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Banks had been closed in many states because of depositors' withdrawals of hundreds of millions of dollars. One of FDR's first acts was to declare a four-day national bank holiday.

People were caught without money but they stumbled through. They lived by barter, by selling jewelry, by using scrip issued by many municipalities, and by the goodness of shopkeepers who gave them credit.

Roosevelt called Congress into extraordinary session on March 9 and asked for powers to cope with the nation's plight.

The famous "First 100 days" of his New Deal produced 30 emergency agencies, including a banking relief act: the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; the Commodity Credit Corporation; the Civilian Conservation Corps, which hired 2.5 million boys and men between the ages of 17 and 23 to work in national parks, and the Public Works Administration, which provided 225,000 jobs a year in the repair and construction of public buildings and other large public works projects.

In 1935 Congress passed the Social Security Act and the National Labor Relations Act and set up the controversial Works Progress Administration (WPA) to take people off welfare and put them to work building roads, parks, schools, hospitals and playgrounds, among other projects.

Included were funds to employ writers, artists and musicians to write local histories, paint murals and give public concerts. Republicans charged the Roosevelt Administration with a policy of "tax, tax, spend, spend, and elect, elect."

AMERICAN BUSINESS DAY

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a joint resolution calling

on the President to proclaim May 13 of each year as American Business Day, to reflect on the spirit of free enterprise that has made this country great.

The day would allow an opportunity to broaden public knowledge of how the free enterprise system operates, how it might be improved, and how large the stake of each citizen is in the system, whether involved in management, labor, or the combination represented by the single-person or family enterprise.

The date is significant for all Americans as the date in 1607 of the first landing of settlers at Jamestown, Va. Although of British origin, this settlement, under the stewardship of Capt. John Smith, was a free enterprise undertaking.

The resolution attracted substantial support in the past Congress, and among business-related organizations in many States, but failed to receive action prior to adjournment.

I have also introduced, as an alternative, a bill which would establish permanently the last Monday in April as a legal holiday to honor American free enterprise. The difference in dates as proposed in these two pieces of legislation was considered advisable, because a legal holiday already has been established in May—Memorial Day—but none has been established in April. The April date was chosen, because the first party of settlers that landed at Jamestown entered Chesapeake Bay on April 26, 1607.

The idea of recognizing American free enterprise in this way is not mine. It originated in the Harrisonburg-Rockingham County Chamber of Commerce, in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent. Other chambers of commerce, and similar organizations, in many States, have joined in support of the proposal, and I want to express my appreciation at this time to the colleagues who joined in the introductions of the resolution and bill today.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced his intention to request \$522 million in supplemental appropriations for military assistance to Vietnam and Cambodia.

I grieve for the Vietnamese people, who have been treated cruelly by friend and foe alike. But, as I first stated on January 10 and have reiterated since then, I cannot support this request for military aid.

Mr. Speaker, in the late 1960's, the continuance of the Vietnam war was justified in large measure on the grounds that American assistance contributed to a "Vietnamization" of the war effort. Vietnamization entailed a gradual increase of the responsibility of the Vietnamese in the conduct of the war.

This policy led many Americans to an ardent embrace of the "light-at-the-end-of-the-tunnel" theory. This theory was that we were on the verge of completely ending the U.S. involvement in this exhausting, wasteful, and debilitating war. Soon, we were led to believe, the Vietnamese people would be able to fight their own fight.

It goes without saying that this policy has proven militarily and economically bankrupt. This tree will never bear fruit.

Yet, notwithstanding our terrible sacrifices in the jungles and paddies of Vietnam, President Ford has asked that we peer through that tunnel again, to the tune of \$522 million hard-earned tax dollars.

We did not see the light before, and I am convinced that this \$522 million appropriation would meet with the same result.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. NANNIE MITCHELL

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that those of us who knew Nannie Mitchell mourn her passing.

Born in 1887, she lived a long and very full life. She devoted her years of service to the St. Louis Argus, the newspaper which she founded. As a result of her unflinching efforts the Argus stands today as the "oldest Black owned business in all of Missouri" and the "oldest continuously published weekly newspaper in all of America." She gave so much of herself to the St. Louis community that she will always be remembered as one of its greatest respected and outstanding leading women. No finer tribute can be paid her than these words that appeared in the Argus:

She was flesh and blood. A very real person with so many dimensions of personality and life that people could tell many stories and versions and they would all have truth. But all will grant that she was kind and generous. That she rarely said no. That she had great energy, good humor and an iron will—with a constitution to match.

She was always there to give a helping hand to those in need.

She was indeed a great lady and those of us whose lives she touched will never forget her. I can say that I will sorely miss her.

I want to share with all my colleagues "The Chronicle of a Noble Life"—the life of Mrs. Nannie Mitchell as presented by the St. Louis Argus. The article follows:

END OF AN ERA: MRS. NANNIE MITCHELL PASSES

CHRONICLE OF A NOBLE LIFE

The passing of Mrs. Nannie Mitchell has caused an entire city to pause and reflect on a noble life. Saint Louis loved her. Rich and poor, young and old, black and white, the mighty and the many have poured in hundreds of telegrams and thousands of messages to tell how she will be missed.

For her funeral there has come to this city she loved a 'gathering in.' Senators, congressmen, her peers in the world of The

Black Press, friends, relatives, those who were touched by her vision, her kindness, her generosity have all come together for a happening the likes of which Saint Louis has never seen, may never see again.

With all of the sorrow there has been a joyous spirit that here was a Great Lady who received her roses during her long lifetime.

What was this quality that could bring forth such an outpouring of genuine affection? Here is a chronicle of the journey of a lifetime that brought to pass the phenomenon we know as Mrs. Nannie Mitchell.

1887—Nannie Flowers Ross was born to the union of William and Nancy Ross in Alexander City, Alabama, a small town near Birmingham. Her parents had been born in slavery.

1901—The young girl, now graduated from grade school, becomes Sunday School Teacher at the little church in her community.

1903—With the help of her friends and neighbors she prepares to leave for college at Tuskegee Institute. A local youth, William E. Mitchell, already a college graduate with a degree in literature, proposes marriage after their very first 'walk and talk.'

1904—William's brother James (known as J. E.) arranges a job for William in Saint Louis. It is the time of the World's Fair and the young couple decide to venture and join the throngs who react to the song, "Meet Me in Saint Louie." They travel by mule-drawn wagon. She was often to remark, "It must have taken longer but it seems that we only traveled for 10 or 12 days."

1905—The young Nannie Mitchell works as a laundress for the family where J. E. is the 'houseman' and William the gardener. Her only son, Frank W. Mitchell is born.

1907—With the help of black educators and professional men the young trio—J. E., William and Nan—form the 'We Shall Rise Insurance Company'. To promote sales they soon launch a monthly 'newsletter of social happenings' which they distribute free at local churches.

1911—J. E. astutely realizes that the 'newsletter' is more popular and has more potential than the insurance company. With Nan and William tutoring him they teach him to read and write. It was his support that had originally put William through college. Now they form The Saint Louis Argus Newspaper with J. E. as managing editor, William as production man, and Nan as bookkeeper and office workers. They chose the name 'Argus' from Greek mythology for 'Argus' was 'the watchdog of the gods, with a hundred eyes, who never slept.'

1914—World War I—"Coloured" troops at the front brings a push for 'equal rights' and community pride burgeons within the black community all over America. The young Frank has graduated from 'delivery boy' to learning 'the family trade,' newspapering.

1931—Nannie Mitchell, her savings depleted by the depression, gets a second mortgage on her home to keep the paper going. Slowly, during the early Roosevelt years, there is a resurgence of black demands for equality. With such leaders as Roy Wilkins and Philips Randolph's programs contrasted with the revolutionary thought of Paul Robeson and W. E. B. DuBois progress is steady. New jobs, new prestige, and a burgeoning black middle class emerges at the end of the 30's.

1940's—World War II, Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, Politics. With the Argus and Nannie Mitchell right in the center of the excitement. The paper becomes so popular that they sell popcorn and soda to the crowds that line up each Thursday to devour 'their newspaper.'

Husband William passes away. Mrs. Mitchell assumes a more active role in the Argus.

1952. J. E. Mitchell passes away. Mrs. Mitchell assumes the presidency of The Argus, appoints Frank W. Mitchell as Publisher.

promotes Howard Woods to Executive Editor, and takes a less active role in the paper. Marries Young Turner, retired postal worker, a man of great personality and humor.

1960's—Howard Woods is 'drafted' to a significant and prestigious role in government by United States President Lyndon Baines Johnson. Frank Mitchell's health begins to fail. Mrs. Mitchell reassumes her role as working head of The Argus.

Joe Holland, assistant to the Publisher of the Post-Dispatch, buys her column for the Post for the grand sum of \$15.00 per column. But the move opens a new and most satisfying facet to her career. She had long been read by a small coterie of the faithful. Now the pages of the Post introduces her to the widest possible audience. Saint Louis, almost all of Saint Louis, loves Nannie Mitchell. The mail pours in. Already long a star, she now becomes a superstar.

1970's—The years and the wear and tear have taken their toll. Her vacations are spent in DePaul Hospital where "they baby me and I can recharge my batteries."

With "care and prayer" she decides that her business interest in The Argus will belong to Frank's son, Eugene. He had already found his niche as Medical Director of Homer Phillips Hospital, Faculty Member of The Washington University School of Medicine. But it was this independence and accomplishment which she sought to assure the continuity of 'her Argus.'

1975—Like an 'old soldier' Nannie Mitchell was 'fading away.' More and more hospital stays, less and less strength. Finally, on the morning of January 25th, 1975, a tired heart quit battling. A legend had passed away.

It is sure that myth and story will increase her fame. Give her a 'Sainthood' she never sought. She was flesh and blood. A very real person with so many dimensions of personality and life that people could tell many stories and versions and they would all have truth. But all will grant that she was kind and generous. That she rarely said no. That she had great energy, good humor and an iron will—with a constitution to match. And she was a Christian in the fullest and finest sense, who truly and dearly loved her fellow man and her town. Saint Louis, and The Good Lord with all of her might. She gave the best that was in her with a full and open heart.

Mrs. Nannie Mitchell received literally hundreds of awards and honors in her lifetime. She was proudest of having been officially designated, in the early 1940's, as 'First Lady of The Negro Press.' Through her guidance The Argus survived to become the "oldest Black owned business in all of Missouri" and the "oldest continuously published weekly newspaper in all of America." She loved her 'sorority,' Sigma Gamma Rho, and her church, Berea Presbyterian. She was a patron of The NAACP, Ferrier Harris Home for The Aged, Annie Malone Children's Home and The Page Park YMCA. The Chapel at Ferrier Harris was dedicated in her honor. The Mitchell Hall at Lincoln University School of Journalism is dedicated to J. E. Mitchell and Mitchell School in Saint Louis is named in honor of the family's great contributions to Saint Louis. She was an ardent supporter of talented black youth, a booster of black business, and provided seed money and impetus for many local firms.

Her favorite sayings were, "Keep on keeping on," she applied that when times were going great or badly; "tell the truth, if only people would tell the truth", she would admonish; "either decision is right if only you will work at it," was her advice to those faced with a hard decision. She read her Bible several times daily and used it as her guideline for everyday living. Who that knew her cannot still hear her say: "Thank you, thank you, thank you."

When a person had accomplished something particularly noteworthy or done a

super job she would say, in gleeful praise and admiration, "Man, he can dig a ditch." She loved and admired hard work and felt, sincerely, that a trash collector deserved just as much credit, was just as necessary to society as a professional man or business leader. Her own life and tastes were simple and she saved what money she did not give away, and she gave away much. Thousands upon thousands each Christmas and all through the year whenever the occasion would arise or a friend was in need.

Mrs. Mitchell is survived by five grandchildren: Dr. Eugene Mitchell of St. Louis, Frank Mitchell Jr. and Kenneth Mitchell, Miss Soroya Mitchell and Cheryl Nan Mitchell; one sister-in-law, Mrs. Edward Wright Mitchell of Philadelphia, and two daughters-in-law, Mrs. Zelma Mitchell Harris and Mrs. Betty Mitchell Wilson.

Her body will lie in state at Beal Undertaking, 4746 West Florissant, and then at Berea Presbyterian Church, from whence burial will take place. Interment will be in the family plot at Washington Cemetery this Thursday, January 30, at 12 noon.

The services at Berea Presbyterian Church will be conducted by Rev. Warner Sanford, Jr.

Mrs. Mitchell's two favorite songs, "My Task" and "Peace in the Valley" are to be sung by the choir and soloists.

Among those scheduled to be honorary pallbearers, are: City Comptroller John Bass, Mayor John H. Poelker, Governor Christopher S. Bond, former Governor Warren E. Hearnes, Congressman Bill Clay, Congressman Jim Symington, License Collector Benjamin L. Goins, Publishers G. Duncan Bauman, Everts Graham, Jr.; Howard B. Woods and Nathaniel Sweets, Secretary of State James Kirkpatrick and president of the Police Commissioners, Colonel T. D. McNeal, are also expected. Active pallbearers are: Eugene Liss, Lucius Cervantes, Elijah McCoy, David Grant, Carl Thomas and William Clay.

The Nannie Mitchell Chapel at The Ferrier Harris Home for the Aged, 3636 Page Avenue was given by the St. Louis Section of the National Council of Negro Women.

A SPEECH BY SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, Senator J. GLENN BEALL of Maryland addressed the other body on a subject with which we are all familiar—the issue of busing for racial balance in the school.

His was a well-researched speech for which he should be highly commended, and the thrust of his remarks was that racial quotas implemented by mass, forced busing have achieved nothing in terms of improving the quality of education.

Time after time, the House of Representatives has approved legislation to end the disruptive busing to impose racial quotas, which are opposed by an overwhelming majority of the American people. On every occasion, the Senate has reduced the House legislation to ineffectiveness.

Now, Senator BEALL has written President Ford to ask for appointment of a National Commission on Busing and Quality Education.

It would not only study the busing issue in terms of its impact on education, but it would also examine methods by which we can insure a quality education for every child.

Indeed, if all of the time, energy, and money we have spent on racial balancing had been spent on education, we might very well have already achieved significant improvement in the quality of education.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO—
VALIANT SOLDIER, COURAGEOUS
PATRIOT

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 10 is the 229th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

The American struggle for independence beckoned many zealous defenders of liberty to our land. Polish patriots were foremost among their numbers, and one of the most outstanding of the Polish patriots was Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Kosciuszko contributed a much-needed scientific knowledge of military engineering and an unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of freedom. By virtue of his military education and experience, Kosciuszko proved to be an invaluable asset to the struggling young Colonies.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko had a special longing for freedom for all men. During his own childhood and as a youth, he had watched as his beloved Poland slowly sank beneath the heels of encroaching Russians, Prussians, and Austrians. As a youth at the Warsaw Cadet School he had witnessed freedom-loving Polish senators being sent into Russian bondage. By the time he had reached manhood, Kosciuszko's Poland had already suffered the indignity of partition. The young man looked elsewhere to join the battle for freedom.

Fired by the dream of American independence, Kosciuszko, well-educated and eager to serve, arrived in Philadelphia in 1776, at a time when America was still alone in the insurrection, and when she had just given to the world her Declaration of Independence. Kosciuszko was among the ablest and most idealistic volunteers to reach America from Europe. He was a professional soldier rather than a professional adventurer. He linked his career to the American cause as a result of deeply held democratic convictions rather than from the motives of self-advancement or vainglory.

In the spring of 1777, after receiving a commission as a colonel from the Continental Congress, Kosciuszko joined the Northern Army where his ability as an engineer was of invaluable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His ability to build almost impenetrable fortifications and his able judgment in the choice of battlegrounds contributed much to the final defeat of Burgoyne's forces.

The fortification of the heights of West Point was Kosciuszko's most important undertaking in America. To maintain

West Point meant to command the Hudson, and in the words of General Washington:

The Hudson River was indispensably essential to preserve the communication between the Eastern, Middle, and Southern States.

In the midst of difficulties similar to those of Valley Forge, Kosciuszko labored for over 2 years, and within that time made West Point impregnable. General Armstrong wrote:

Kosciuszko's merit lies in this: That he gave the fortifications such strength that they frightened the enemy from all temptation of even trying to take the Highlands.

In 1780, Kosciuszko was appointed Chief Engineer of the Army of the South. Remaining there until the end of the war, he was regarded as one of the most useful and best-liked among his comrades in arms.

But as soon as American independence was won, Kosciuszko set sail for Europe. There he spent his remaining years fighting in vain for the freedom of his beloved Poland. The aid which he had extended to the American Colonies was a gift which this country could never really repay. Even the reward, in terms of land grants in Ohio, which a grateful America bestowed upon Kosciuszko, was ordered in his will to be sold so that the freedom of Negro slaves could be bought.

As one of the proud cosponsors of the bill—now Public Law 92-524—to officially designate the Kosciuszko home in Philadelphia as a national memorial, I consider this an occasion to honor this great Polish patriot and also salute our fellow citizens of Polish descent who, following in the footsteps of Kosciuszko, have dedicated their lives, often at great risk, to continue the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join with the American Polonia in this commemoration and I extend my greetings to the Polish-American residents of the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am privileged to represent, the city of Chicago and the Nation as they pay tribute to General Kosciuszko and his dedication to the cause of liberty.

THE CASE AGAINST RATIONING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Ford's energy program is the key issue on Capitol Hill. Although I agree with some of the President's proposals, I strongly oppose the alternative suggestion of gasoline rationing.

Basically, this rationing system would grant every licensed driver an equal monthly allotment of coupons, entitling him to roughly 36 gallons per month. Coupons would be transferable, or could be sold if the user did not need them. Commercial users would receive coupon allotment equal to 90 percent of their consumption in 1973. Special needs would be dealt with on State and local levels, where 3 percent would be set aside for hardship or emergency cases.

All coupons would be issued through the Postal Service.

On the surface, the rationing system does not sound like a bad idea. However, I have researched the proposal and have found several serious flaws in the basics of the program.

First. A rationing system would take 4 to 6 months to implement, 15,000 to 25,000 people to operate, \$2 billion in Federal funds, 40,000 post offices to distribute coupons, 3,000 State and local boards for special cases, and 4.8 billion coupons for the first quarter.

Second. The bureaucracy would increase both in size and in the extent to which the Government would be involved in controlling our private lives. This would add complexity, confusion and inconvenience. Some Government official would decide which individuals deserved more coupons because of emergencies or hardships, and which businesses, because of expansion, deserved a greater allotment.

Third. Individuals who depend on automobiles for their livelihood, such as traveling salesmen and taxicab drivers, would have to compete at the State and local level for consideration under the 3 percent of the coupons that would be set aside for hardships and emergencies. A majority of these special coupons would have to go to police, firemen, and hospitals, to enable them to combat emergency situations. This would leave little extra to compensate for the extra mileage incurred by those men who make their livings by driving.

Fourth. Curbing automobile gasoline consumption will only solve a portion of our energy shortage. Private vehicles account for only 40 percent of the total petroleum used in this country. Other petroleum uses must be reduced concurrently if such a rationing plan is to be effective—such as fuel oil, jet fuel, and refinery products going into petrochemicals, etc. At the same time, industrial efficiency must be increased, as well as better construction and insulation methods.

Fifth. Rationing would have long-range negative effects. Since demand would be a constant, unchanging factor, there would be little impetus or incentive to develop better production methods, or to increase supply.

Sixth. Tourism would be hurt, due to a less mobile society. People would have to use the few coupons they have to drive to work and carry on their daily routines. Long trips would be out of the question.

Seventh. The automobile industry could expect sales to drop even more than they already have—possibly another 35 percent. This will only add to our massive unemployment.

Eighth. Although an open trading and selling market is to be in effect, counterfeiting and other illegal activities are inevitable.

Ninth. Users would have to first make applications, which would have to be processed and filed, then validated. This must be done in person to avoid problems with transferability. Consider the inconvenience, long lines, and red tape involved just in obtaining the coupons.

Tenth. The Postal Service is to be the distributing agent for coupons, as well as

the processing point for applications. Is the Post Office capable of this added responsibility?

Eleventh. Our goal is to save 1 million barrels per day (2 million by 1977.) This would mean limiting licensed drivers to 36 gallons per month, (or 1.2 gallons per day.) The current average is 50 gallons per month.

In addition to the difficulties involved in implementing the program, and the numerous, harmful spin-off effects, there is the almost impossible task of dealing with the inequities of the system. Gasoline usage varies greatly among private drivers, according to their personal situation, jobs, or regional location. Consider the following examples of the unfair problems that could result:

a. A low or middle-income worker, or a migrant worker, who owns a car that gets 9 miles per gallon cannot afford to buy a more efficient automobile, while a more affluent person can trade in a "gas-eating" automobile to buy a car that gets 22 mpg. The difference in allowable mileage on coupons for both persons would be 320 versus 790 per month.

b. A suburban family, where both husband and wife work and must commute more than 15 miles each way, every day, would be penalized, particularly in comparison to a family who runs a business from their home. This second family could afford to use their coupons for vacation trips, while the first family would use more than their share just commuting.

c. What should be done in the case of a community that has a good network of bus commuter lines, as opposed to one with no bus lines? This is particularly true in Dallas. What about the man who has to commute from North Dallas to LTV; or the person who lives in Irving and works at TI? There are no reliable bus routes between these points. Should you give less coupons to communities with bus routes and more to those without? Suppose those persons with access to buses do not work along bus lines? The more you try to make the system fair, the more complicated and unfair it becomes.

d. Construction workers and consultants travel to different jobs every day, and there is never any guarantee that the job will be close to home. Long-distance traveling could conceivably cause these people to use over their allocated coupons.

e. A gasoline rationing system could be imposed that would grant coupons only to families as a whole. This would mean the allotment would have to go to the wage-earner in the family. Suppose a family had several teenage members who usually drove to school because they had part-time jobs. If they were ineligible for coupons, this would mean they would lose their jobs. However, granting a family more coupons because more members are licensed drivers also has its inequities.

f. Ranchers, farmers, and those who live in rural areas normally drive hundreds of miles more than city dwellers. How would we compensate their traveling needs and not deprive others?

g. How would we handle coupons for car rental agencies?

h. What happens to families, who, be-

cause of job transfers, must move frequently? They would be using more than their coupon allotment just in moving.

There are just too many exceptions to be taken into consideration. You cannot plan a nation-wide program that will treat all areas of our population equally. An equitable system seems impossible, and judging by present bureaucratic controls, would also be inefficient.

One further point I would like to emphasize is the cost to American taxpayers. At a time when we are trying to cut back on domestic spending, instituting a rationing system will add a large layer of bureaucracy and take another bite out of the already overburdened budget.

Consider the proposed cost estimates for a rationing system:

Pesonnal required

FEA-Washington	625
FEA-Regional Offices	3,250
Post Office	unknown
Enforcement program	2,500
State & Local Boards	3,000
Motor Vehicle	5,100

COSTS

Postal distribution (at \$1.60 per transaction)	\$845,000,000
Postal shipping	50,000,000
Printing of coupons	195,000,000
Printing of forms (applications)	30,000,000
ADP system (data processing)	200,000,000
Public education materials	10,000,000
Salaries:	
Federal (based on 6,375 at \$20,000)	127,500,000
State and local (based on 20,100 at \$20,000)	402,000,000

Grand total..... 1,859,500,000

This figure of almost \$2 billion is only an estimate. It will grow larger once we know salary requirements for the Postal Service. And, it will increase every year, due to the nature of Government salaries and bureaucratic costs.

Rationing worked for us once before, but we were in the midst of a world war and patriotic Americans knew sacrifices were necessary.

We are not in a war. Today, we have more people and at least three times as many automobiles that consume greater quantities of gasoline. Our situation is not comparable to what it was three decades ago, and we cannot expect to implement the same policies we did then.

We need to direct our attentions to the heart of the problem—we need more domestic oil supplies and the only way to insure this is to provide incentives to increase production here in the United States. A rationing system would only mean more bureaucracy—it would not produce more gasoline.

I have discussed the idea of gasoline rationing with President Ford. He is determined to stand firmly against imposing such a system and I will support his position. Like the President, I feel that based on past experiences with the Federal Government, rationing would hit the hardest those people who could least afford the additional economic hardships.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT ABANDON SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, For many years the United States and the members of this Congress believed that it was a valid and legitimate national policy to stop Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

In pursuit of that policy tens of thousands of young men were inducted into the armed services and sent to fight a bitter war in South Vietnam. More than 50,000 died in that struggle.

Today, the South Vietnamese continue to fight aggression. The Paris peace agreement which we encouraged them to sign was not in any sense a final conclusion of that war. That agreement permitted the North Vietnamese to maintain their entire army in South Vietnam, while we withdrew all of our forces. This left our allies, the South Vietnamese, at a decided disadvantage. They were assured, however, by both President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger that we would provide them with the necessary means with which to defend themselves.

Now, in the face of a renewed Communist assault upon the South, many in the Congress want the United States to go back on its word. They want the United States to tell the families of the thousands of Americans who had died that they have died in vain, that South Vietnam will, in the end, be turned over to Communist aggression. They are, as many say, "bored" with and "tired" of Vietnam.

It is essential that this new isolationism be defeated. It is equally essential that those whose isolationism is of a double standard, urging aid for Israel, for example, while opposing aid to South Vietnam, be called to task. What is at stake at the present moment is not only South Vietnam, as important as that is, but the credibility of the United States in the world.

In its lead editorial for this week, Human Events, the Washington weekly journal, declares that:

A refusal to endorse the supplemental means, simply, the subjugation of 20 million people by an aggressive Communist regime which has killed hundreds of thousands of its own people in the traditional "style" of Communist rulers around the world. The stakes in Asia . . . are higher than just the fate of the non-Communist people in South Vietnam and Cambodia. America's security and, indeed, the security of the rest of the free world are also involved.

A decision to abandon South Vietnam, Human Events notes—

Could shatter the rest of our alliances around the globe . . . for clearly it would call into serious question the U.S. capacity and determination to resist Communist aggression anywhere. If we are unwilling to supply even bullets and oil to nations facing

Communist aggression, it may well be asked, then what sacrifices are we willing to make?

I wish to share the important editorial, "Ford Must Go to Mat on South Vietnam Aid," which appeared in the February 8, 1975, issue of Human Events, and insert it into the RECORD at this time

FORD MUST GO TO MAT ON SOUTH VIETNAM AID

Not too many years ago, the newspapers carried the story about Kitty Genovese, a young woman in New York City who cried out for help as she was being stabbed to death in the streets. Though many heard her screams, no one came to her rescue, or even placed a call to the police. There was a rash of condemnatory editorials at the callousness of those who ignored her pleas, but now the United States is about to exhibit the same sort of callousness toward the 20 million people in South Vietnam and Cambodia. We are about to sit by while both countries are consumed by Communist aggression, offering neither a helping hand.

President Ford has asked \$522 million more in military aid so these allies can defend themselves against the current Hanoi offensive. It is not much, considering we used to spend \$20 to \$30 billion a year there. But congressional lawmakers, many of whom concoct far more expensive and far less deserving ways to spend the taxpayer's dollars, are now wringing their hands over such a "costly" endeavor.

Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), who has never blinked at a penny that has been given to Israel, which received \$2.6 billion in U.S. aid in fiscal 1974, says he can't bring himself to vote a dollar more for Saigon. The same sentiments are shared by a number of conservative Republican lawmakers as well, including Sen. William Scott (R-Va.) and Rep. Jim Collins (R-Tex.).

So prevalent is the feeling against providing more aid, in fact, that the chances the supplemental will pass are quite unlikely. But the consequences of shutting off aid are unmistakable: if Congress opposes Ford's plan, neither country will have the ammunition necessary to survive.

A refusal to endorse the supplemental means, simply, the subjugation of 20 million people by an aggressive, Communist regime which has killed hundreds of thousands of its own people in the traditional "style" of Communist rulers around the world.

The stakes in Asia, however, are higher than just the fate of the non-Communist people in South Vietnam and Cambodia. America's security and, indeed, the security of the rest of the free world, are also involved. Surely it is difficult to believe that if Hanoi conquers South Vietnam that this aggressive Communist regime will suddenly have slaked its thirst for new conquests.

A deliberate and conscious decision by Congress to let South Vietnam and Cambodia fall, an act which will create a new and powerful Communist regime throughout all of Indochina, will have the effect of endangering the stability of the rest of non-Communist Asia.

Moreover, such a decision could shatter the rest of our alliances around the globe, including NATO, for clearly it would call into serious question the U.S. capacity and determination to resist Communist aggression anywhere. If we are unwilling to supply even bullets and oil to nations facing Communist aggression, it may well be asked, then what sacrifices are we willing to make?

President Ford has only a slim shot at winning the aid plan, but the consequences of failure are so grave that he has to pull out

all stops to turn Congress around. Like President Nixon before him, who was extremely successful in explaining his Vietnam policy to the public, President Ford must take to nationwide television to explain the critical need for his aid plan.

The President, we believe, has a persuasive story to tell. He can underscore the enormous violations of the Paris peace accords by the North Vietnamese. He can talk of the fact that over 170,000 North Vietnamese troops have been infiltrated into South Vietnam and that Hanoi's main force army in the South has increased to 300,000, up 80,000 from the time of the agreement.

The President can disclose how the North has tripled its armor in the South, expanded its armament stockpiles, constructed airfields, shelled population centers and overrun 11 district towns which were unequivocally held by the Republic of Vietnam at the time of the cease-fire. The latest and most serious escalation began in early December 1974 which concluded with the conquest of Phuoc Long Province and its capital, Song Be.

In contrast, the South Vietnamese, for the most part, have lived up to the cease-fire agreement, and they have fully cooperated with the International Commission of Control and Supervision which is supposed to monitor cease-fire violations. They have steadfastly called for implementation of the provisions of the Paris agreement calling for internationally supervised elections, but the Communists refuse to go along because they know they would lose.

The Communists have solid evidence they would lose, in fact, because, virtually without exception, millions of refugees in South Vietnam have fled to government-controlled areas, even when it would have been easier and safer to stay where they were and accept Communist rule.

President Ford can point out that he does not want to send American troops to Vietnam. He does not want to send pilots or renew the bombings. What he does want to do is keep the solemn promises we made to South Vietnam when the Paris accords were signed in January 1973.

South Vietnam entered the agreement with the solemn promise of the United States that we would continue to provide its soldiers with the level of equipment they had at the time of the cease-fire. Everyone knows we haven't done this. As the American Conservative Union's Jim Roberts, a former naval lieutenant who served in Vietnam, pointed out in his excellent report on his recent visit to that country, the government's forces have been restricted by a shortage of fuel and ammunition, the result of slashes in U.S. aid.

As Gen. Laan told Roberts, "We have had greatly to reduce our firepower in engagements with the enemy so that now we are often hit by more shells than we can fire back. It is essential that we maintain a minimum stockpile of ammunition, but in the event of an all-out enemy offensive, I don't think we would have more than a week's reserves on hand."

Laan struck a theme Roberts and others in his party were to hear over and over during their visit: the growing supply shortage is seriously weakening the army's ability to resist the enemy.

"One of the greatest ironies of the situation," said Roberts, "is the status of the air force which possesses 1,800 aircraft bequeathed to Saigon in the Vietnamization program and manned by a highly professional corps of pilots and technicians, most of whom were trained in the United States.

"Because of the shortage of fuel, ordnance and spare parts, most of those aircraft are grounded. Also, as a result of shortages, air reconnaissance is limited to situations in

which the enemy is actually engaged. Fighters are limited to close tactical operations and even they are deployed sparingly; helicopters can no longer be used to shift troops and are limited to medevac operations.

"The effects of the aid cutbacks are everywhere evident. For the first year and a quarter following the cease-fire the ARVN troops were able to hold their territory and outposts. In the last two months, as a result of inadequate supplies, they have withdrawn from dozens of outposts. Dozens of other outposts have been overrun. . . ."

The United States, President Ford can continue, lost 50,000 men in Vietnam and spent \$150 billion to save it from a military takeover by Hanoi. Does Congress now purposely desire to make that sacrifice in vain by having the U.S. waltz on a solemn promise to a valiant ally?

WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAWS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1970, the Occupational Safety and Health Act—a far-reaching measure designed to protect the lives of America's approximately 85 million workers—was signed into law.

Several years of extensive hearings and debate on this legislation revealed that another related area affecting the Nation's work force sorely needed the attention of Congress; namely, the States workers' compensation laws.

The Occupational Safety Act of 1970 accordingly established a National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws to study thoroughly and evaluate State workmen's compensation statutes. On July 31, 1972, the Commission issued its report, recommending numerous changes in the States' workers' compensation laws in order to realize fair compensation for work-related accidents, illness, disease, and death.

Some States have made efforts to bring their laws into conformity with the Commission's recommendations. A listing of these measures is compiled by Florence C. Johnson in the January 1975 issue of *Monthly Labor Review*. I want to call my colleagues' attention to an excerpt from this article and a table illustrating increases in maximum weekly temporary total disability benefits in 1974.

These improvements are steps in the right direction, but the important point is that not a single State fully meets the Commission's recommendations, and in some areas the compensation laws are woefully inadequate.

I intend to introduce appropriate workers' compensation legislation in this session of Congress, and the Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation, Safety and Health which I chair will hold hearings on bills to modernize the various State workers' compensation systems.

The article follows:

WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAWS—CHANGES IN 1974

(By Florence C. Johnson, a labor standards adviser in the Division of Workers' Compensation Standards, Interdepartmental Workers' Compensation Task Force)

In a continuing effort to update their laws and bring them into conformity with recommendations of the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws, the legislatures of 46 States enacted over 200 amendments in 1974. The importance of such legislation was evidenced by the fact that several States held special sessions, and a number of States carried over legislation introduced in the prior year that had not reached final approval. As a result, considerable progress has been made in improving the protection provided the injured worker, although no State as yet fully meets all of the "essential recommendations" of the National Commission.

A new development this year was the creation of the Interdepartmental Workers' Compensation Task Force by the President and the issuance of a White Paper stating the Administration's objectives. The task force's functions is to strengthen workers' compensation systems by providing technical assistance to the States in areas of coverage, occupational diseases, medical and rehabilitation services, benefits, cost-of-living adjustments, and a nationally uniform data system. It also will conduct research designed to answer many critical questions in the field of workers' compensation. In conjunction with the technical assistance program, the task force will evaluate each State's progress toward meeting the minimum objectives proposed by Administration. Its report and recommendations for appropriate Federal legislation is expected by early 1976.

Nine States (Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia) enacted comprehensive changes in an effort to meet various recommendations of the National Commission. Changes from elective to compulsory laws were made in six States, and exemptions of small firms based on number of employees were eliminated or reduced in five. Four States extended coverage to specified domestic workers, and coverage of agricultural workers was provided in two States and liberalized in two others. Kansas for the first time provided full coverage of occupational diseases.

One State established a second injury fund to provide compensation coverage for any injured employee who has had a previous permanent physical impairment, and a second injury board to administer the fund. A number of States provided for rehabilitation services or benefits for the first time or liberalized their existing provisions. Full medical care was newly provided in one State, and liberalizing amendments were enacted in several others. Six States enacted provisions for annual adjustment of benefits based on the State's average weekly wage, and at least three-fourths of the 46 legislatures in session increased the maximum weekly benefits. Three States reduced their periods of waiting before benefits become payable.

An article by Alfred Skolnik and Daniel Price, "Workmen's Compensation Under Scrutiny," in the October 1974 issue of the *Social Security Bulletin* shows the magnitude of the workers compensation program. The article looks at recent coverage, cost, and earnings-replacement trends in workmen's compensation in light of the recommendations of the National Commission. It states, among other things, that 84 percent of the civilian wage and salary labor force have the protection of the program, and that in 1973, 21 jurisdictions paid the average injured worker the full statutory wage-replacement rate.

MAXIMUM WEEKLY TEMPORARY TOTAL DISABILITY BENEFITS INCREASED IN 1974

Jurisdiction	Former maximum	New maximum	Jurisdiction	Former maximum	New maximum
Alabama	\$68	\$75	Montana ¹	\$110	100 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$137).
Arkansas ¹	\$63	\$66.50	Nebraska	\$80	\$89
California ¹	\$105	\$119	Nevada ²	\$106.07	\$111.96
Colorado ¹	\$84	66 2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$109.20)	New Jersey ²	\$108	\$112
Delaware	\$75	66 2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage (effective July 1, 1975)	New Mexico	\$65	\$75
District of Columbia	150 percent of national average weekly wage (\$210.54)	175 percent of national average weekly wage (\$261)	New York	\$95	\$125
Florida	\$80	66 2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage (effective Jan. 1, 1975)	North Carolina	\$80	100 percent of State's average weekly wage (effective Nov. 1, 1975)
Georgia	\$65	\$80	North Dakota ²	\$74, plus \$5 for each dependent child but not to exceed employee's take-home pay.	\$78, plus \$5 for each dependent child but not to exceed employee's take-home pay.
Hawaii	\$112.50	100 percent of State's average weekly wage (effective Jan. 1, 1975)	Ohio ²	\$110	\$112
Idaho ¹	\$74.40-\$111.60 ²	\$78-\$117 ²	Oregon ²	\$125.20	\$133.07
Indiana	60 percent of employee's wage—Statutory amount of \$60 to \$74.3	66 2/3 percent of employee's wage—Statutory amount of \$90	Pennsylvania ²	\$100	\$106
Iowa ^{1,2}	\$91	\$97. Effective July 1, 1975, 100 percent of State's average weekly wage.)	Rhode Island	60 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$81.55), plus \$6 for each dependent; aggregate not to exceed worker's average weekly wage.	66-2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage, plus \$6 for each dependent; aggregate not to exceed 80 percent of worker's average weekly wage. (Effective Sept. 1, 1975, 100 percent of State's average weekly wage.)
Kansas	60 percent of employee's wage—Statutory amount of \$56	66 2/3 percent of employee's gross wage—66 2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$95.20)	South Carolina	\$63	66-2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$87.62)
Kentucky ²	\$81	\$84	South Dakota	56 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$63)	60 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$72). (Effective July 1, 1975, 66-2/3 percent.)
Maine ²	\$83	\$87.53. (Effective Nov. 30, 1974, 100 percent of State's average weekly wage.) (\$131.29)	Tennessee	\$62	\$70.4
Maryland ²	\$96	\$102.30. (Effective July 1, 1975, 100 percent of State's average weekly wage.)	Texas ¹	\$63	\$70
Massachusetts ¹	\$80, plus \$6 for each total dependent; aggregate not to exceed worker's average weekly wage.	\$90, plus \$6 for each total dependent; aggregate not to exceed worker's average weekly wage. (Effective Nov. 1, 1974, \$95 plus dependent's allowance.)	Utah ²	\$89.33	\$95.33
Michigan ²	\$93-\$122 ²	\$100-\$129 ²	Vermont ¹	\$81	\$86
Mississippi	\$56	\$63	Virginia	\$80	\$91
Missouri	\$70	\$95	Washington ²	\$121.38	\$129.23
			West Virginia	60 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$91.80)	80 percent of State's average weekly wage (\$128). (Effective July 1, 1975, 100 percent.)
			Wisconsin ¹	\$90	\$100. (Effective Jan. 1, 1975, 66-2/3 percent of State's average weekly wage.)

¹ Based on legislation enacted in prior year.
² Based on increase in State's average weekly wage.
³ According to number of dependents.

⁴ Texas: Thereafter each additional increase of \$10 in average weekly wage for manufacturing production workers, as annually determined by Texas Employment Commission, will increase maximum weekly benefit by \$7.

ABOLISH THE AIRLINES' MUTUAL AID PACT
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
 OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the airlines' mutual aid pact has caused prolonged strikes that have netted the struck carriers millions of dollars in profits for not flying. In addition, this agreement encourages companies with the poorest management-labor relations to stay away from the bargaining table and thus force a strike. That is why I am today introducing legislation to terminate the mutual aid pact.

There are many examples showing how the airlines can make profit without flying. Most recently, the International Association of Machinists struck National Airlines from July to October of 1974. During the 108-day shutdown, National Airlines received more than \$43 million in MAP assistance. In November 1973, TWA flight attendants struck and forced a 44-day shutdown. During that period, TWA netted \$74.4 million in payments from the other airlines which benefited from the additional passengers. In 1972, Northwest Airlines' pilots were off for 95 days. It received \$43.6 million in subsidies from the other carriers, which helped Northwest post a \$17.2 million profit for the year. The list goes on and on.

The major argument in favor of MAP is that the airlines should be able to obtain strike benefits just as the striking workers do. There is no comparison. Some unions provide no strike benefits

at all, and the unions that do pay only subsistence funds from \$2 per day to a maximum of \$15 a day. This barely puts food on the table let alone pays the running expenses of the average household. No airline employees have been known to make a profit from strike benefits, a statement their employers cannot make.

Before the aid agreement was instituted in 1958, airline strikes lasted an average of 15 days, compared to a national industrywide strike duration average of 19.7 days that same year. During the first 3 years of the pact, airline strikes increased in length to an average of 23 days. When supplemental payments to carriers were instituted in 1962, the average strike lasted 29 days. Since 1969, airline shutdowns averaged 95 days, compared to a national strike average of only 25.3 days. Clearly, the mutual aid pact has prolonged airlines' strikes, with no letup in sight.

In view of these problems concerning the settlement of airline strikes, termination of the mutual aid pact is necessary. As long as striking airlines can make a profit without flying, collective bargaining is ignored and little incentive exists for airlines to reach a settlement.

WOMEN AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in light of International Women's Year, I would like

to call to the attention of my colleagues the most recent issue of UNICEF News entitled "Women and Development." This outstanding issue explores some of the continuous problems faced by women in the developing nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. Through a series of vignettes of the lives of typical women, the tragedies of illiteracy, overpopulation, and complete male dominance of societies are illustrated. But attention is also given to what progress is being made and to what hope the future holds.

The issue raises many serious questions about the role played by development planners in improving the status of women. Are stereotypes being reinforced? Are the needs of both urban and rural women being adequately assessed and effectively met? Is enough being done to combat illiteracy?

I would strongly urge that this important issue be read and its implications considered by all Members. It is available from the U.S. Committee for UNICEF, 311 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y., 10016, for \$1 a copy or 500 copies for \$100. They will be distributed on a first come, first serve basis.

The introductory article, "For UNICEF: Every Year is Woman's Year," follows:

FOR UNICEF EVERY YEAR IS WOMAN'S YEAR

The goals of international Women's Year being celebrated during 1975 and those of World Population Year for 1974, have much in common with the Children's Fund, for the advancement of the woman and the concept of responsible parenthood continue to be a major focus of attention in all UNICEF activity.

A woman who understands the advantages of better child spacing will be healthier herself and bear healthier children. A mother

who learns some basic rules about better child care and nutrition will know how to keep her children healthier at all ages. A literate mother will see the benefits of sending her children to school and keeping them there for as long as possible. A woman who increases her own skills, inevitably increases her feelings of self-respect and dignity and the knowledge that she can contribute to the development of her own community.

To help achieve these goals, UNICEF has been working with governments in developing countries for well over a quarter of a century to help them build up their health, nutrition, education and social welfare services.

Unfortunately, however, the emphasis is still on *talking* about goals rather than on *achieving* them. Of course, there has been some progress in expanding maternal and child health services and providing family planning services to governments who want them, in increasing educational opportunities, in training more women in many fields, and in improving the lives of disadvantaged peoples in many countries.

But the sad fact remains that despite the efforts of the developing nations themselves and the assistance from more affluent countries and international agencies, including UNICEF, the vast majority of women and their families still live lives of poverty, squalor and ignorance with little or no hope of bettering their situation.

This is why UNICEF applauds the aims of International Women's Year to focus worldwide attention on the plight of women and the need to help them. The initiative taken by UNICEF's Executive Board in declaring a state of emergency for the world's children, especially in light of the present world food crisis, is a significant step. Hopefully, this declaration will help to mobilize greater resources for action to improve the incredibly poor living conditions for millions of mothers and children throughout the developing world.

This issue of UNICEF NEWS is dedicated to the women in developing nations. It provides a picture of the lives of women in a few countries and some of the ways in which they are helping themselves—and being helped—towards the possibility of a better future in which they can become active participants in the development of their own countries.

ST. JUDE'S CHILDREN'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL GETS BIG HELP FROM ALPHA PHI OMEGA FRATERNITY OF UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT MARTIN

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each year during the spring, a group of dedicated young men, students at the University of Tennessee at Martin, use their entire spring vacation to benefit their less fortunate fellow men.

Those young men are all members of Alpha Phi Omega National Service Fraternity at the University of Tennessee at Martin and their annual project is a fundraising drive that benefits the St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, Tenn.

But this is no ordinary fundraising effort. While their contemporaries are off from school enjoying what has become the annual spring vacation, the

men of Alpha Phi Omega are walking from their Martin, Tenn., campus to Memphis, a distance of 130 miles, pushing a wheelbarrow in which donations for the hospital are collected.

Their efforts are most rewarding. The annual Push for St. Jude has raised a total of \$65,000 during its 4-year existence and the men of Alpha Phi Omega hope to add another \$18,000 to that total when they embark on the trip this year during the week of March 22-28.

While the project has gained in momentum each year since its inception in 1971, this year promises to be the biggest and best year to date. Not only are the members of Alpha Phi Omega preparing to make the trek again, they are preparing to coordinate with other charity organizations in order that it will be a regional effort.

While one fraternity brother makes the usual arrangements for food and lodgings during the week long walk, others are gaining the support of other groups to aid in the collection of donations. Still others are making arrangements to make the push well known throughout the entire Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee.

The result then is a mammoth task totally undertaken by a group of youngsters who are interested in helping their fellow man, lending a helping hand where it is needed.

I, too, have become involved in the project, meeting the men along their route, and I am continually amazed at the group's cheerfulness and enthusiasm at the end of a 7-day walk. Their desire to aid their fellow human beings and offer a monetary contribution to research that may someday eliminate many children's diseases is most refreshing.

But I think their purpose and their willing sacrifices can best be summed up by a statement made by one of their members, former chapter president Scott Correll,

The Push is a fantastic example of mankind's unselfishness. It shows that people of West Tennessee have a great love for St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital and the work it does. Our sore feet, blisters and aching legs are all forgotten when we are greeted by the children and staff of St. Jude's. Our pains turn to joy when we begin to think of the children whose lives will be saved by the donations from the Push.

The unselfishness of these young men should be recognized by the entire Nation and their efforts should be commended. Their civic responsibility and humanitarian concern reflects great credit upon the young people of Tennessee and the Nation and it should serve as a model for all who see such unselfish giving of time and energy.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS VERSUS A LIFE

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 28, 1975, I introduced a bill to establish a national ban on the

importation, sale, manufacture, and possession of handguns to end the senseless slaughter of human beings in this supposedly civilized country.

The accessibility of handguns to the general public is a major cause of domestic violence and death in America. The intentional and ruthless passion killings, as well as inadvertent handgun accidents, account for more deaths than all the calculated robberies and burglaries of several years. The most disconsolate is that most victims are either innocent objects of carelessness or random targets of temporary or permanent dementia.

The argument that private ownership of handguns is necessary to discourage lawlessness is simply untrue. The handgun is a source of violence and death for many innocent people. It is a means to lawlessness.

A contemporary poet asks:

How many deaths will it take till we know, that too many people have died?

There have already been too many deaths. It is time for the people to make the appropriate laws which will help put an end to the tragedy of violence and death caused by the use of handguns.

It is with these thoughts that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the moving letter which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, January 31, 1975, written by Claudia Anderson Nevins, a resident of the District of Columbia:

THE "RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS" VERSUS A LIFE

Mary Jo Donovan is dead. She died while she was warming up her car on a cold January day in a Maryland suburb of Washington. She died because someone shot her and left a beautiful little boy motherless and a devoted husband and friends without one of the liveliest, most charming, warmest, best humored people we have ever known.

This is not the first letter I have written on gun control. And it probably will not be the last. But I hope to God that it is the most painful, as I doubt that I personally could endure more pain than those of us who knew Mary Jo have experienced. Mary Jo was one of those rare women who had found liberation and was a mother and wife and a career woman who did all of those things well and without complaint or trauma. And she made a lot of people laugh in a time when there is not a great deal to laugh about in the world.

I am tempted to call the National Rifle Association and ask whether they can honestly say that the "right to bear arms" is a sufficient trade-off for the life of one truly fine human being. A right versus a life. Would they think about that? Since hearing that Mary Jo is dead, I have been wandering around in a daze as have most people I know. And all that I seem capable of saying to myself is "Who cares?" I have not been able to decipher what that means, but I want to know when this country is going to get to the point of valuing human life and dignity? I have heard people say that life is cheap in Asia and Africa, but here we have the most senseless killings and a numb acceptance that is frightening.

It would not surprise me if this letter is not printed because of its incoherence. And I can understand that. But I hope that someone, somewhere does read it and realizes it is intellectually easy to oppose something, but when someone who has been a friend to many and an enemy to no one is sacrificed for nothing, we can only hope that the

hopelessness and the bitterness we feel can somehow be interpreted into a positive means of combating the most incredible narrow-mindedness that exists in our nation today.

CLAUDIA ANDERSON NEVINS.

Washington.

VALIDITY OF CURRENT "CONVENTIONAL WISDOM"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, with all this talk of rising budget deficits and skyrocketing unemployment, "conventional wisdom" has it that the Federal Government should do more to keep jobs up and prices down. But, if one looks at past performance, one must doubt the validity of current "conventional wisdom."

By doing as much as it has—both in terms of spending money and regulating the economy—the Federal Government has created more problems than it has resolved. Excessive Federal spending, resulting in huge budget deficits, has been the primary cause of inflation and excessive Government regulation of business and the economy has discouraged, rather than stimulated, productivity.

As a consequence, prices have continued to rise, purchasing power has begun to fall, demand for goods has been dropping, companies have reduced production still further, and more layoffs have resulted. And, unless there is more incentive and fewer obstacles to greater productivity—which will drive prices down—this trend will continue.

Unfortunately, one of the biggest obstacles to productivity these days is the Federal Government itself. Not only has it interfered in the free market to the detriment of the producer, but it has become so preoccupied with regulation that the producer spends much of his time and money filling out forms rather than making goods or expanding his productive capability.

With all of the redtape involved in getting projects approved, it's a wonder more businessmen have not gone bankrupt while waiting for some paperwork to clear or some permit to be issued.

Originally, the idea behind the Federal regulation was to prevent monopolistic practices and to make it easier for those who wanted to compete in the free market to do so. But, now the concept has been expanded so that, at times, it appears the original purpose has been forgotten or altogether distorted.

Moreover, other regulations aimed at opening the job market, protecting the environment or aiding the consumer, have snowballed to the point where many of those being "protected" are wondering if the cure is not worse than the disease. One need only look at higher price tags, delayed deliveries or the use of quotas in hiring to know what I mean.

However, for the benefit of those who have not had the dubious pleasure of dealing with an unreasonable Federal bureaucrat or a mound of frustrating Federal paperwork, I commend to my

colleagues an article by Mark Frazier in the January issue of Readers Digest. In it, Mr. Frazier discusses the rulemaking of the Interstate Commerce Commission—ICC—and his account is one that Congress and the American people should not ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Mr. Frazier's article to be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

HIGHWAY ROBBERY—VIA THE ICC

(By Mark Frazier)

A truckful of furniture, en route from Dallas to San Diego, detours 800 miles out of its way—adding 12 hours to the trip and squandering 160 gallons of fuel. Reason: arbitrary federal regulations.

In Atlanta, Ga., a trucking company announces plans to lower rates on truckloads of tire treads bound for Ohio to save its customers \$400 a trip. But it is prevented from making the cut. Reason: arbitrary federal regulations.

Along the main interstate routes between Milwaukee, Wis., and Birmingham, Ala., trucks roll along with trailers empty, even though depots at both ends of the line would gladly give them cargo. The truckers are permitted to haul freight one way only, and must make the 1000-mile return trip empty. Reason: arbitrary federal regulations.

Responsible for these and hundreds of other interstate-trucking regulations is the Interstate Commerce Commission. Every day, its regulatory roadblocks prevent the speedy, efficient transport of the goods we buy and sell. Economists totaling the bill say that ICC edicts cost consumers from \$5 billion to \$10 billion a year in higher prices for everything from tuna fish to television sets—as much as \$200 a year for the average U.S. family.

Few would have predicted such a destructive role for the ICC when it was set up in 1887. Its handful of employees were supposed only to protect customers and rail lines from discriminatory pricing and rate wars. But, during the 1930s and '40s, pressured by railroads losing business to other forms of transportation, Congress brought interstate trucking and barge lines under ICC regulation to end "cut-throat competition" throughout the nation's transportation system.

Today, the commission boasts more than 2000 employees, in 78 offices around the country. Operating on a budget of \$34 million a year, the agency claims to be doing a better job than ever. A host of critics disagree. Says Sen. William Proxmire (D., Wis.): "The ICC has become a captive of the transportation industry itself. Instead of regulating transportation to avoid monopoly and increased prices, it has established monopolies, reduced competition, and ordered high and uneconomic rates to cover the costs of inefficient producers."

How does an agency that claims to protect the public actually cost it billions of dollars in higher prices? Consider these aspects of the ICC's sweeping authority:

1. The ICC dictates which truckers can go into interstate business. In reports to Congress, the agency claims that, by controlling "entry into transportation," it "fosters a balanced, stable and responsive trucking system." Facts belie the statement. Each year, hundreds of qualified companies seeking to win operating rights are turned down by the ICC. Many more are intimidated and do not ask, out of fear that protests from established firms will tie up their cases in costly litigation—and out of the likelihood that the ICC will rule against them in the end. "The ICC has a disturbing tendency to be protective of the large carriers," says Robert Gallagher, a New York attorney who specializes in transportation matters.

The application of Checker Transfer &

Storage is a case in point. Checker has hauled household goods in South Carolina for 27 years, using licenses owned by a number of giant van lines. Each time the company makes an interstate trip, it must pay an average of ten percent of the revenues to the big van companies that hold the permits it needs.

In August 1972, Checker asked the ICC for a modest interstate license of its own. A half-dozen nationwide van lines and one regional competitor who already held such permits filed immediate protests. Checker had to spend \$5000 in legal fees to present its case. None of these complainants challenged Checker's service or denied the charge that they shunned the short-haul interstate traffic Checker specialized in. Nevertheless, the commission, after a wait of 20 months, rejected Checker's application—thus forcing the line to continue paying virtual kickbacks for the right to haul goods in interstate commerce.

Why such turndowns? Incredibly, the commission has set as virtual policy that no applicant may cite lower costs, faster service or greater responsiveness to customers as reasons for receiving a permit. Evidence that existing service may be inefficient or overpriced is considered irrelevant and inadmissible. Only if the applicant can prove that established carriers lack the capacity to haul specific traffic will the commission decide that "public convenience and necessity" demand approval of a new certificate. In the words of commission chairman George Stafford, the policy is to guarantee that carriers conforming to ICC requirements "will not have their profits drained by unwarranted or destructive competition." If the profits are not fat enough, he states, existing companies will have no "inducement" to expand.

2. The ICC determines what a commercial trucker can and cannot carry. Certificates granted by the agency, spelling out the specific items that a trucker may haul (only livestock and raw agricultural products are exempt from ICC regulation), are sometimes so irrational as to be ludicrous—if they were not so injurious to the economy. Thus, some truckers are permitted to carry only unexposed film; exposed film must be hauled by someone else. Other truckers may transport plastic pipe but not metal pipe. Officials at Quaker Oats, starting up a new pizza-making plant in Jackson, Tenn., have had to face problems with certificate-hobbled truckers. Trucks hauling tomato paste to the plant from California are not allowed to carry pizzas back. Trucks bringing pizza crusts from Denver must also return empty.

"The situation is absurd," says Mike Parkhurst, a former trucker who now edits the trucking magazine *Overdrive*. "It's as if American Airlines could only carry people from east to west, while United took passengers from west to east."

The commission defends its practice of regulating cargo rights as "stabilizing" the transportation industry. If truckers could haul whatever cargoes they could find, says the ICC, a dog-eat-dog scramble for shipments might force many firms out of business. Cargo restrictions also protect truckers by creating a need for more trucking activity; in limiting what one carrier may carry back to his point of origin, the ICC gives another driver a job. But consumers, of course, pay for the second truck to carry what could have been taken by the first.

Indeed, regulated truckers today travel empty an estimated 30 percent of their miles—triple the percentage for unregulated carriers, according to a widely respected 1970 report on the ICC co-authored by Robert Fellmeth and members of the Ralph Nader research staff.

3. The ICC decides what areas truckers may serve. The commission has parceled out hundreds of thousands of routes, often detailing to the mile just where an individual trucker may go. Thus, certificates may re-

strict service to one side of a street or to roundabout roads rather than more direct highways. Agency rules require Cedar Rapids Steel Transportation, for example—hauling 60 truckloads a week to Chicago from St. Paul—to go 80 miles out of the way, through Clinton, Iowa. If a factory changes its gate location, truckers sometimes have to apply for new authority to pick up and deliver.

The ICC claims that its control over routing prevents "harmful and wasteful effects of unrestrained operations." But each day hundreds of truckers are prevented from taking the quickest, most economical route to their destination. While no one knows exactly the amount of fuel that would be saved by eliminating all the circuitous routing, conservation organizations such as the Sierra Club put the sum at tens of millions of gallons a year.

Last April, after strenuous protests from environmentalists concerned with the waste, the commission did eliminate a number of flagrant abuses. But many truckers are still threatened with heavy fines or even jail terms for taking the most direct routes.

4. The ICC permits the trucking industry to fix its own prices. Interstate rates are set by 148 "rate bureaus"—regional associations of truckers—and are put into effect automatically unless an aggrieved party goes to the expense of asking the ICC to intervene. Justice Department lawyers note sardonically that trucking executives would land in jail if their "rate bureau" meetings took place in almost any other business. Says John Snow, of the Department of Transportation: "They are in a situation that almost every industry would like to be in. They can sit down and veto the rates of their competitors."

Truckers who try to lower rates often learn to regret it. Each year, rate-bureau attorneys file hundreds of protests with the ICC, charging that truckers' independent proposals to reduce rates constitute "unfair competition." Thus, when Poole Trucklines of Alabama told customers that it was reducing by 35 percent its rate on hauling paper products, the Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference protested to the ICC that the action was "unjust and unreasonable." The commission agreed, forcing the firm to cancel its reduction. Since 1970, the ICC has exacted more than \$3 million from carriers and their customers, via the courts, for charging less than rate-bureau fees.

The price-fixing system uses the carrot as well as the stick. By forcing rates up to high levels, the rate bureaus have convinced most regulated truckers that there is little reason to engage in price competition with one another. The result is that regulated truckers have an estimated profit of 15 percent—twice that of most industries.

Would free competition really lower prices? Prof. Thomas Gale Moore, of Stanford University, notes that when ICC regulations were removed from frozen vegetables in the 1950s, shipping rates dropped 20 percent and more. He predicts savings of billions of dollars a year if all rates were to be set by the free market.

Clearly, drastic reforms are needed in these four areas. They will, however, be hard-fought.

Former ICC chairman Anthony Arpaia warns that major truckers oppose change, and that they "constitute a powerful lobby with plenty of money on Capitol Hill." The American Trucking Associations, for instance, dominated by large trucking firms with protected route and cargo rights, pay for a persuasive Washington staff of 240. "We think the law is perfectly all right the way it is," says ATA president William Bresnahan. Since the more driving they do, the more they are paid, many truck drivers, too, support present wasteful policies. And the Teamsters Union, ably represented in Washington by 125 full-time staffers, also profits from ICC

rules that create empty trucks and circuitous routes.

Reform is even more difficult because of the cozy relations between the regulated and the regulators. Of 14 commissioners who have left the ICC for new employment since 1958, 12 found jobs representing the industry they once controlled. The Nader report argues that job-switching between the ICC and the industry has become so frequent that "deferred bribes" are the norm.

The special-interest obstacles to reform, then, are enormous. But encouraging signs are nonetheless spreading. The head of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Rep. Harley O. Staggers (D., W.Va.), now believes that the agency should scrap rules creating roundabout routes and empty trucks. Early this year, President Ford is expected to ask Congress to reform the commission as part of the Administration's effort to curb inflation—by loosening the regulatory system to allow greater competition. "It's bad enough to pay the salaries of bureaucrats when they do nothing," says a spokesman for the National Taxpayers Union. "It is even worse to pay to have them skewer us the way the ICC is doing."

The effort will die, however, unless enough citizen support steps forward. Consumers have already lost billions of dollars to ICC-protected cartels. It is time for us to demand that Congress put a stop to this highway robbery.

STARVING THE POOR WILL NOT STOP UNEMPLOYMENT, INFLATION, OR RECESSION

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Members of the House to cast his vote on the suspension of the food stamp regulations, I believe the House acted humanely, compassionately, and with dispatch. We did the decent thing in helping to ease the burden of the poor and the elderly, those who can least afford the ravages of inflation, recession, and unemployment.

The administration proposed to increase the price of food stamps to 30 percent of net income. That meant the average household would have to pay about one-third more in order to get the same amount of stamps. The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that over one-half of the people in one- and two-person households enrolled in the food stamp program are elderly poor. Simply put, the administration was trying to turn the war on poverty into a war on the poor.

Testimony before the House Agriculture Committee has shown that persons enrolled in the supplemental security income program—SSI—would be affected with particular severity. That is the Government's basic assistance program for the aged, blind, and disabled poor.

For example, an elderly individual with \$146 a month net income, the basic Federal payment level in the SSI program, now pays \$30 for \$46 in food stamps, for a net benefit of \$16. The new regulations would have required such individuals to pay \$43 for \$46 in stamps,

for a net benefit of only \$3. And it goes downhill from there.

For many persons on social security, the administration's food stamp program would be cut to a benefit of only \$1 a month, or less than bus fare to the food stamp office. Beyond that, I am told by experts that if the President's proposed program went into effect, as many as one-half of all elderly individuals and couples in the program might drop out. That would be a disaster.

Many of the recipients of the food stamp program are already living below the poverty level. And another point is that the proposal to cut the program may be illegal since it appears to contradict the intent of the laws which Congress explicitly enacted to make SSI recipients eligible for food stamps.

In a nutshell, with our vote yesterday we did our part in helping the Nation's poorest people by reducing the awesome burden already placed on them. We can improve the diet of the neediest which is all too often below the recommended nutrition levels. We can give a boost to agriculture by stabilizing the buying power of millions.

There are other pluses also, such as slowing down the recession and saving millions of dollars in administrative costs that would be required in reorganizing and policing a change so vast that it affects more than 17 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, working with the administration, this Congress has a formidable job in cranking up the economic engine of America once again. I believe we are up to it and that the job will be done.

But I do not believe the best way to begin that job is by making the poor a little poorer, the hungry a little hungrier, or by multiplying the problems of more than 21 million senior citizens whose work and sweat generations ago made this Nation great. Twenty-five percent of them already live in poverty. By our vote yesterday, we voted to ease their burden, not to increase it.

DO THAT WHICH IS RIGHT

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the crush of legislative business and in dealing with the many critical problems facing us in Congress it is too easy to forget the primary purpose why we are all here: To represent the people of the United States.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Charles F. Nicholson of Nashville, Tenn., which is addressed to all of us. In his eloquent letter, Mr. Nicholson cogently deals with the problems which presently confront us.

I feel that he speaks for all hard-working, law-abiding Americans as he asks us to simply "do that which is right." We have a moral, as well as a legal obligation to all Americans to do what he requests. Our failure to do so

will have grave consequences for many generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share this letter with all my colleagues, and I hope they will read it, think deeply about it, and act accordingly.

The letter follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., January 24, 1975.

THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in the care of The Honorable ROBIN BEARD, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to present an appeal to you. My motives are selfish but inasmuch as I have never written to any of you in my behalf heretofore, perhaps I can gain your ear for the few moments it takes you to read this letter.

Perhaps, before I continue, I should present my credentials. I am that fellow you keep reading about in the press, referred to on television and quoted in magazines but always characterized as the "silent majority" in American society. That is a curious tag, even a misnomer, which they have placed on me, for I find in review that I raise my voice almost daily. In my endeavors to be "heard" I have voted at every opportunity, worked and paid my taxes, served in the armed forces and, now, am writing to you. In all of these endeavors it has been my purpose to do what I believed to be the right thing, to fulfill my obligations to my country, community and my conscience. I have served to preserve this country yet ask for no medals. I have placed you in office but ask for no thanks. I pay your salary yet look to you for leadership. Ironic, isn't it?

So, now I come to the point. My appeal is simply for you to do what I have endeavored to do . . . that which is right. At this juncture in our history I feel we are imperiled if you fail to act courageously. Neither of us can any longer afford the politically expedient solution to our economic problems. You gentlemen know the answers as well as I, for we must wrestle with it daily. Should I fail to balance my budget my family would be imperiled—so, too, will our nation. If I fail in my pledges to my children, I will no longer hold their trust—your oath of office is in my mind. If I fail to act at all in an emergency then I am lost—200 years is a short life for a country so great. So you see gentlemen, the answer in essence, is simple. You *must* do what is right. If there is only one million dollars in revenue then you must do the job with one million dollars. You must decide on the priorities, but one million dollars is it. I do not want any taxes returned. I do not mind paying the bills. I *DO* mind how it is spent and I do not mind how much is spent. If our defense is a worry, then spend it there this year. If transportation is a worry, then spend it there this year. You decide the priority BUT . . . let the income govern the outgo.

Gentlemen, let us quit fooling ourselves with the mathematical gymnastics in our taxation. I am reminded with each weekly pay ticket and more forceably each year's that more than 20% of my earnings are skimmed off the top of my check and countless other taxes are paid through purchases over the year. Let's keep it simple how we pay it for there is no doubt who is paying nor any doubt what the tab amounts to. I know the news is bad but I, for one, prefer to bite the bullet now rather than face my children's accusing faces later.

Therefore, as I mentioned in the beginning, mine is a selfish appeal. I love this country and I want it preserved. I send you a lot of money. I don't expect to be in debt. You demand much of my time, of my labor, of my honest devotion to duty. I am selfishly asking no less of you.

Yours truly,

CHARLES F. NICHOLSON.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this year the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act of 1973 expires, and unless the Congress acts before its expiration, we will revert to the Uniform Time Act under which we observed daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October of each year.

Last year the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act was amended to provide for 8 months of daylight saving—from the last Sunday in February to the last Sunday in October—and 4 months of standard time each year. Part of the rationale behind this change was to provide more daylight for young children traveling to school in the early morning hours. By providing for 8 months of daylight saving time and 4 months of standard time we were able to continue to conserve at least a small portion of energy, although data is not yet available which would show how worthwhile the concept of year-round or 8-month daylight saving time actually is.

I am today introducing an amendment to the Uniform Time Act of 1966 which would provide for daylight saving time on a permanent basis from the last Sunday in February to the first Sunday in November of each year. The decision to set the switch to standard time on the first Sunday in November rather than the last Sunday in October is, as a result of numerous requests I have received from PTA groups in my district, to allow youngsters an additional hour of daylight on Halloween evening.

Last year the Department of Transportation recommended that we keep the 8- and 4-month plan, since it is generally believed that under this plan at least a small amount of energy is conserved. At the same time, we can provide a greater measure of safety for our young children on school mornings and on Halloween evening. I urge, therefore, that the Congress move to enact this legislation as soon as possible. The text of the proposed amendment follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for daylight savings time during the period beginning on the last Sunday in February and ending on the first Sunday in November of each year

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "April" and inserting in lieu thereof "February"; and

(2) striking out "last Sunday of October" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of November".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that—

(1) if such date is within the 37 day period ending on the first Sunday of November of the year in which this Act is enacted, such amendments shall take effect immediately

after 2 o'clock ante meridian on such Sunday; and

(2) if such date is within the period beginning 30 days prior to the last Sunday of February of 1976 and ending at 2 o'clock ante meridian on the last Sunday of April of 1976, such amendments shall take effect—

(A) at 2 o'clock ante meridian of the first Sunday which is more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, or

(B) immediately after 2 o'clock ante meridian on the last Sunday in April of 1976,

whichever is earlier.

THE DEAR JOHN LETTER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I received the following article from our friend and former colleague H. R. Gross. The article was written by Bob Considine, January 1, 1975, in the Los Angeles Times.

I remember well the picture of the U.N. Building in H.R. Gross' office with the inscribed words underneath it which had originated from the witty Mr. Gross—"The U.N.—New York City's Tower of Babel."

I commend the article for my colleagues:

THE "DEAR JOHN LETTER"

(By Bob Considine)

Would anything catastrophic happen to the country if President Ford sent a message to UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim telling him that we've had it with the "last great hope of mankind?"

To save the President the energy of writing such a note, herewith is a rough first draft: "Dear Kurt: We're fed up with your club. As you know, we got it off the ground in 1945 and we've been its main sugar daddy ever since. We've fought its wars: kept its peace. But there comes a time when enough's enough.

"Would you do us a favor? Just leave, just vacate the land our new Vice President's old man gave you for your permanent headquarters. We'll think of something to do with the buildings. Matter of fact, Bugs Baer had an idea on that many years ago. Bugs sent an open letter to UN which read, 'Do something soon or put back the brewery.'

"Lots of luck when all of your delegates from Afghanistan to Zambia reassemble for your 30th anniversary next year in the Peoples Republic of Yemen or whatever new wonderland you choose. Hope the local cops let your limousines park double and triple in the clogged streets of your next capital and that the residents are as patient with your more boorish members as New Yorkers have been.

"The fact of the matter, Kurt, is that we have more urgent uses for our money. We have a lot of needy people, too, not one of whom ever received a dime from, say, Kuwait.

"But perhaps there is a more urgent reason for resigning, and that is a matter of pride. You've hurt our feelings as a nation, made us feel impotent. Your so-called Third World members have conspired to diminish us in the Assembly voting, either for political reasons or out of petty spite. Uganda has as much power during balloting as we have. So does Cameroon, Chad, Fiji, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Mali, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Togo and Zaire.

"That's not contrary to the letter of the charter, of course, but it stains the spirit of that hopeful declaration when all the little countries of the Third World unite automatically—at the snap of a Russian or an oil monarch's fingers—and knock us in the head.

"We've put up with so much, playing the role of indulgent host to such a bewildering variety of relatives within the human family. We've privately paid the membership dues for dozens of countries who were in arrears—but whose leaders had rich accounts in Swiss banks. We've endured such rude guests as Krishna Menon, Nikita Khrushchev and Fidel Castro. But it was a bit too much when the president of the 29th session, Algeria's Abdelaziz Bouteflika, welcomed pistol-packing Yasir Arafat, the terrorist leader, to the stately halls of U.N.

"It's all been quite an experience for us. In another generation we were damned for not joining the League of Nations. Now we're damned for not only being a member of the league's successor but by far the most substantial contributor to all of its humanitarian efforts. We're not retiring from the world, Kurt. We'll continue to be the champion of the rights of all our allies in NATO and elsewhere; the chief source of information and aid in medicine, agriculture, food preparation, engineering, industrial know-how, the solar system and the deepest depths of the ocean. We'll continue to show concern about where every sparrow falleth. What we're bowing out of is your congregation of little minds. What we're saying good-bye to is your organization's futile and endless rhetoric, your debates on whether or not to debate, your interpretations of what is substantive and what is procedural. In short, we're sick from the purple canapes of your nonstop cocktail parties. Good luck, Jerry."

REDS PREPARE ANTI-CHILE LOBBY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as part of the international campaign to bring down the anti-Marxist government of Chile, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has focused its efforts on pressuring Congress to cut off all forms of aid to Chile. I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to this campaign and its background.

On February 8 and 9, 1975, the Second National Conference in Solidarity with Chile will be held at Concordia Teachers College in the Chicago suburb of River Forest. This solidarity conference was organized by the National Coordinating Center in Solidarity with Chile—NCCSC—a project of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—and its local affiliate, the Chicago Committee to Save Lives in Chile which is run by CPUSA stalwart Sylvia Kushner from the offices of the Chicago Peace Council, yet another CPUSA front group.

The primary purposes of the conference, as indicated in the conference call, are to raise money from "progressive Americans" to "assist the resistance," to discredit the covert activities of the Central Intelligence Agency by "making use of the revelations relating to Chile"; and to "stimulate considerable support in the U.S. Congress for legislation helpful" to the Marxists.

The conference call, printed by Prompt Press, which has served for more than three decades as the "in-house" printer for the Communist Party and its fronts, states:

Now is the time to consolidate and increase these efforts in Congress. During the next year it is our special responsibility, as U.S. citizens, to press for cutting off *all sales and all military and economic aid to the junta, a measure of great strategic and practical importance to the anti-fascist forces in Chile.* (Emphasis in the original).

Let me remind my colleagues that the so-called anti-Fascist resistance in Chile is composed of the Chilean Socialist and Communist Parties together with several other Marxist parties and movements which were the Popular Unity coalition. Chile's Socialist Party was characterized in testimony before the House Internal Security Committee as "more extremist or leftist" than the strongly pro-Soviet Communist Party with which it has worked in close alliance for the past 20 years.

The Popular Unity coalition used their warm relations with Fidel Castro to import weapons to arm private, Communist paramilitary forces, including the terrorist MIR—Movement of the Revolutionary Left—headed by Salvador Allende's nephew, in preparation for a coup.

The non-Marxist government brought charges against many members of the Popular Unity coalition for crimes related to that planned takeover, including the diversion of government supplies and property and embezzlement. Many of the detained Marxists have now been expelled from Chile.

Communist Party literature has made clear the importance placed by the world Communist movement on the international campaign against the anti-Marxist Chileans.

Party Affairs, a confidential internal publication of the CPUSA, in April 1974, published a directive from the CPUSA International Affairs Commission to all members which said:

Join and work with local Chile Solidarity Committees in your area wherever possible and work to ensure support for the Chilean struggle in your work center, your mass organization and your community.

Last July the NCCSC held a National Legislative Conference on Chile and People's Lobby, in the words of Party Affairs—

To inform and involve Congressional leaders, to demand investigations of the U.S. role in the coup, to immediately cut off all forms of aid to the junta, and to urge that the U.S. open its borders to Chilean refugees.

The International Affairs Commission further ordered all Communists to "continually exert" pressure on Congress.

Regrettably, I see the names of three of my colleagues in the House on the list of sponsors of this Communist Party project.

The sponsors of the Second Chile Solidarity Conference have for the most part been drawn from the CPUSA hierarchy, and from such CPUSA fronts as Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy—TUAD—which coordinates the penetration of trade unions and rank-and-file movements; the National Alli-

ance Against Racist and Political Repression—NAARPR—which is active in the civil rights and prison movements; the National Lawyers Guild—NLG—legal bulwark of the Communist Party; the Emma Lazarus Clubs and the Venceremos Brigade, now also a party controlled operation.

Other sponsors have been drawn from CPUSA-controlled or influenced labor unions, often through the TUAD, such as the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU; Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Workers; the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers; and the Amalgamated Meatcutters. And an additional group represent various Marxist-Leninist and Marxist organizations allied with the CPUSA in the Chile solidarity campaign. Among these groups are the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, the People's Party, New American Movement, and the Socialist Party.

Among the better known admitted or identified CPUSA members sponsoring the call are John Abt, CPUSA general counsel; Herbert Aptheker, central committee member; Lucille Berrien; Fred Blair; Anne and Carl Braden; Joseph Brandt; Archie Brown, former national committee member; Bert Corona; Angela Davis, central committee member; Ernest DeMaio, international vice president of United Electrical Workers; Abe Feinglass; John Gilman; Charles Hayes; Sylvia Kushner; Charlene Mitchell, central committee member; Amadeo Richardson; Roque Ristorucci; Jack Spiegel; James West; and Helen Winter, secretary of the CPUSA International Affairs Commission.

The complete list of sponsors follows:

John Abt, Esq., New York City.
 Harry Amana, journalist, Philadelphia Tribune.
 Herbert Aptheker, American Institute for Marxist Studies.
 Ramon Arbona, First Sec'y U.S. Section/Puerto Rican Socialist Party.
 Max Aragon, Vice President, Local 26, ILWU.
 Gilbert Badilla, Sec'y-Treasurer United Farm Workers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
 Tony Baez, Puerto Rican Community Ind. School, Milwaukee.
 Nick Ballas, Field Dir., Dist. 48, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.
 James Barret, professor, Marquette University.
 Bay Area Trade Unionists Com. for Chile.
 Norma Becker, War Resisters League, New York City.
 Louise R. Berman, San Francisco.
 Lucille Berrien, chairwoman, Milwaukee Alliance Against Racist & Political Repression.
 Fred Blair, chairman, Community Party of Wisconsin.
 Edmond Bobrowsicz, bus. agent, Local 248, Amal. Meat Cutters & Butcher Work of N.A.
 Harding Bond, president, Local 248, Amal. Meat Cutters & Butcher Work. of N.A.
 Edward Boorstein, author, New York City.
 Anne & Carl Braden, Southern Institute for Prop. and Organizing.
 Edward Bragg, Vice president, Local 1199, Drug & Hospital Workers.
 Joe Brandt, Korea Focus.
 Charles Briody, form. Nat'l Chmn, Peoples Party.
 Archie Brown, Executive Board, Local 10, ILWU.
 Rev. John P. Brown, Ecumenical Peace Institute Berkeley.

Father Frank Buismato, Center for Peace & Social Justice, San Francisco.
 Gene Byrnes, Casa Maria, Milwaukee, Wisc. CALA, Madison.
 Marion Calligaris, Trade Union Action & Democ. Chicago.
 Humberto Camacho, Field Organizer, Local 1421, UERMW of America.
 Joan Campbell, Assoc. Director, Greater Cleveland Interchurch Council.
 Ward H. Cann, Dist. Chairman, Div. of World Peace, United Methodist Church of R.I.
 Anthony J. Capizzi, S.J., Director, Campus Ministry, St. Joseph's College.
 Prof. Fred J. Carrier, American Korean Friendship & Information Center, New York.
 Anthony J. Cascone, Rec. Sec., Local 87, United Steelworkers of America.
 Ernesto Chacon, Director, Latin American Unit for Civil Rights, Milwaukee.
 Juan Chacon, Local 890, United Steelworkers of America.
 Rev. Benjamin Chavis, Commission on Racial Justice, United Church of Christ, Treasurer, National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression.
 Chicago Citizen's Comm. To Save Lives in Chile.
 Paul Chown, President, Dist. 10, UERMW of America.
 Rev. Peter Christiansen, First Unitarian Church, LA.
 Mary Clarke, Women's Strike for Peace, San Francisco.
 Prof. James D. Cockroft, Rutgers-Livingston, New Brunswick, N.J.
 Johnnetta B. Cole, Nat'l. Comm. Vencemos Brigade.
 Robert E. Cole, New American Movement, Amherst, Mass.
 Walter Collins, Exec. Dir., Southern Conf. Ed. Fund.
 Common Front for Latin America, Washington, D.C.
 Virgil Connins, Sec'y.-Treas., Local 216, UAW.
 Marvel Cook, Nat'l. Legal Defense Fund.
 Coordinating Committee for a Free Chile, Denver, Colo.
 Bert Corona, organizer, C.A.S.A., Los Angeles.
 Eleanor Crain, U.S.-Cuba Health Exchange.
 Irving J. Crain, MD., Amer. Acad. of Psychoanalysts.
 Sara Cunningham, Actors Equity Association.
 Angela Davis, co-chairperson, Nat'l. Alliance Against Racist & Political Repression, Communist Party, USA.
 Admiral Dawson, Delegate, Los Angeles Co. Federation of Labor.
 Father Mark Day, Los Angeles.
 John Deckenback, Assoc. Exec. Dir. Joint Strategy & Action Comm., San Francisco.
 Angelo Deitos, President, Local 78, UAW.
 Ronald V. Dellums, Member, U.S. Congress.
 Ernest De Maio, Chicago Commission of Inquiry in Chile.
 Arsh Derbabian, Field Rep., Michigan Federation of Teachers.
 Susan Duncan, Coordinator, L.A.P.A.G., Austin, Texas.
 Ecumenical Peace Institute, Berkeley, Cal.
 Dr. Eugene Eisman, professor, Univ. of Wisconsin.
 Norman Eisner, New York City.
 Joan Elbert, Clergy & Laity Concerned, Chicago.
 Emergency Com. To Save Chilean Health Workers, New York City.
 Fair Trials for Chilean.
 Political Prisoners, Corvallis, Ore.
 Richard Fagen, President, Latin American Studies Assoc., Stanford Univ.
 Stanley Faulkner, Nat'l Layers Guild, Committee for Justice in Chile.
 Abraham Feinglass, Int'l V.P. Amal. Meat Cutters & Butcher Work. of N.A./Chicago Comm. of Inquiry in Chile.

Joe Figueirido, Bus. Agent, Local 6, ILWU.
 Ann Law Finch, Local 2345, AFGE.
 Charles Finch, New American Movement, Durham, N.C.
 Leon Finney, Woodlawn Organization, Chicago.
 Mons. James B. Flynn, Chairman, Comm. on Social Justice, Catholic Archdiocese, San Francisco.
 Henry Foner, President, Joint Board, Fur, Leather & Machine Workers.
 Moe Foner, Exec. Sec'y, Local 1199, Drug & Hospital Workers.
 Clifford Fried, Vice President, Local 2070, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.
 Dr. A. Lisa Friedman, psychiatrist, New York City.
 William Friedman, New York City.
 Victor Fuentes, Spanish Dep't, Univ. of California.
 Joel Gajardo, Comm. on U.S.-Latin American Policy Studies, Cornell Univ.
 John Gardiner, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, San Francisco.
 Russell W. Gibbons, Asst. Editor, STEEL LABOR/USWA, Philadelphia, Pa.
 John Gilman, Regional Dir. PCPJ, Milwaukee.
 Sidney Gluck, U.S.-Cuba Health Exchange, New York City.
 Carlton B. Goodlett, Ph. D., M.D., Editor-Publisher, The Sun Reporter, San Francisco.
 Larry Gossett, Chmn., Third World Coalition, Seattle.
 Rev. David M. Gracie, Urban Missioner, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.
 Rev. G. G. Grant, S.J., Dept. of Philosophy, Loyola Univ. Member, Chicago Comm. of Inquiry.
 Terry Greene, Executive Board, Local 6, ILWU.
 Dr. Sidney Greenfield, professor, Univ. of Wisconsin.
 Sister Anne Greenslade, Sister's Council, San Francisco.
 Edward Greer, professor, Hampshire College.
 Father James Groppi, St. Joseph Young Christian Workers, Milwaukee.
 Rita Gross, Comm. Against Inflation & Unemployment, Milwaukee.
 Larry Gurley, Local 771, Am. Fed. of Teachers.
 George Guitierrez, Councilor, Chance Program, Northern Ill. Univ., Human Rights Com./Member, Chicago Commission of Inquiry in Chile.
 Jerry Hall, Local 535, Social Service Workers.
 Mike Hamey, American Indian Movement, St. Paul, Minn.
 John L. Hammond, Jr., Columbia University.
 Dr. Howard Handelman, professor, University of Wisconsin.
 Rhonda Hanson, Co-Chairperson, Milwaukee Comm. to Restore Democracy in Chile.
 Leah Nudell, President, Lazarus Club of Los Angeles.
 Michael Harrington, Member, U.S. Congress.
 Chester Hartman, San Francisco.
 Maril Hasegawa, President, U.S. Section, WILPF.
 Charles Hayes, Chmn., Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, Aml. Meat Cutters & Butcher Work. of N.A., Chicago.
 Robert High, NICH, Berkeley.
 Fred Hirsch, San Jose Emergency Comm. to Defend Democracy in Chile.
 Father William Hogan, Chicago Clergy & Laity Concerned.
 George T. Hrbek, Lutheran Global Justice Taskforce.
 Sister Mary Ann Ihm, professor, Marquette Univ.
 Ying Lee Kelly, City Councilwoman, Berkeley, Calif.
 Dr. David Kimmelman, Co-Chairperson, U.S.-Cuba Health Exchange.

Freida Kreitner, Women Speak Out for Peace & Justice, Cleveland.
 Helen Kuzman, WILPF.
 Sylvia, Kushner, Exec. Sec'y, Chicago Peace Council.
 Saul Landau Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.
 Anna Langford, Alderwoman, City of Chicago/Chicago Comm. of Inquiry in Chile.
 Latin American Solidarity Group, Atlanta, Ga.
 Father Thomas LeMieux, Pastor, St. Michael's Church, Milwaukee.
 Sandra Levinson, Center for Cuban Studies, New York.
 Sheldon B. Liss, Univ. of Akron.
 Blanche Livingstone, President, Women Speak Out for Peace & Justice, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Dr. Richard Lobban, Ass't. Prof., Rhode Island College.
 Lee Lockwood, author, Los Angeles Com. to Restore Democracy in Chile.
 Walter Lowenfels, poet.
 Dr. David Luce, professor, Univ. of Wisconsin.
 Jack Lucid, Local 6, ILWU.
 Prof. Beatrice Lumpkin, Local 1600, AFT.
 Salvador Luria, professor.
 Conrad Lynn, Esq., New York City.
 Raymond Majerus, Dist. Director, District 48, UAW.
 Bob Malone & Linda Medlin, Greenville Chile Support Comm., Greenville, N.C.
 Bertha Marshall, Chairperson, CDC Club, Los Angeles.
 Betita Martinez, author, Albuquerque, N.M.
 Richard Massman, Asst. Dir., District 48, AFSCME-AFL-CIO.
 Rabbi Robert J. Marx, Congregation Saul-el, Highland Park, Ill.
 Goldie Maymudes, President, City Comm., Jewish Cultural Club, Los Angeles.
 Dr. Ray McCall, professor, Marquette University.
 Frederick A. McGuire, Division for Latin America, U.S. Catholic Conference.
 Lawrence McGurty, President, Local 1437, AFT.
 David McReynolds, War Resisters League, N.Y.
 Philip Meranto, professor, University of Washington.
 Jorge Merida, Coordinating Committee for a Free Chile, Denver, Colo.
 Sam Meyers, Local 259, UAW.
 Michigan Com. for a Free Chile.
 Joe Miller, National SANE.
 Milwaukee Com. to Restore Democracy in Chile.
 Charlene Mitchell, Exec. Sec'y, National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression.
 Julio Mojica, Vice Pres., District 65, DWA.
 Father Cuchollan Moriarity, San Jose, Ca.
 J. P. Moray, attorney, Chmn., Fair Trials for Chilean Political Prisoners, Corvallis, Oregon.
 Rev. John C. Moyer, Unitas House, Berkeley, Ca.
 Helen Moser, Napa Methodist Church.
 Marcos Munoz, United Farm Workers, Unitarian Church, Willmette, Ill.
 Helen Murray, Comm. on Social Justice, Archdiocese of California.
 Michael Myerson, author, NYC.
 Vivian Myerson, President, Los Angeles WILPF.
 NACLA, East & West.
 National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity with African Liberation.
 New American Movement.
 New York Chile Solidarity Com.
 NICH, Berkeley.
 Robert Nichols, Avanza, New York City.
 Grace, Paley, Resist, New York City.
 Rev. William Parrish, Pastor, Summerfield Methodist Church, Milwaukee.
 Dean Peerman, Man. Editor, Christian Century/Chicago, Commission of Inquiry.
 Philadelphia Chile Emergency Com.

Symour Posner, Assemblyman, New York State.

Joanne Fox Przeworski, University of Chicago/Chicago, Commission of Inquiry in Chile.

Thomas Quigley, Division of Latin America, U.S. Catholic Conference.

John Randolph, Actors Equity Association. Abba Ramos, Local 6, ILWU.

A. A. Raynor, former Alderman, City of Chicago.

Amadeo Richardson, President, Chelsea Action Coalition, New York City.

Rogue Ristorucci, nat'l staff, Young Workers Liberation League.

Mark Rogovin, muralist, Public Art Workshop, Chicago.

Higinio Romo, President, Local 131, United Rubber Wkrs.

Pauline Rosen, Women Strike for Peace, N.Y.

Norman Roth, President, Local 6, UAW.

Carlos Russell, Dean, Brooklyn College School of Contemporary Studies.

Helen I. Saffa, Rutgers University.

Augusto Sallas, Hispanic American Labor Council, Chicago.

Ralph Shapiro, Esq. NYC.

William H. Simons, Washington Teachers Union Local 61, American Fed. of Teachers.

Dr. James Silverbery, professor, University of Wisconsin.

Saul Silverman, Pres., Local 140/United Furniture, Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Ed Smith, Field Organizer, Local 248/Amal. Meat, Cutters & Butcher Work, of N.A.

Rev. Kenneth Smith, Exec. Dir., Milwaukee Christian Center.

Lasker Smith, Chairman, Auto Workers Caucus, UAW, Local 2 Education Committee.

Rick Smith, Local 14, 11 WU, Oakland.

Francois A. Samlyo, Cooks Union Local 209.

Social Service Workers of Chilean Freedom, New York City.

Jack D. Spiegel, Org., Dir., Lake States District & Council/United Shoeworkers of America.

Dorothy Steffens, Exec. Director, WILPF. Gloria Steinem, MS magazine.

Patricia H. Strandt, Local 71, Newspaper Guild.

Doris E. Streiter, Chairwoman, Chicago Comm. to Save Lives in Chile/Chicago Comm. of Inquiry.

Leon Sverdlove, President, Int'l. Jewelry Workers Union, AFL-CIO.

Ethel Taylor, Nat'l Coordinator, Women Strike for Peace.

Myra Taylor, Local 400, SFTU.

Frank Teruggi, Sr., Local 16, International Typographical Union, Chicago, Comm. of Inquiry.

Edith Tiger, Exec. Sec'y, Emergency Civil Liberties Comm.

Lou Torre, Local 85, IAM.

Andres Torres, Puerto Rican Socialist Party, N.Y.

Urho Touminen Local 10, ILWU, Trade Unionists Chile Solidarity Com., Chicago.

Lloyd Vandevere, Vice Pres., District 10 UERMW of America, Northern Cal.

Vietnam Vets Against the War, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dr. Gilbert Walter, professor, University of Wisconsin.

Jack Weintraub, Local 85, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Jeff Wilkenson, executive board, Local 164, International Molders and Allied Workers.

Women's Studies College, State Univ. of N.Y., Buffalo.

Malcolm Wright, Exec. Vice Pres., Michigan Federation of Teachers.

Jim West, Exec. Sec'y, Ohio Communist Party.

Jim Williams, Coordinator, Labor Today. Helen Winter, Communist Party, U.S.A.

Charlotte Walker, Chicago Area Committee to Defend all Political Prisoners.

Andrew Young, Member, U.S. Congress. Frank Zeidler Nat'l Chmn., Socialist Party/former Mayor of Milwaukee.

Joan Zeiger, Field Worker, Project Involvement, Milwaukee.

At this time, when the alleged involvement of our country in the affairs of foreign lands is being hysterically denounced by the Communist Party, its allies, and willing dupes, I would ask my colleagues to examine carefully the aims of those same groups as they seek to reimpose a Marxist regime on the people of Chile.

MAKING RAIN THE HARD WAY

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in its short but turbulent history, weather modification has oftentimes seemed more art than science. Faith has counted for as much as anything learned in textbooks, and diviners and soothsayers have done about as well as the more disciplined practitioners.

In my home area of San Diego, rainmaking dates back to the turn of the century. The most spectacular and destructive downpour in the recorded history of the area occurred in January 1916, a few days after legendary rainmaker Charles M. Hatfield had done his thing. In places, more than 12 inches of rain fell within 4 days—well over the usual quota for a full year in our semi-arid clime. There were severe floods and considerable loss of life. The city of San Diego never honored its contractual obligation to pay Mr. Hatfield for his contribution.

Rainmaking in San Diego actually began 16 years earlier, but the origins were so low-key they are now largely forgotten. These first experiments involved using sulphuric acid to create hydrogen gas and were not notably successful. They were, however, ambitious; and we are indebted to Joe Stone, a feature and historical writer for the San Diego Union, for bringing these early rainmaking efforts into perspective.

Mr. Stone's article, which ran in the Union on Sunday, February 2, follows. Since Congress retains responsibility for the latter-day rainmaking program, our colleagues should find this well-researched account relevant and of interest—they will note that Congress did finance rainmaking experiments, to the tune of \$29,000, back in 1900—and, amazingly, \$5,000 of the money was given back.

The article follows:

EARLY RAINMAKING VENTURE FAILED

(by Joe Stone)

In the minds of believers Charles M. Hatfield was, when he performed that historic feat January, 1916, the first and only rainmaker in San Diego history.

Not true. One rainmaking effort was well recorded 16 years before Hatfield. It was 75 years ago this January-February, in 1900.

One man, Fred Binney, was connected with both the 1900 rainmaking effort and with

the better-known Hatfield affair. For the benefit of unbelievers, late-comers, and those who did not see "Hatfield the Rainmaker" in a motion picture theater or on television re-runs, this much recapitulation:

In December, 1915, Hatfield entered into a written agreement to fill Morena Reservoir, 35 miles east as the crow flies, at that time the most distant link in the city water system. After mysterious sights and sounds were seen and heard to originate from a tower Hatfield built at Morena, it began to rain Jan. 16.

In four days San Diego County's share of a general rain over the Southwest included 12.73 inches at Morena and 4.66 at Otay. Rivers rose rapidly and flooded the countryside and the coastal plain. Otay Dam went out. More than a dozen persons lost their lives—the total has never been known.

Hatfield's lawsuit against the city, trying to collect on his rainmaking contract, was finally dismissed in 1938. Hatfield died in 1958 in Pearblossom in the desert in eastern Los Angeles County. He took what he claimed was his rainmaking secret to his grave.

The method used by the 1900 rainmakers was no secret. It was published in The San Diego Union which said it was obtained from another newspaper, the Wichita Eagle, in Kansas. A story said a rainmaker hired by the Rock Island Railroad had been going about Kansas making rain, and this was his formula.

The Union recommended a potion of 10 fluid ounces of sulphuric acid, five ounces of zinc and 50 fluid ounces of water.

"Renew every hour and stir every thirty minutes day and night until rain begins to fall," said the newspaper.

Whoever thought up the idea was basing his theory on facts known since 1766 when Henry Cavendish reported on the properties of hydrogen, which could be produced by putting zinc in acid. Hydrogen, a light gas, rose rapidly when loosed in the atmosphere.

Capriciously, one reporter wrote, "The hydrogen gets up in the clouds and causes a commotion."

Another wrote more seriously for The Union that the ascending gas created a shaft through hot air, down which cold air rushed, creating a storm center and gathering moisture for precipitation.

It sounded reasonable in 1900. In addition, the very name hydrogen was derived from a Greek word meaning water-former. Also, in Kansas, "It is claimed that of 200 experiments made, 180 were successful."

The formula was published with the third of a series of stories about rainmaking beginning Jan. 26. It was dated Jan. 29, 1900, and it told of an effort to make rain which had started in Otay five days before.

That and subsequent rainmaking stories were flanked by stories which said there had been less than three inches of rain since October, that fruit trees and farm crops were beginning to show distress, and reservoirs was getting low. Water for agriculture was being rationed, and the ration was not enough.

On Feb. 1 The Union published a letter to the editor signed "F. A. Binney." That is Fred. He was an Englishman who had been here more than a decade. He had been a real estate man in Murrieta, now in Riverside County, in Spring Valley and Chula Vista and would be one in San Diego. He would also be president of the Wide Awake Improvement Club of San Diego.

His letter showed he had done homework on the subject of making rain. In the Kansas rainmaking venture, he said, 20 tons of chemicals were used and success was total, not 180 out of 200.

Congress had given the Weather Bureau \$29,000 with which to experiment, he said, and the bureau had returned \$5,000.

With the \$5,000 was a letter concerning

the \$24,000 worth of experiments. The letter, wrote Binney "refers only to explosives. There is not a word about gases."

He suggested that four stations using the hydrogen method be placed at Otay, Lemon Grove, Linda Vista and Oceanside. He said money should be raised to pay \$15 per day per station for 30 days. Congress and the state of California should be asked for money and he suggested \$2,000 be raised locally. Finally, he corrected The Union on the formula it had published. It needed five pounds, not five ounces of zinc, he wrote.

Now rainmaking was taken over by such old bulls as John V. Mumford, former fire chief and man with enough substance to travel occasionally in Europe, and John G. Capron, transportation baron of the stage-coach days and still a force in the community. On Feb. 9. The Union, referring to the two as the rain makers, said they had commenced their experiment.

"They expect to send a volume of hydrogen gas into the upper air which will cause such an agitation that something must drop," said the newspaper.

They had stations in Old Town, Mission Cliff Gardens, Fourth Avenue and Laurel Street, Golden Hill, Logan Heights and overlooking Chollas Valley.

They had 1,600 pounds of acid and 400 pounds of zinc. They also encountered opposition.

Capron was told, "You are tempting God to visit all kinds of evil on San Diego." He responded by asking, "Is it more of a sacrifice to go up after water than to go down?"

His accusers, who had been drawing water from wells all their lives, said it was.

By Feb. 12, 1900, Capron and Mumford were quarreling publicly. There had been no rain. Capron said the formula was wrong. Mumford said instructions were not followed.

Ten days later a group of La Mesa ranchers organized for another try. It did no good. In his measuring device on top of the four-story Keating Building at Fifth Avenue and F St. the weatherman caught 0.69 inch in January and 0.03 inch in February, 1900.

Four years later Charles and Paul, sons of Steven Hatfield of Gopher Canyon near Vista began rainmaking experiments from the top of a windmill tower. Twelve years later, with a scrapbook of clippings he claimed showed his success as a rainmaker, Charles Hatfield appeared in the San Diego office of Fred Binney. They made a deal.

The late Eric Binney, son of Fred, left a manuscript, a copy of which is in Serra Museum and Library. He wrote that his father was to get a 5 per cent commission if he could get Hatfield a contract with the city.

The contract was made. The rain that ensued caused so much damage and loss of life that the San Diego City Council could not admit they believed Hatfield had caused the rain by paying him the \$10,000 called for in the contract. It would have opened the gates to a stampede of lawsuits against the taxpayers of San Diego.

Binney never got his commission and, son Eric wrote, he needed the money. He died Dec. 5, 1927, in County Hospital. His grave is in Mt. Hope Cemetery.

tax purposes, of up to \$500 of interest income earned on savings deposits. I am appending a copy of this bill at the end of these remarks.

This bill will provide a long-needed tax equity to small savers who are already among the hardest hit by inflation. Many of these people are retired, and live on fixed income from a small pension or social security and a modest interest income from a life savings.

As we all know, one of the factors which keeps inflation at a high rate is the fact that people save less of their incomes, following a "buy now—the price will be higher next year" philosophy. If we can encourage people to save more we will not only be helping to bring inflation under control but will also be providing a growing pool of money for mortgage lending. This legislation will, therefore, contribute to the elimination of two of our economy's worst and most persistent problems.

My bill is similar to one introduced in the 93d Congress which was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means. Since this legislation has already passed the initial test of legislative scrutiny, I am hopeful of its early passage in the 94th Congress.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2840

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income \$500 of interest on savings in the case of an individual taxpayer

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 124 as section 125 and by inserting after section 123 the following new section:

"SEC. 124. INTEREST ON SAVINGS

"(a) EXCLUSION.—In the case of an individual, gross income does not include amounts received as dividends or interest on deposits or withdrawable accounts in a domestic savings and loan association, bank, credit union, or similar thrift institution.

"(b) LIMITATION.—The exclusion allowed under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$500 for any individual for any taxable year."

(b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by striking out the item relating to section 124 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 124. Interest on savings.

"Sec. 125. Cross references to other Acts."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1975.

ONE APPROACH TO COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, during a period of economic recession, such as we are now experiencing, the harbingers of good news with regard to employment are few and for that reason should be noted, when they do appear.

For that reason, I would like to enter

into the RECORD an article entitled, "Don't Let Recession Stop Your Career Progress," by Mr. Lowell B. Martin. In this article, Mr. Martin describes employment opportunities that do not appear on the "Help Wanted" pages, and reveals a strategy to assist jobseekers in finding such opportunities in a variety of occupations.

The text follows:

DON'T LET RECESSION STOP YOUR CAREER PROGRESS

(By Lowell B. Martin)

The recession is a poor excuse for staying in a job that is not totally satisfying, much less one you hate. Yet, you have probably decided against making a move to advance your career this year. And, I'm willing to bet your decision was based on the economy. Perhaps you believe the slump put a stranglehold on the executive job market. Or, maybe you think your chances for the promotion you want will be better if you wait. If you are convinced you're worth more than you are earning, or you long for broader responsibilities in your work, or a tense, unhappy job environment is upsetting your home life, then putting off your decision to make a move could be costing you money, position and career fulfillment.

You can make a change now, and here's some encouragement from one of our recent clients.

A former real estate broker came to us when the bottom fell out of his market. He was trying to sustain himself financially by selling pots and pans and working on commission for an employment agency, but it wasn't working out. His confidence was shattered by a series of hard-luck events which he felt had kept him from getting ahead. Because he lacked a college degree, he was positive he would never be able to get the type of professional job he really wanted. However, we discovered he had developed and used his writing skills frequently and effectively throughout his life, and had also demonstrated the ability to come up with creative solutions to various sales and marketing problems. Combined with his work experience in sales, this "find" helped him focus a job hunt in the area of marketing communications—a field which fascinated and excited him. This fall he was appointed special assistant to the Vice President of Marketing for a \$40-\$50 million a year corporation. His new salary tops his best year in sales by several thousand dollars. He is now directing public relations projects in a job created for him, at a time when the economy was officially labeled a recession.

This client's success is one of over 100,000 career advancements we have guided for men and women throughout the nation. The 27-year development of the Haldane organization has coincided with several slumps in our nation's economy, but a recession never stopped our clients—and it isn't stopping them now.

In New England for instance, every client who completed our program this fall got a better job. Two are settled into new, profitable businesses they started for themselves—a striking achievement considering the sluggish economy. Approximately 70 percent of the group now command higher salaries and two-thirds successfully changed careers. Nearly half of those who changed careers also increased their earnings.

Our clients' ability to get ahead shows there are top-level jobs available for you right now, in spite of the economy. Recession is certainly a fear, but not a valid reason for deciding against going after a better job. Realistically, if anything holds you back, it won't be the lack of jobs, it will be your lack of self-knowledge and job-finding know-how. The less you know about "selling yourself," the more a recession can hurt you.

During a slump in business, few companies

BILL INTRODUCED FOR EXCLUSION OF INTEREST INCOME

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will allow individual taxpayers an exclusion from their gross income for

will recruit for management and administrative talent. That does not mean there is no market for these critical professional skills. It does mean you aren't likely to find exciting advertisements in the Help Wanted section of your newspaper. Nor is an executive search agency going to have unlimited demands for your resume. Our research shows that "advertised" jobs account for only 20 percent of the job market—even during a period when the economy is thriving. That leaves most opportunities there for the asking, if you know who and how to ask.

Since conventional job-finding methods have limited value, particularly in a depressed market, you probably have already concluded that an unconventional approach is called for. It has to be an aggressive, well-planned approach, one you define and direct to achieve your job improvement.

Bernard Haldane, who founded our firm in 1947, had come to the same conclusion when he began his work in career counseling in the 1930's. His techniques have been 98 percent successful in helping people across the nation get better jobs, or advance their careers, whether they started as chronically unemployed, unskilled workers or corporate presidents. A track record like that inspires our belief that there is no good or bad year for making career advancements. There are only wise executives willing to accept the challenge.

CALLING SENATOR JACKSON

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention by Mr. Eugene Workman, executive assistant of the National Association of Free Will Baptists of Nashville, Tenn., of another incident in the continuing program of oppression being carried out in the Soviet Union.

This was recently brought to light in a column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled, "Calling Senator Jackson," and I include Mr. Buckley's column in the RECORD at this point commending it to the consideration of my colleagues:

CALLING SENATOR JACKSON

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Do you read the London Times? (Neither do I, but somebody sent me a copy.) Unless it happens that you do, you are probably not aware of a recent communication from Dr. Andrei Sakharov, the famous Russian dissident physicist. Dr. Sakharov's latest act of valor has been to protest, along with three colleagues in the Soviet human rights movement, a recent act of oppression by the Soviet Union.

The appeal tells us that a Mr. Vins will be tried in his home city of Kiev under Article 209-1 of the Ukrainian Criminal Code. This Article penalizes the infringement of citizens' rights on the pretext of conducting religious rites. Apparently Soviet authorities have relied more and more on this particular Article, because it provides for a longer prison sentence—ten years plus exile—than other Articles commonly applied to believers. It appears that, in fact, Mr. Vins is being charged with "living on the means of believers and, in this way, infringing their material rights." But, the appeal points out, "it is obvious and well known that the Church puts no compulsion on believers to contribute money.

"And second," Sakharov continues, "how can the authorities make such charges when, for their devotion to God, believers are fined thousands of rubles, all their religious lit-

erature is confiscated and destroyed, prayer houses are razed, parents have their children removed from them, and the road to any education beyond secondary school is barred to young believers?"

Now there are several extraordinary things here. Not the persecution of yet another Christian—that is a staple of Communist oppression in the Soviet Union. It is remarkable that Dr. Sakharov, himself an atheist, should bestir himself—should honor the freedom of religious conscience even of those who disagree with him. Extraordinary and noble.

Another remarkable feature of this story is that Sakharov's appeal was addressed to the World Council of Churches two weeks ago, and at this writing, has not so far as I am aware been acknowledged.

What is unremarkable about it is that the persecution of Georgy Vins, and of his fellow Christians, causes not a ripple in the Christian world. If I were a Christian living in the Soviet Union, I would address my appeals not to Christian authorities outside the Iron Curtain, but to Jewish groups. It is they and only they who have the conscience left to protest. The Palestinian Liberation Organization has probably tortured and murdered a few hundred people in the past 20 years. In protest against their spokesman being invited to the United Nations, organized Jewish groups mounted the most impressive meeting in recent New York history.

Only a few weeks ago, Senator Jackson's protest against Soviet restrictions on Jewish emigration finally cracked the impasse; and for the first time we can remember, we faced down the Soviet Union, which has promised to swell the quota hugely. I really do not think it has occurred to Senator Jackson to introduce complementary legislation denying favorable economic treatment to the Soviet Union unless it grants religious liberty to Georgy Vins.

He, of course, is only a symbol, as Sakharov's protest shows, citing the systematic and continued persecutions. In 1974 there have been (so far) a dozen trials of Russian Baptists. Indeed, a second appeal of Sakharov concerns the imminent trial of six Lithuanian Catholics. It too is addressed by Dr. Sakharov to the World Council of Churches but also to the 1974 Synod of the Roman Catholic Church, which until recently was meeting in Rome. Both bodies were asked "to speak out in defense of the people who have been arrested for their religious beliefs." Maybe one of these bodies has done so, but not in my presence. Or yours, I warrant. The World Council of Churches has been too busy denouncing Rhodesia, to worry about the Soviet Union. The Catholics are trying to put some order back into their house, and if there is great concern among the Bishops for the persecution of Christians in Russia and China, they must have given up that concern for Lent—about ten years ago, which is the last time I heard, from a pulpit, a denunciation of Communist persecution of the Christians.

I do not expect to hear any such denunciations from Senator Jackson's pulpit. So that I say this quite sincerely: This is an appeal to American Jews to put pressure on American Christians to help Russian Christians.

OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE UNDER MEDICARE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing legislation—with 92 cosponsors—to provide outpatient prescrip-

tion drug coverage under medicare for those who suffer the most common crippling or life-threatening chronic diseases of the elderly.

This is the second successive Congress in which more than 100 Members have joined me in sponsoring legislation to add out-of-hospital maintenance drug coverage for medicare beneficiaries. The Senate approved a companion measure in 1973 as an amendment to H.R. 3153, but that bill died in conference. The Senate also did so in 1972, as an amendment to H.R. 1, but that year the provision was deleted in conference.

Given the strong showing of support for this measure again this year, I believe the House is in a better position than ever to work for its enactment. And I say that as one who has been authoring legislation in this area—calling for either a comprehensive drug program or a maintenance drug program—since March of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill (H.R. 1344), eligibility for maintenance drug coverage would extend to medicare patients with one or more of the following conditions: Diabetes, high blood pressure, chronic cardiovascular disease, chronic respiratory disease, chronic kidney disease, arthritis, rheumatism, gout, tuberculosis, glaucoma, thyroid disease, cancer, epilepsy, parkinsonism, and myasthenia gravis.

Generally, the drugs to be covered include those prescription drugs—and insulin—necessary over a prolonged period of time for treatment of the conditions listed above. For example, people with chronic heart disease often use digitalis drugs to strengthen their heartbeat, anticoagulant drugs to reduce the danger of blood clots, and drugs to lower their blood pressure. These types of drugs would be covered—but sedatives and tranquilizers would not.

Such coverage would target the medicare dollar toward patients with chronic diseases who need drugs on a continuing basis for a lengthy period of time. On the average, the elderly with chronic illnesses have prescription drug expenditures nearly three times as high as those without chronic illnesses. The office of the social security actuary estimates such coverage would cost the medicare program \$1 billion, minus an offsetting savings of up to \$100 million in the medicare program, for a net cost of about \$900 million.

The bill has these features:

First. Financing under the part A—payroll tax—portion of medicare, meaning that an individual would pay for his drug insurance during his working years, rather than later when his income is sharply reduced due to retirement.

Second. Selection by a formulary committee of the drugs to be covered.

Third. A copayment by the medicare patient of \$1 to have his prescription filled. Medicare patients would not have to pay monthly premiums, keep records, or file claims.

Admittedly, moves to revise the medicare program this year are complicated by two factors: Concern about the short- and long-term fiscal condition of the social security trust funds, and the prospects for enactment of national health insurance.

On the first, I would point out that the Advisory Council on Social Security will shortly be making recommendations for changing the social security benefit and financing structure, and an outpatient maintenance drug benefit deserves consideration at the same time those recommended changes are considered.

On the second, I would suggest that our concern for national health insurance need not prevent us from working to improve the medicare program, especially if it appears that various features of national health insurance would best be phased in over a period of years into the future. Medicare patients cannot afford to wait.

Mr. Speaker, the list of cosponsors follows:

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1344

Silvio O. Conte of Massachusetts.
Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania.
Leonor K. Sullivan of Missouri.
Charles J. Carney of Ohio.
Ken Hechler of West Virginia.
Bob Carr of Michigan.
William F. Walsh of New York.
John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan.
George E. Brown, Jr., of California.
Ron de Lugo of the Virgin Islands.
Richard Bolling of Missouri.
Glenn M. Anderson of California.
Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts.
Herman Badillo of New York.
Frank Horton of New York.
Joshua Ellberg of Pennsylvania.
Mendel J. Davis of South Carolina.
Sidney R. Yates of Illinois.
Teno Roncalio of Wyoming.
Joseph P. Vigorito of Pennsylvania.
Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland.
Parren Mitchell of Maryland.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.
Yvonne Brathwaite Burke of California.
Joseph P. Addabbo of New York.
Robert H. Mollohan of West Virginia.
William S. Cohen of Maine.
Michael Harrington of Massachusetts.
James L. Oberstar of Minnesota.
John Melcher of Montana.
Stephen J. Solarz of New York.
Ralph H. Metcalfe of Illinois.
John J. LaFalce of New York.
Marilyn Lloyd of Tennessee.
John F. Seiberling of Ohio.
Les Aspin of Wisconsin.
Ronald M. Mottl of Ohio.
Henry A. Waxman of California.
Philip Hayes of Indiana.
Donald Fraser of Minnesota.
Gladys Spellman of Maryland.
William D. Ford of Michigan.
Thomas M. Rees of California.
William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
William M. Brodhead of Michigan.
Leo J. Ryan of California.
Robert W. Edgar of Pennsylvania.
Bella Abzug of New York.
Edward R. Roybal of California.
Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut.
Louis Stokes of Ohio.
Charles Wilson of Texas.
Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii.
Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey.
Fortney H. (Pete) Stark of California.
Alvin Baidus of Wisconsin.
James J. Howard of New Jersey.
Joseph M. McDade of Pennsylvania.
David R. Bowen of Mississippi.
Floyd V. Hicks of Washington.
Claude Pepper of Florida.
Margaret M. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Robert J. Cornell of Wisconsin.
Gilbert Gude of Maryland.
Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania.

Harold T. Johnson of California.
John M. Murphy of New York.
Stewart B. McKinney of Connecticut.
Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Dante Fascell of Florida.
Bob Bergland of Minnesota.
Don Edwards of California.
Robert N. C. Nix of Pennsylvania.
Larry Winn, Jr., of Kansas.
Antonio Borja Won Pat of Guam.
Mike McCormack of Washington.
William Lehman of Florida.
Donald W. Riegel, Jr., of Michigan.
Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania.
Joe L. Evins of Tennessee.
Henry Reuss of Wisconsin.
Gerry E. Studds of Massachusetts.
Henry Helstoski of New Jersey.
Patsy Mink of Hawaii.
Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York.
Shirley Chisholm of New York.
Richard H. Fulton of Tennessee.
Charles Rangel of New York.
John Brademas of Indiana.
James A. Burke of Massachusetts.
Walter E. Fauntroy of the District of Columbia.

LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER—
BRAIN-
POWER THAT CAN HELP SOLVE
THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. RONALD M. MOTTL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. MOTTL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this Congress, the administration, and the Nation to an invaluable center of brainpower which, if properly utilized, can help solve the present energy crisis.

I am talking about the Lewis Research Center at Cleveland, Ohio.

The American people have a half-billion dollar investment in this giant research facility of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This investment has already paid us many rich dividends. Originally founded as a major laboratory of the former National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Lewis Research Center scientists contributed vastly to the development of jet propulsion. Their findings increased air safety and aided in the development of improved commercial and military aircraft.

I think it is fair and reasonable to say that the men and women of the Lewis Research Center can claim considerable credit for helping make American aircraft the best in the world.

Later, under the aegis of NASA, the brilliant, dedicated personnel of the Center made enormous contributions to the conquest of space. Our men on the Moon adventures and other space exploits would not have been possible without their patient, painstaking research in many fields.

The time has come to put the expertise and ingenuity of the Lewis Research Center and its pool of priceless brainpower to work solving our down to earth energy problems.

This is the facility—these are the people—magnificently equipped to tackle such problems as the development of economical new energy sources. This is the Center which can blaze the trail to

greater engine efficiency and improvements. These are the people who can perfect methods of getting more miles from every gallon of gasoline.

I most strongly urge the administration to place the Lewis Research Center high on its list of assets to be utilized for these and other purposes.

I particularly call the attention of the newly formed Energy Research and Development Administration to the following summary of the Lewis Center's history and capabilities, which was prepared by Bruce T. Lundin, director of the facility, at my request:

THE FACTS ABOUT LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER—
PROGRESS IN FLIGHT AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY

(By Bruce T. Lundin, Director)

The Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio, was created in the difficult days of 1941 as the engine research laboratory of the former NACA.

For the next twenty years, the people of this federally supported research institution worked on and were deeply involved with the many technical advancements that are found in today's jet engines.

It is probably no accident that American aircraft are today the finest in the world and fly nearly all of the airways of the world.

When our nation turned its attention to space in 1958, Lewis applied its skill and energies to the advancement of our nation's space propulsion and power technologies.

Outstanding among their contributions in this period was the development of the hydrogen fuelled rocket—the fuel that sent our astronauts to the moon and which today, in the Centaur rocket under Lewis management, is the world's only operational transportation system for both civil and government purposes that uses liquid hydrogen as a fuel.

The major programs at Lewis today embrace aeronautical propulsion research, the management of the Atlas/Centaur and Titan/Centaur launch vehicles for many users, space propulsion and power technology, and advanced space communications research and applications.

Engaged in this work today at the Cleveland laboratory are 3100 civil service employees in a unique complex of laboratories valued at over 500 million dollars. Half of this staff are scientists and engineers and over half of this group hold advanced degrees.

The total business of the Lewis Center runs to about 350 million dollars a year, about two-thirds of which flows to American industry and universities in some of our most advanced technologies.

With Lewis being long established in the technologies of engines and power generation, it is natural that they now turn a part of their existing staff and facilities to the problems of energy R&D.

Accordingly, some 200 people of Lewis are today supporting our nation's programs in solar energy, central utility power conversion, and advanced automobile engines. It is a good base upon which to build.

In many ways, the unique capabilities of Lewis in the fields of energy conversion and engines neatly augments and can ideally support many of the important programs of the newly formed Energy Research and Development Administration.

Among the many unique strengths that Lewis can bring to ERDA are:

- (1) A unique and strong existing capability in energy conversion systems and engines,
- (2) Several on-going programs in these areas,
- (3) Good relations with the industries and universities with whom they work,
- (4) An excellent geographical location for this type of work, and
- (5) A long tradition and heritage of service

to others and in using the skills and resources of our government to strengthen industry in high technology.

REPORT FAVORS LEWIS FOR AUTO RESEARCH

That concludes Mr. Lundin's factual statement.

I would now like to present a report by Thomas Brazaitis, a Washington correspondent for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which was published in that newspaper last February 2:

WASHINGTON.—NASA's Lewis Research Center in Cleveland has been proposed as a national center for research and development of new automobile propulsion systems and fuels.

A report by a government team to Robert C. Seamans, head of the Energy Research and Development Administration, cites the need for a new technical approach to automotive propulsion.

The report says the Lewis Center, which has been used primarily for research in space technology, would be ideal researching alternatives to the gasoline internal combustion engine.

This would cost about \$150 million a year for 25 years, the report says. The cost would be shared by the government and the auto industry.

A committee of the Society of Automotive Engineers also selected Lewis as the logical site for the national center. Seamans has indicated he likes the proposal.

"NASA-Lewis has a long history in combustion research, and its facilities and expertise in turbine research are outstanding," the government report says. "They are, in addition, already serving an important role in the automotive turbine area, and their location near Detroit is desirable."

Ohio's congressmen and northeast Ohio industrial leaders have advocated the conversion of Lewis to a ground propulsion laboratory. It has been estimated the new contracts would create 1,000 jobs at the facility next to Cleveland Hopkins International Airport.

Chalmer O. Kirkbride, scientific adviser to Seamans and one of the authors of the report, said the government's share of the total funding of \$50 million the first year, rising to \$150 million a year, would come from the new agency's \$1.7 billion appropriation.

The auto industry, which spends about \$50 million a year on this kind of research, would help finance the center.

It would be modeled after the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which pooled government and private money to speed production of combat airplanes.

With the leveling off of government spending for space exploration, Lewis has the space and professional manpower for conversion to automobile technology. Kirkbride said it would take 20 years to rebuild an organization like Lewis if it were allowed to disintegrate.

The report stresses urgency of new ground propulsion systems before domestic oil becomes scarce, possibly by the late 1980s.

The report suggests refining synthetic fuels from coal and shale for heat-engine vehicles.

Meanwhile, because of the dependence on liquid hydrocarbon fuels, highly efficient propulsion systems must be developed for those fuels.

Another long-range objective would be to perfect a new transportation mode, such as the electric car, the report says.

The immediate demand is for automobile engines that will increase mileage without fouling the air.

The government has stayed out of automotive research and development until now because until the 1973 oil crisis, the automotive industry has been vigorous and prosper-

ous, the report says. The oil crisis raised the issue of the efficiency of automobiles, which use more than 30% of the national petroleum supply.

Automobiles are among the biggest energy wasters, the report says, because over the years "engine efficiency has been a secondary consideration to performance, comfort, convenience, and, more recently, emission control."

Existing technology, plus a shift to smaller cars, could raise average miles per gallon of automobiles from 13.5 to 20, the report says, but "radical new propulsion systems" are required to achieve the desired 40 miles per gallon.

LET'S MAKE GREATER USE OF THIS FACILITY

I think it is apparent from the foregoing statement by Mr. Lundin and the article by Mr. Brazaitis that only a small percentage of the potential of the Lewis Research Center for problem solving is now being utilized.

All appropriate authorities should take immediate action to assign new missions and funds to the Lewis Research Center. The probable returns from such action and investments are as fabulous and fantastic as some of this facility's past achievements.

AQUACULTURE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, the world food crisis has reached incredible proportions. World population growth has increased to such an extent that the United Nations has estimated a need to boost food production by a minimum of 3.5 percent per year. Unfortunately, the normal land agricultural capacity has diminished proportionately with the population growth increase. Furthermore, most agricultural land in underdeveloped nations has been subjected to generations of unscientific abuse so that what land is available is now often non-farmable.

Magnifying this serious problem, is the current energy crisis which has put a severe strain on the entire nitrogen production of artificial fertilizers. Obviously, energy consumption and food production must necessarily go hand in hand, each dependent on each other.

It is quite clear that the world's population growth cannot be halted overnight. Such a change would mean basic revisions in a country's entire social structure—a change which could not feasibly be implemented in a short period of time.

With the supply of land, water, and energy in such dire jeopardy, it is obvious that an innovative approach to alternative sources of high protein food must be found immediately. "Aquaculture," the scientific growth of aquatic organisms under a controlled environment, is probably the most realistic and viable approach toward solving a world food shortage of the present magnitude.

Over the past several decades, aqua-

culture has been most effective in the farming of a wide variety of fish—salmon, shrimp, trout, and even oysters. A distinct advantage of aquaculture is that fish normally thought of as being undesirable—carp and buffalo fish, for example—can be bred for eventual use as processed fish food, such as frozen fish cakes and sticks. Development of innovative machines in Japan allow the maximum percentage of edible portions to be separated and processed into frozen fish blocks—excellent sources of high protein, yet economical at the same time.

Through continual cross-breeding and experimentation, fish can be bred to provide not only a higher growth percentage, but also on excellent quality of flesh and appearance. Ironically, it is not actually necessary for aquaculture development to take place in the normal environs of fresh water ponds or in areas with immediate access to salt water. Aquaculture development has successfully taken place in vacant dairy barns and, in fact, failing dairy farms have been converted to fish farms with a minimal amount of energy or capital.

The science of aquaculture is certainly not a new phenomena, but has been in existence for well over 4,000 years in countries such as China, Japan, and Egypt. It is now time for the United States to make a concerted effort toward maximizing the full value of this process—not only the people of our Nation, but for the starving and undeveloped nations of the world.

A bill such as the National Aquaculture Development Act which directs the Secretary of Commerce to develop a national aquaculture program, is an excellent step in the right direction. It will, in my view, provide for a coordinated effort of both public and private sources in best achieving a possible goal of total food independence. With the startling and dramatic decline of our ocean's fish from the continuous exploitation of over-fishing, it is imperative that the Federal Government begins a program which would both support and encourage the development of private commercial aquaculture industries in this Nation. The net result of increased high protein food production is much too important and vital and certainly demands our immediate and swift consideration.

HERALD STRINGER

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's veterans have lost one of their most articulate spokesmen with the retirement at the end of last year of Mr. Herald Stringer, director of the American Legion's National Legislative Commission.

Herald, during his tenure in Washington, has proved to be an extremely effective champion of veterans' benefits. He has always been most cooperative and helpful as we pursued our mutual goal

of serving the Nation's veterans. As we embark upon this 94th Congress, we will miss Herald Stringer. May his future be bright. The enclosed editorial from the Stars and Stripes reflects the high regard in which Herald Stringer is held:

HERALD STRINGER . . .

The American Legion, Congress and Veteranism have lost one of the finest representatives of veterans' legislation in the country, as Herald Stringer, National Legislative Director, The American Legion, retired at the end of December. Senators Vance Hartke, Clifford P. Hansen, Strom Thurmond, Congressman Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn and many others have expressed regret at his departure.

Senator Hartke remarked, "Without men like Herald Stringer, and organizations such as The American Legion, the causes of veterans would have great weight but no clear voice."

"It takes a clear voice to be hard, to get things done."

"Without the voice of a Herald Stringer, who speaks for the largest veterans' organization in the country, it would be impossible for those of us responsible for veterans' legislation to know adequately what veterans across the country are thinking and feeling, and we lawmakers cannot fulfill our concern without knowing the needs of our veterans."

Although he has retired, we hope that Herald Stringer will keep a foot in the door, as we need men of his experience and devotion to help all of us improve veterans' programs.

Senator Hartke made several points that are of paramount importance.

1. Regardless of worth, it takes a clear voice to get the message across.

During the past year, The Stars and Stripes urged all of you to write your Congressman and express your desires on veterans' programs. We provided forms for your use. These forms were a "clear voice", as they identified the issue you were writing about and did not allow you to bring up other subjects. As we lose these Herald Stringers from our working team, it is vital that we pick up and continue the projects we all have started together with continuity of purpose.

2. It is impossible for your Congressmen to know the desires of their constituents without hearing from them.

Legislative directors of all the veterans' organizations are part of your voice. You are the other part, and you have the responsibility to make your voice heard and not sit back and let "old George" do it all the time.

American women have always stood beside their men and supported them. It is their responsibility, through their auxiliaries and their own organizations, to really get on the ball and get involved with veterans' legislation. After all, the results of these laws affect them, too.

We have mentioned previously that the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force is recommending that veterans be placed in a general social welfare status. We have 171 Veterans Administration hospitals across the country, all of which are established and operating under the VA, and all veterans with an honorable discharge are eligible for admittance to one of these hospitals when they need medical care. Let's keep it this way. Veterans must retain their autonomy. We must watch this proposal and fight it with all our determination.

We must improve the funding of the Veterans Administration to hire and retain the best medical and paramedical personnel available by increasing their earning capacity within the VA system so that we can continue "second to none" medical care delivery service.

We must get the financial plight of our older veterans and their dependents upgraded so that they will have a liveable income.

We must bring about improvements in the GI Educational Bill so that our young veterans can utilize the maximum entitlement of 45 months as Congress originally intended.

Herald Stringer has left the blueprint for a busy year for everyone.

NEW PERSPECTIVE ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in the past few weeks in the Nation's press about the alleged wave of reform that swept the House at the start of this session of Congress. Many of these reports implied that the Republican Party was lagging behind in the area of congressional reform.

In a recent article, which appeared in edited form in the Ripon Forum, J. Brian Smith, press secretary to the minority leader (Mr. RHODES), provides a new perspective to the issue of congressional reform. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention and am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

WHERE IN HELL DID YOU GO WRONG

(By J. Brian Smith)

Sitting in a television control booth on a recent evening in Washington and watching the House Minority Leader engage program host Martin Agronsky in verbal battle. The producer, a young and gregarious Irishman, turns to me quite suddenly and in a booming voice exclaims: "You seem like a nice enough fellow. Where in hell did you go wrong? How can you be a Republican?" We enjoy a laugh. But in the subsequent peace of the dark December night, the question haunts.

The most recent pounding at the polls has served to exacerbate an inferiority complex which Republicans have endured for many years. Democrats, it is believed, are hipper, more in tune with reality, and are more fun to be with at parties. "Didja ever notice that Republicans always show up at these things with prepared remarks and wonder why?" House Majority Leader Tip O'Neill engagingly asked a reception crowd. "It's 'cause they don't get invited out as often."

The roots of the Republican image problem go deep. I had a college professor who taught me political science. He is the epitome of the academic man, one room in his Baltimore apartment having been set aside to house stacks of newspapers, yellow with age, that will one day be read for political content. He is also a good Democrat—so good that, despite the depth of his political acumen, he did not know that Republicans conduct their Congressional business in a way markedly different from Democrats. He was unaware of the Democratic Caucus' power to bind its membership on certain votes, while Republicans can vote anyway they choose. It was similarly news to him that Republicans select their ranking committee members through automatic secret ballot while, on the Democratic side, it takes four Members to stand in challenge of a nomination (it used to be ten) in order for a secret ballot to take place. The Democratic Speaker still retains the power to appoint

Members to the Rules Committee without a ratifying vote by the Caucus.

Finally, my good friend the professor was blissfully ignorant of the fact that the Democratic Caucus gave itself the power to abort the legislative process and send bills to Caucus subcommittees where they are frequently remodeled (and that is the kindest word for it).

That was precisely what happened to the Bolling Committee proposals for House reform. For fourteen months, this committee laboriously studied a legislative system that has grown archaic with age. In the end, the Bolling panel had the audacity to propose genuine reform.

The Bolling recommendations were promptly directed to a Caucus subcommittee headed by Rep. Julia Butler Hansen of Washington State. Few Hill observers were surprised at the diluted changes that took place. For Democratic power barons to support a package that would have substantially reduced their own power would have been somewhat like Red Auerbach, in the glory days of the Boston Celtics, agreeing not to play Cousy, Russell and Heinsohn simultaneously as a concession to other basketball teams who lamented the Celtics' depth. Such is the nature of self-interest and the Democrats' sensitivity to Hill reform.

One is led to wonder how the Democrats do it—holding so tenaciously to a pro-reform image despite their understandable susceptibility to vested interest? One wonders why the electorate falls to contrast the Democrats' glorious pronouncements of "a new day coming" at the '72 convention against their recent adoption in Kansas City of precisely the "affirmative action" program advanced by the Republican Party? Why won't the people penalize the other party for hypocrisy?

The good news for Republicans is that reality appears prepared to catch up with image. One reason for this is that the members of the national press who cover Capitol Hill are, generally, reporting the reality. When David Broder of the Washington Post writes that "the Republicans appear to be solidly in favor of the (Bolling) reforms," and notes subsequently that the proposals were "whipsawed to death," he provides Republicans reason for hope.

When Broder's Post colleague, Mary Russell, who sits by the hour in her perch high above the Speaker's rostrum, notes that "if there is to be a resurgence of congressional strength, it must come from the Democratic majority, which runs Congress," followed by a reference to the "passive attitude to power" of Democratic leaders, she also gives the Republican cause a dose of adrenalin.

The Republican hope is not wholly dependent on the press. The truth has many advocates such as Common Cause Chairman John Gardner. He recently called a news conference to release a survey showing that, while a majority of House Democrats favor reform, their leadership remains adamantly opposed to change.

This is not meant to suggest that Republicans have yet to come up with the sort of responsive, innovative answers of the type that majority parties are made, or that it is a foregone conclusion that we will. Image is not our only problem. We must fully tap our talent reservoir in order for the rebuilding process to take hold. When we do this, we stand an excellent chance of winning the potential converts who seem vaguely, almost subconsciously aware that the Democrats aren't making too much sense. "With a little bit of nudging," a sharp young Hill reporter recently confessed to me, "I, too, could become a Republican."

In the meantime, there is encouragement in the realization that the Republican Party is not nearly as bad as it looks. We seem to suffer from a Billy Budd syndrome, in which

our stuttering and stammering precludes effective communication. It is a problem. But it is not nearly as large a problem as if we had no answers at all.

When they ask why you are a Republican, don't cite Lincoln, TE, Goldwater, Scott, Rhodes, or any of our own. Recall, instead, the words of the silver-haired and respected gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Bolling, who is a Democrat. He was asked what happened to his reforms. His answer was that "they" killed them. He wasn't talking about Republicans.

INFLATION: HOW DO WE STOP THEM DOING IT?

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest of the former members of the Conservative Cabinet in Britain, the Rt. Hon. J. Enoch Powell, M.D., has recently published a perceptive article in which he points out that the cause of inflation in his country—where it is now running about 20 percent a year—and ours is not the unions, or businessmen, or the consumer but the government itself.

As he puts it—

Even ex-Ministers themselves are now confessing . . . that inflation occurs when governments create excessive additional money to meet excessive public outlays.

I should like to urge all of our colleagues to read this brief article by a leading British politician so that they may better understand the true causes of inflation and what can be done to cure it.

The article is from the first issue—November 1974—of a new British publication, Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow—170 Sloane St., London—founded by one of the strongest defenders of the free market in Britain, a gentleman whom I had the pleasure of meeting on his recent visit to this country. I commend Mr. Antony Fisher's very educational newsletter to everyone interested in enlarging liberty and building prosperity.

INFLATION: HOW DO WE STOP THEM DOING IT?

(By J. Enoch Powell)

How do we stop them doing it? Even ex-Ministers themselves are now confessing (and gaining a certain kudos by confessing) that inflation occurs when governments create excessive additional money to meet excessive public outlays. Still, the question remains, what members of the public who are convinced of the truth of this can do to make the politicians stop it. Or rather, since inflation has to come to an end some day, the question is how politicians can be induced to stop it sooner—before irreparable harm has been done to the nation.

There is a good deal of humbug about the question. People are not generally reticent about what they want politicians to do, nor stumped for means of getting them to do it. Tell them; and having told them, threaten them that there will be no more votes and no more money until they comply. That's how electors go about getting more subsidies and higher pensions. What's wrong when it comes to inflation?

What's wrong is that so few mean what they say. They do not really want the widespread bankruptcies and unemployment

which are the inevitable accompaniment—at all events in a developed economy—not really want the rate of inflation. They do not really want the increase—let alone the absolute level—of public expenditure to be reduced. They do not really feel so strong that they are prepared to use their only effective political weapon, regardless of the threatening consequences in other directions; for the elector who always bows to the threat that "if you withhold your support, the other side will get in, and that would be worse still, wouldn't it?" is a political factor equal to nought.

Few people in this world go looking for trouble or asking for trouble; and as long as inflation appears to be the lesser evil compared with the end of inflation, so long will those with anything to lose who raise their voice and use their political power to have inflation stopped be a very small band indeed. This is due to human nature and the world as it is. It cannot be remedied by attempting to dream up imaginary political devices—new political parties, new centres for political research, new and earnest political groups, not even new periodicals.

Nothing will alter until the balance of fear tilts the other way and the end of inflation comes to appear the lesser evil. When that happens, the lonely few who have dared previously to raise their voices will be trampled underfoot by the innumerable multitude pressing forward to enforce their demands upon politicians, parties and governments. All that can be done meanwhile—and it is little enough—is to try to hasten somewhat the tilting of the balance.

The continuance of inflation will not be feared more than the ending of inflation until inflation is seen to be making the everyday conditions of life intolerable and endangering the basic processes of production, exchange and distribution in a civilized society. The phenomena cannot, of course, in themselves be accelerated by those members of the public who understand the nature and cure of inflation: I am not recommending sabotage! What can be accelerated by them is the correct interpretation of the phenomena as the results of inflation instead of the variety of other causes to which they will at first be attributed. The sooner this happens, the sooner will the weathercock of political will begin to swing around.

The early stages of these phenomena, and not so early either, are already being witnessed: the accumulation of strikes, as recently in Glasgow; the deterioration of services—postal, sanitary, transportation; the mysterious spasmodic shortages and disappearance of goods from the shops—salt, sugar, toilet paper etc. These are not isolated and unconnected occurrences, a trade dispute here or an unforeseen interruption of procurement there. They are collectively the marks of an inflation which is threatening to pass over into hyperinflation. The threshold is crossed when the readjustment of all money payments can no longer take place fast enough to preserve in tolerable working order the mechanism of real prices, i.e. relative prices or (blessed word) relationships.

As long as this relationship of cause and effect is not understood, people will vent their irritation and dismay on irrelevant objects. They will blame the trade unions; they will preach sermons on the decline of patriotism; they will denounce profiteers and speculators. In the end, of course, the true cause cannot be mistaken any longer; but that end may be the wheelbarrow to take home the wages, which is also the destruction of all existing social relationships that rest on contract and the necessity of painfully rebuilding them anew to an unknown pattern. So I answer the question: 'how do we stop the politicians inflating?' as follows. Through teaching the public, by every means and on every opportunity, to identify the hidden cause of what is hurting them as inflation,

always inflation. As Cato used to say to the Romans whatever they asked him, *delenda est Carthago* ("it's no good until you've destroyed Carthage.").

SECOND ANNUAL SURVEY OF OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES AND ILLNESSES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 requires the Secretary of Labor to "develop and maintain an effective program of collection, compilation and analyses of occupational safety and health statistics." The Bureau of Labor Statistics has published the results of the survey of occupational injuries and illnesses for 1973. This survey covers the second full year of record-keeping under OSHA and a comparison of 1972-73 job related injury and illness experience.

The report follows:

BLS REPORTS OF SURVEY OF OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES AND ILLNESSES FOR 1973

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today the results of the 1973 survey of occupational injuries and illness. The results cover the second full-year survey and provide information for all employees covered by the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA).

The following are some key survey results for industries in both 1972 and 1973:

On the average, about 1 out of every 10 workers in private industry experienced a job-related injury or illness during 1973. (Some workers had more than one injury or illness during the year.)

About 5.9 million work-related injuries and illnesses occurred during 1973. About 28 million workdays were lost.

Work-related fatalities declined from 5,500 in 1972 to 5,100 in 1973.

The incidence rate (number of injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time workers) for all industries combined was about the same for both years.

All five industries selected for special emphasis by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration because of high injury rates showed some decline in the incidence rate from 1972 to 1973.

1972-73 COMPARISON

A comparison of the job-related injury and illness experience covering only those industries included in the surveys for the base year 1972 and 1973 follows.

Work-related fatalities declined by more than 7 percent from 1972 to 1973, though more persons were employed in 1973 than in 1972. The largest decrease in the number of deaths occurred in contract construction which fell from 1,500 in 1972 to 1,000 in 1973.

Trenching and excavation activities in construction, which have had relatively high fatality experience, were the targets of special Occupational Safety and Health Administration programs for accident prevention.

The incidence rate (number of injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time workers) was virtually the same—10.9 for 1972 and 11.0 for 1973.

The number of recordable cases increased from 5.65 to 5.92 million, or about 270,000. Recordable cases include all illnesses and those injuries requiring more than first-aid treatment. This increase of nearly 5 percent can be largely attributed to an increase in total hours worked by all employees during

1973. Employment rose nearly 3 million from 1972 to 1973, resulting in an increase of over 4.4 billion hours of work exposure (about 4 percent). In addition, the industry composition of employment in the private nonfarm sector, which could have an impact on the all-industry incidence rate, remained substantially the same for both years.

The most significant change in overall incidence rates for the major industry divisions between the 2 years occurred in contract construction where the rate rose 4.2 percent. (See table 1.) A second comparison may be made for incidence rates for lost workday cases. Industry divisions showed markedly different changes for the 2 years. For example, the incidence rate for lost workday cases increased in manufacturing by 7.1 percent but decreased in wholesale and retail trade by 3.6 percent. A third measure, the incidence rate for nonfatal cases without lost workdays, showed considerable variation among industry divisions.

In almost every industry division, the very large (2,500 employees and over) and the very small (1 to 19 employees) reporting units showed decreases in overall incidence rates between 1972 and 1973.

In both 1972 and 1973, about 3 in every 10 injuries and illnesses resulted in absence from the job or work limitations. The average number of days lost per lost workday case rose from 14 in 1972 to 15 in 1973. The incidence rate of lost workdays (number of lost workdays per 100 full-time workers), another measure of severity, increased from 47.9 in 1972 to 52.0 in 1973.

Five industries were selected by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as having an unusually high occurrence of injuries over the years. These target industries—roofing and sheet metal; meat products; lumber and wood products; miscellaneous transportation equipment; and water transportation services—all showed a decline ranging from 2.6 to 5.1 percent in overall incidence rates from 1972 to 1973. (See table 2.)

A decline of over 15,000 illnesses or about 7 percent in the total number of recordable illnesses occurred between 1972 and 1973.

1973 INJURIES AND ILLNESSES

The 1973 survey covered agriculture which was not surveyed in 1972. The following figures for 1973, including agriculture but excluding railroads and most of mining, slightly exceed those used in the comparisons with 1972.

Nearly 6 million recordable work-related in-

juries and illnesses occurred during 1973 in private industries. (See table 3.) Ninety-seven percent of all recordable cases were injuries and the remaining 3 percent were illnesses. There were an estimated 5,200 work-related fatalities during the year. Lost workday cases accounted for only 30 percent of all recordable cases. Nevertheless, about 28.4 million workdays were lost during 1973 or an equivalent loss of nearly 114,000 employee-years of work.

The 1973 incidence rate for all recordable cases was 11.0. Rates for industry divisions ranged from 2.4 in finance, insurance, and real estate to 19.8 in contract construction. Rates for agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; contract construction; and manufacturing exceeded the rate for all industries, whereas transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; services; and finance, insurance, and real estate fell below the all-industry level. (See table 4.)

For employees working on farms, the estimates indicate that their job-related injury and illness experience parallel that for all employees covered by the survey. Approximately 66,000 injuries and illnesses were estimated for 1973, of which 40 percent resulted in lost worktime.

Contract construction accounted for approximately 626,500 recordable injuries and illnesses during 1973, slightly over 10 percent of the total cases, although representing only 6 percent of the total employment. Approximately 3.1 million workdays were lost, the equivalent of over 12,000 employee-years of work.

Manufacturing, which accounted for nearly one-third of employment, had almost half of the total number of recordable cases. About 13.2 million workdays, constituting over 52,000 employee-years of work, were lost during the year. Among the 21 major industry groups within the division, 10 had incidence rates above the level for all manufacturing (15.3). As can be seen in table 4, the highest rates were experienced in the lumber and wood products (24.1) and fabricated metal products (22.7) industries.

Reporting units with less than 50 or more than 1,000 employees tended to have lower incidence rates than units in the mid-size classifications. The highest incidence rates were generally concentrated in reporting units of 100 to 249 employees.

1973 INJURIES AND ILLNESSES FOR EMPLOYEES IN MINE AND RAILROAD ACTIVITIES

Excluded from coverage under the Act are working conditions over which other Fed-

eral agencies have exercised statutory authority affecting occupational safety and health. As of the present time, other Federal agencies have exercised authority over certain working conditions in coal, metal and nonmetal mining and railroad activities. Pending clarification of jurisdictional questions, OSHA did not generally engage in enforcement in those activities during this report period.

Data for mining are preliminary and were furnished by the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration, U.S. Department of the Interior. Data for railroads were furnished by the Federal Railroad Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.

Mining, with an incidence rate of 12.5, exceeded the all-industry rate. Coal mining, with a rate of 19.1, was much higher than the other two major industry groups in the mining industry—oil and gas extraction (12.8) and metal and nonmetal mining (7.8). Injuries and illnesses in mining were much more likely to result in lost worktime compared with other industries. Of the nearly 76,000 recordable cases in mining, 35,000 or 46 percent involved lost worktime. There were 300 fatalities reported in coal, and metal and nonmetal mining activities during 1973.

Railroads had an incidence rate of 8.7 during 1973. An estimated 52,000 injuries and illnesses, of which nearly 200 were fatal, were experienced by railroad employees.

More complete data for occupational injuries and illnesses will become available in an analytical bulletin to be published early next year.

BACKGROUND OF SURVEY

This survey is a Federal/State program in which reports are received and processed by State statistical grant agencies participating with the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. The survey, response to which is mandatory, involved a national sample of approximately 200,000 private employers. Another 450,000 employers are included in the survey so the States can produce similar estimates. Reported occupational injury and illness data are based on the records employers must maintain under the Act.

The survey relates to employers in private industries. Excluded were self-employed individuals and employees in Federal, State, and local government units. In a separate reporting system, agencies of the Federal government are filing reports comparable to those of private industry with the Secretary of Labor.

TABLE 1.—RECORDABLE OCCUPATIONAL INJURY AND ILLNESS INCIDENCE RATES FOR COMPARABLE INDUSTRIES, PRIVATE NONFARM SECTOR, BY INDUSTRY, UNITED STATES, 1973 AND 1972

Industry	Incidence rates per 100 full-time workers ¹					
	Total recordable cases		Lost workday cases		Nonfatal cases without lost workdays	
	1973	1972	1973	1972	1973	1972
Private nonfarm sector ²	11.0	10.9	3.4	3.3	7.6	7.6
Contract construction.....	19.8	19.0	6.1	6.0	13.6	12.9
Manufacturing.....	15.3	15.6	4.5	4.2	10.8	11.4
Transportation and public utilities ³	10.5	10.8	4.6	4.5	5.9	6.3
Wholesale and retail trade.....	8.6	8.4	2.7	2.8	5.9	5.6
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	2.4	2.5	.8	.8	1.6	1.7
Services ⁴	6.3	6.1	2.0	2.0	4.3	4.1

¹ The incidence rates represent the number of injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time workers, and were calculated as: $(N/EH) \times 200,000$, where N =number of injuries and illnesses, EH =total hours worked by all employees during calendar year, 200,000=base for 100 full-time equivalent workers (working 40 hr per week, 50 weeks per yr).

² Includes oil and gas extraction which is not a component of the industry divisions listed. Other mining activities are not included.

CXXI—172—Part 3

³ Excludes railroads (SIC 401).

⁴ Includes agricultural services, forestry, and fisheries (SIC 07-09).

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—RECORDABLE OCCUPATIONAL INJURY AND ILLNESS INCIDENCE RATES FOR TARGET INDUSTRIES, UNITED STATES, 1973 AND 1972

Industry	SIC code ¹	Incidence rates per 100 full-time workers ² total recordable cases		
		1973	1972	Percent change
Roofing and sheet metal work.....	176	27.7	28.9	-4.2
Meat products.....	201	27.2	28.2	-3.5
Lumber and wood products.....	24	24.1	25.4	-5.1
Miscellaneous transportation equipment.....	379	35.5	36.5	-2.7
Water transportation services.....	446	26.2	26.9	-2.6

¹ Standard Industrial Classification Manual, 1967 edition

² The incidence rates represent the number of injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time workers, and were calculated as: (N/EH) X 200,000, where N = number of injuries and illnesses, EH = total hours worked by all employees during calendar year, 200,000 = base for 100 full-time equivalent workers (working 40 hr per week, 50 weeks per yr).

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 3.—NUMBER OF RECORDABLE OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES AND ILLNESSES, AND LOST WORKDAYS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, EXCLUDING RAILROAD AND MINE ACTIVITIES, BY EXTENT OF CASE AND INDUSTRY DIVISION, UNITED STATES, 1973

Industry	[In thousands]				
	Total recordable cases	Fatalities	Lost workday cases	Nonfatal cases without lost workdays	Lost workdays
Private sector ¹	5,991.3	5.2	1,872.3	4,113.8	28,392.7
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.....	91.1	1.2	35.9	55.0	534.9
Contract construction.....	626.5	1.0	194.3	431.2	3,103.3
Manufacturing.....	2,960.2	1.4	859.9	2,098.8	13,165.9
Transportation and public utilities.....	403.5	1.0	175.8	226.7	3,026.2
Wholesale and retail trade.....	1,190.1	.9	376.7	812.5	5,182.5
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	89.0	.1	28.4	60.5	371.1
Services.....	596.0	.4	185.5	410.1	2,657.0

¹ Excludes railroads (SIC 401) and mine activities except oil and gas extraction (SIC 13).

Notes: Data may not add due to rounding. Differences between the totals and the sums for the component industries may not reflect the estimates for oil and gas extraction (SIC 13).

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 4.—RECORDABLE OCCUPATIONAL INJURY AND ILLNESS INCIDENCE RATES IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, EXCLUDING RAILROAD AND MINE ACTIVITIES, BY INDUSTRY, UNITED STATES, 1973

Industry ¹	SIC code ²	1973 annual average employment (in thousands) ³	Incidence rates per 100 full-time workers ⁴			
			Total recordable cases ⁵	Lost workday cases	Nonfatal cases without lost workdays	Lost workdays
Private sector ⁶		63,290.3	11.0	3.4	7.6	52.1
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.....		1,418.0	11.6	4.6	7.0	68.0
Agricultural production.....	01	NA	10.9	4.3	6.6	63.6
Agricultural services, forestry and fisheries.....	07-09	NA	13.7	5.5	8.2	82.5
Oil and gas extraction.....	13	274.3	12.8	5.8	7.0	129.2
Contract construction.....		4,028.0	19.8	6.1	13.6	98.1
General building contractors.....	15	1,271.8	20.7	6.1	14.6	94.1
Heavy construction contractors.....	16	762.4	19.3	6.1	13.1	107.6
Special trade contractors.....	17	1,994.2	19.4	6.2	13.2	96.3
Manufacturing.....		20,054.0	15.3	4.5	10.8	68.2
Durable goods.....		11,814.0	17.1	4.8	12.3	72.4
Ordnance and accessories.....	19	183.9	7.6	1.8	5.8	33.8
Lumber and wood products.....	24	639.7	24.1	9.2	14.8	150.7
Furniture and fixtures.....	25	539.2	19.6	5.5	14.1	75.2
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	32	691.1	18.2	5.9	12.3	96.2
Primary metal industries.....	33	1,320.9	20.8	6.3	14.5	107.1
Fabricated metal products.....	34	1,493.5	22.7	6.4	16.3	92.0
Machinery, except electrical.....	35	2,086.5	17.7	4.3	13.4	60.5
Electrical equipment and supplies.....	36	2,017.2	10.8	2.7	8.1	37.3
Transportation equipment.....	37	1,891.4	16.7	4.6	12.1	67.3
Instruments and related products.....	38	499.4	8.6	2.0	6.6	26.6
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries.....	39	450.6	13.5	3.7	9.8	54.3
Nondurable goods.....		8,240.0	12.8	3.9	8.8	62.2
Food and kindred products.....	20	1,721.0	19.2	6.8	12.3	98.6
Tobacco manufactures.....	21	78.3	8.4	2.5	5.9	33.0
Textile mill products.....	22	1,030.5	11.7	2.6	9.1	47.2
Apparel and other textile products.....	23	1,402.4	7.7	1.9	5.8	26.1
Paper and allied products.....	26	703.0	5.8	4.3	11.5	87.1
Printing and publishing.....	27	1,104.8	7.4	2.3	5.1	31.9
Chemicals and allied products.....	28	1,035.5	9.7	3.0	6.7	48.6
Petroleum and coal products.....	29	193.4	9.7	2.7	7.0	57.1
Rubber and plastics products, n.e.c.....	30	678.3	17.8	6.5	11.3	103.1
Leather and leather products.....	31	293.1	12.4	3.6	8.8	50.9
Transportation and public utilities.....		4,086.0	10.5	4.6	5.9	78.7
Local and interurban passenger transit.....	41	273.3	8.1	4.1	3.9	73.5
Trucking and warehousing.....	42	1,188.2	17.2	7.9	9.2	139.8
Water transportation.....	44	203.6	16.3	8.0	8.2	205.5
Transportation by air.....	45	364.6	11.7	6.0	5.7	67.3
Pipeline transportation.....	46	16.2	5.9	1.7	4.1	30.6
Transportation services.....	47	123.6	6.6	2.6	4.0	33.3
Communication.....	48	1,174.4	2.9	1.3	1.6	23.8
Electric, gas, and sanitary services.....	49	729.8	11.1	3.4	7.7	52.1
Wholesale and retail trade.....		16,665.0	8.6	2.7	5.9	37.6
Wholesale trade.....	50	4,118.0	9.8	3.3	6.4	45.5
Building materials and farm equipment.....	52	617.7	12.3	4.0	8.3	61.4
Retail general merchandise.....	53	2,558.8	8.6	2.6	6.0	32.3
Food stores.....	54	1,856.3	12.0	3.9	8.0	51.3
Automotive dealers and service stations.....	55	1,809.2	9.2	2.6	6.6	36.9
Apparel and accessory stores.....	56	770.6	2.2	1.6	1.6	11.7
Furniture and home furnishing stores.....	57	527.4	6.4	2.2	4.2	32.6
Eating and drinking places.....	58	3,035.3	7.2	2.0	5.2	27.5
Miscellaneous retail stores.....	59	1,371.5	4.2	1.4	2.8	22.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....		4,075.0	2.4	.8	1.6	10.2
Banking.....	60	1,178.7	1.5	.5	1.0	5.1
Security, commodity brokers, and services.....	62	193.8	.8	.3	.5	6.4
Insurance carriers.....	63	1,081.1	1.8	.6	1.2	7.2
Real estate.....	65	796.5	7.1	2.2	4.9	31.2
Services.....		12,690.0	6.2	1.9	4.2	27.5
Hotels, and other lodging places.....	70	904.9	.7	2.8	5.9	42.8
Personal services.....	72	892.1	4.1	1.5	2.6	26.3
Miscellaneous business services.....	73	1,880.0	5.6	1.9	3.7	25.6
Auto repair, services and garages.....	75	434.3	9.8	3.0	6.8	48.2
Miscellaneous repair services.....	76	212.5	13.1	3.9	9.2	51.1
Motion pictures.....	78	208.1	3.9	1.1	2.8	21.2
Amusement and recreation services, n.e.c.....	79	539.1	8.7	2.8	5.9	53.7
Medical and other health services.....	80	3,656.9	7.5	2.2	5.3	31.4
Educational services.....	82	1,178.7	4.8	1.3	3.5	15.0
Nonprofit membership organizations.....	86	1,685.5	4.5	1.5	3.0	17.8
Miscellaneous services.....	89	783.4	2.2	.7	1.5	7.4

¹ Industry division totals include data for industries not shown separately.

² Standard Industrial Classification Manual, 1967 Edition.

³ Annual average employment for nonagricultural industries are based on the establishment survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, in cooperation with State agencies. Annual average employment for the agriculture, forestry, and fisheries division is a composite of estimates from the BLS survey and estimates provided by the Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

⁴ The incidence rates represent the number of injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time workers, and were calculated as: (N/EH) X 200,000, where N = number of injuries and illnesses, EH = total hours worked by all employees during calendar year, 200,000 = base for 100 full-time equivalent workers (working 40 hours per week, 50 weeks per year).

⁵ Includes fatalities. Because of rounding, the difference between the total and the sum of the rates for lost workday cases and nonfatal cases without lost workdays may not reflect the fatality rate.

⁶ Excludes railroads (SIC 401) and mine activities except oil and gas extraction (SIC 13).

Notes: NA = employment estimates are not available. n.e.c. = not elsewhere classified.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 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 Lithuanian people established their own government and proclaimed their independence.

The Lithuanian Council of Chicago is commemorating this 57th anniversary with a program at Maria High School auditorium on Sunday, February 16. The officers of this outstanding organization include Juozas Beliuonas, president; Algis Jasaitis, executive secretary; Rev. Adolfas Stasys, Rimas Sarka, Teodora Kuziene, Mykolas Pranevicius, vice presidents; Vladas Solimas, treasurer; Antanas Svitra, financial secretary; Stasys Mankus, recording secretary.

Trustees include Kristina Austin, John Evans, Julius Pakalka, Oskaras Kremeris.

The members of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago are as follows: Ignas Andrusiunas, Mikalina Baronas, Elena Bucinskas, Adele Gabalas, Juze Gulbinas, Petras Jokubka, Alvydas Jonikas, Don Kuraitis, Vincas Mankus, Kazys Oksas, Algirdas Puzauskas, Rimas Staniunas, Antanas Vaicaitis, Jonas Valaitis, Jonas Valkiunas.

The Lithuanians took these historic steps in 1918, at the close of World War I and, for 20 years thereafter, Lithuania enjoyed peace and freedom from oppression. During this period the Lithuanian economy stabilized, and there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture.

But in 1939, the Soviet Union began an unwarranted assault on this tiny country and concentrated its armed forces on the Lithuanian frontier. This massive threat was followed on June 15, 1940, by actual occupation of Lithuania by the Red Army. The valiant Lithuanian Government had no alternative but to concede to brutal Soviet demands.

Immediately the Communists began arresting and executing the Lithuanian patriots. Non-Communist political parties were liquidated, and leaders in these parties were imprisoned. The people were forced to vote in national elections in which only the Communist Party was represented. The Lithuanians, despite these hopeless odds, resisted heroically—but to no avail. The Soviets finally succeeded in forcibly annexing Lithuania and subjugating these courageous people.

Despite condemnation by the free world of this unlawful aggression against the sovereign rights of a free people, the Soviet Union still occupies Lithuania and maintains Communist troops within her borders. The national culture is gradually being destroyed, and the Lithuanian people are forced to suffer under the harsh yoke of cruel Soviet oppression.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago I wrote to the Soviet Ambassador here in

Washington urgently requesting that he facilitate the grant of permission to Mrs. Aloyzas Jurgutis and her daughter, Daina, to emigrate from Lithuania as she requested on October 1, 1974. Mr. Jurgutis, now a resident of Chicago after getting out of the U.S.S.R. last year, submitted to the Washington Consulate of the U.S.S.R. his formal renunciation of Soviet citizenship on November 26, 1974. It is my understanding that since requesting permission to emigrate, Mrs. Jurgutis was expelled from her position as a librarian and that she has not been allowed to receive any mail at all from her husband.

I strongly feel that in cases such as this, we as Americans must continue to insist that the Soviets begin to adhere to basic humanitarian principles of human decency and the dignity of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, it was for these reasons that I introduced the following resolution at the beginning of the 94th Congress:

H. CON. RES. 2

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 number 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, during ongoing negotiations with the Soviet Union, I believe it is most important that our Nation not forget the just aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and self-determination. The United States has never recognized the forcible conquest of Lithuania and because I believe that we should stand behind this policy, I also introduced the following resolution regarding this aggression:

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 there cognition 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.

In behalf of the many thousands of Lithuanian-Americans residing within my own 11th Illinois Congressional District, whom I am privileged to serve, and also for Americans of Lithuanian heritage all over this Nation who are commemorating this anniversary, I urge the early enactment of this legislation.

On this occasion, I want to assure the courageous Lithuanians that our Nation continues to support their just aspirations for freedom and independence, and I want to express the fervent hope that the goal of Lithuanian self-determination shall soon be realized.

THE "FREE PRESS" IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Philip A. McCombs' article in today's Washington Post, which I would like to insert in the RECORD, needs no introduction. So much for the free press, in this regime we are being asked to support with another \$300 million dollars:

SAIGON HOLDS MORE NEWSMEN; PAPERS PROTEST

(By Philip A. McCombs)

SAIGON, February 4.—National police continued arrest of Vietnamese journalists for the second day today in what appears to be a concerted effort to crush elements of President Nguyen Van Thieu's internal political opposition.

Nine journalists were arrested in pre-

dawn raids on their homes. According to families of those involved, this brings the total of newsmen arrested to 24, four of whom have been released by the police.

At the same time the Vietnam Publishers' Association today decided to shut down opposition and independent dailies in Saigon as a protest against the government's apparently permanent closure of five dailies yesterday.

It was not clear whether the association's action will be more than temporary. It leaves the city with only three Vietnamese-language dailies all pro-government.

The four newsmen who were released made no comments for the record today. Most of Saigon's scores of opposition and independent journalists are living in fear and finding places other than their homes to sleep in tonight.

Those arrested so far include many of Saigon's best known journalists, many of whom were considered independent. The government charged yesterday that those arrested were underground "Communist cadres."

Journalists here have been a leading element in the political opposition to President Thieu that reached a peak with anti-government street demonstrations last October and November.

The current government campaign against them began Sunday when government censors ordered police to confiscate press runs of nine dailies that printed political charges against Thieu made by the Catholic Anticorruption Movement and 21 other anti-government organizations.

The first 15 arrests were mainly made in the pre-dawn hours of Monday. Then the government announced it was withdrawing the publishing licenses from three opposition and two independent papers. The arrests continued after the midnight curfew yesterday, according to the families of those arrested, and were completed by dawn this morning.

A high government official said privately that more arrests can probably be expected.

Squads of riot police with wicker shields were on duty in several areas of downtown Saigon today, though there was no sign that anti-government groups were planning public demonstrations right now.

Arrested today were: Choe, an internationally known political cartoonist whose work appears in several papers here; Mrs. Trung Duong, publisher of Tidal Wave; Uyen Thao, Tidal Wave's editor-in-chief; Ly Dai Nguyen, the paper's editorial director; Chu Tu, former publisher of the defunct newspaper Life; Vu Bang, a writer, and Mac Thu, a poet, both of whose work appears in various papers; Quoc Phuong, a reporter for The Orient; and Duy Thai, the paper's editor-in-chief.

Thao, Tu and Mrs. Duong were released after a few hours of police questioning. Released late yesterday after his arrest early in the day was Hoang Chau, publisher of Independence.

Besides Chau, those arrested yesterday were: Minh Loc, managing editor of Independence; Le Hien, publisher of Steel Pen; Truong Son, the paper's political director; Viet Quang, its managing editor; and Cao Tran, its assistant managing editor.

Also arrested yesterday were: Kieng Giang and Dlep Lien Anh, reporters for The Telegraph; Truong Cam Vinh, managing editor of Tidal Wave; Tran Quan, assistant managing editor of The Orient; Doan Hung, assistant managing editor of Ray of Light; Ngo Dinh, a reporter for Ray of Light; Son Tung, assistant managing editor of Great People; Nguyen Van Hong, formerly editor-in-chief of the now defunct paper People's Opinion; and Vu Hanh, a novelist whose work appears in several papers.

Meanwhile, the government announced today that President Thieu has promoted six top police commanders. Nguyen Khac Binh, national police chief, was promoted to the rank of major general. Trang Si Tan, Saigon's police chief, was promoted to brigadier general. Four assistant national police chiefs were promoted to one-star rank.

Fighting continued to be relatively light throughout the country today. Military analysts say they expect the current lull in the Communist dry-season limited offensive to end soon with a sharp increase in fighting.

THIRD WORLD TAX HAVENS CONFERENCE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as Americans begin to fill out their 1040's and as the unemployment lines mount, I am sure that people will be interested in knowing that an invitation to the "Third World Tax Havens Conference" is being mailed out to various tax lawyers and accountants. This "third" conference is being held in Zurich, February 17 through 19. The travel and hotel cost of attending is \$850 per person.

What is a "World Tax Havens Conference?" It is a series of seminars on how wealthy individuals can "take full advantage of legal tax avoidance." The seminar titles, however, give a better flavor to this than I can. Among the seminars, for example, are the following.

Current Developments in Lesser-Known European Tax Havens including Andorra, Campione, Gibraltar, Isle of Man, Malta and Monaco.

Where and How to Establish a Private Offshore Bank for your Family or your Company. Tax Havens and the Entertainment Industry—the use of tax havens by literary and entertainment personalities.

Seminar on Bank Secrecy—Comparing other Countries with Switzerland.

As the last seminar example shows, Mr. Speaker, this conference is a journey to the edge of the law—of interest only to tax dodgers with no sense of patriotism to their home countries.

I might add that this third conference has a new angle that last year's conferences in Amsterdam and Paris missed—a "visit to Liechtenstein by bus" and an opportunity to "develop professional contacts" in this tiny tax shelter country.

And the best is yet to come, the organizers of this tax haven conference are planning a "World Tax Havens Tour, limited to 80 persons," in the Caribbean Islands between April 12 and 26. No doubt this tour of such tax havens as the Caymen Islands, and so forth, will be a tax deductible business expense to the tax lawyers who attend.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the IRS to study what is involved in this Caribbean tour to insure that it is not turned into a tax-deductible vacation extravaganza.

I would like to make one other observation. The organizers have provided

no seminar on the changes being proposed by the Ways and Means Committee to close these types of foreign tax haven loopholes. Last year, the committee spent considerable time developing a tax reform bill—including reforms to prevent foreign trust abuses. I expect that these reforms will be enacted by the full Congress in 1975; I am hopeful that the description which I have given today of the Third Tax Haven Conference will help encourage rapid action on these reforms.

THE SENATE OF PRIESTS, DIOCESE OF PATERSON SEEKS CONGRESSIONAL ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY TAX

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of you and our colleagues the following resolution unanimously adopted January 20, 1975 by the Senate of Priests, comprised of 500 Catholic priests, of the Diocese of Paterson in my congressional district, which most poignantly and concisely brings into sharp focus the damaging repercussions of the domino effect on our Nation's economy that the President's proposal to increase tariffs on imported oil will have, particularly on the people of our country who are living on limited or fixed incomes:

The Priests' Senate of the Paterson Diocese hereby resolve to call upon our elected and appointed government officials to support a full examination in Congress of the current plans of President Ford for energy control. Limited and fixed income whether from welfare, unemployment checks, low paying jobs, pensions and social security will not stand for the projected increases in housing, food, electrical, and transportation costs due to projected energy tax plans of the President. The whole process of what energy taxes will do should be examined before the nation embarks on a plan that at the present bodes only unprecedented problems and not solutions. We ask you to do all that you can so that the nation may know what it must face. If taxes prove to be necessary, then we all know why. If not, then, we have saved a great percentage of our people from unnecessary hardships.

In transmitting the foregoing resolution to me for consideration by all of our elected officials, the distinguished president of the Senate of Priests, the Rev. Herbert K. Tillyer, stated:

It (the resolution) represents the consensus of our thinking on the issue of energy conservation, a laudable goal in the President's overall program of action. I urge you to consider alternatives to the energy tax. Rationing may well be a more equitable route, since it will not further tax the resources of low and middle income people who cannot afford a price rise for energy products at this time. We believe that this method of reaching the goal of energy conservation must be given the highest consideration. . . .

It was my privilege to join with Congressmen McFALL of California, REUSS

of Wisconsin, and other of our distinguished colleagues on January 23, 1975, in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 61 urging the President to delay the implementation of his plan to use Presidential powers to raise the fee of all imported crude oil and petroleum products by increasing crude-oil fee levels \$1 per barrel on February 1, \$2 per barrel on March 1, and \$3 per barrel on April 1. The text of our resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should not impose, pursuant to section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, any tariff or other import restriction on petroleum or petroleum products before April 1, 1975, so as to give the Congress a reasonable period of time in which to act legislatively on such matter if it determines such action is necessary.

The President's proposal for increasing oil fees will materially add to the economic squeeze and energy cost strangulation on our Northeastern States who are almost solely dependent on imported oil, force all retail prices higher, and have a devastating impact throughout our economy. Such action will not only add to the cost of gasoline vital to all forms of transportation, farming, and food processing but the cost of each barrel of oil which is converted to industrial fuels, including feed stocks for the plastic industries and other chemical products, will increase the cost of every product and commodity manufactured in our country. Home-heating oils will also be affected, encouraging increased cost in competitive fuels such as gas and coal.

Everyone of our people has already experienced one of the most severe national and international peacetime economic disruptions as a result of the oil embargo and the increased price of imported oil previously imposed by oil-producing nations. Can America really afford to subject our people to higher prices on imported oil, a product which we are all agreed is essential and will continue to be needed for some time to supplement our own domestic oil supplies.

Oil is one of the most important commodities in world trade and our Nation's responsibility in the conservation, development, and management of our oil resources is a national priority of the highest order. I know that all of us here in the Congress share the President's deep concern and anxiety to establish a national fuel conservation program and achieve national self-sufficiency in meeting America's energy needs but it is axiomatic that it will require a partnership effort between the administration and the Congress to provide a national program that will be fair and equitable to all of our people. To that end I am dedicated and stand ready with you and our colleagues to extend my fullest efforts in every respect to achieve these national priority goals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

IN HONOR OF MISS LUCILLE V. ROBERTS

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, Miss Lucille V. Roberts recently retired from her position as principal of the James Madison School in St. Thomas after devoting more than 50 years to the education of young people in the Virgin Islands.

Beginning in 1922, her remarkable career has spanned teaching stints at the Lincoln, Washington, Nisky, Jefferson and Madison Schools. In 1953, Miss Roberts became the principal of Madison, presiding over its growth from 38 students to 436.

The greatest reward of any teacher is in being recognized by one's former pupils. By this standard, Miss Roberts is greatly loved indeed. Recently the Virgin Islands Department of Education and the James Madison School sponsored a testimonial dinner honoring her dedication to teaching and her many achievements.

Prior to her testimonial dinner, Miss Roberts was interviewed by the St. Thomas Daily News, in which she reflected on her long career and her philosophy of education. I think this article is instructive, and I commend it to your attention:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER-DANCE TO HONOR LUCILLE ROBERTS FOR 50 YEARS SERVICE

Miss Lucille V. Roberts, who joined the staff of the Department of Education more than 50 years ago, recently retired and now spends her time "just walking around spreading joy . . . making people happy."

Miss Roberts, a member of an old St. Thomas family, is to be feted this Saturday night at a testimonial dinner-dance in her honor at the Frenchman's Reef Holiday Inn. The Department of Education and the James Madison School, where she worked for 25 years including 20 years as principal, are sponsoring the testimonial. Governor Cyril E. King will be the keynote speaker.

Being able to get out and meet new people and renew old acquaintances are the things Miss Roberts enjoys most about being retired. She also says that she has more time to devote to her hobbies of gardening and, her favorite activity, teaching Virgin Islands cultural dances. She has been teaching Quadrilles, Lancers and Musurkas for years to young and old alike.

She says she inherited her musical appreciation and ability from her father, Lionel Roberts, who was a well known musician, athlete and legislator. The local ball park was named in honor of her father whose athletic prowess was most evident in cricket although, according to his daughter, he also showed skill in football and softball.

Miss Roberts explained that her father fostered her musical interests and he was "among the oldest of the dancers, and he was always a chaperone at the house parties." She explained that in the days of her youth, dances were held in individual homes and the children always went along.

"Orchestras were there and you didn't have to pay them \$300 to play," she said. "The

musicians were usually treated to the food and drink, and they played for very little. Money was no object."

Interest in music, it turns out, is not the only legacy she received from her father.

"Our parents chose our vocations, and fortunately for me, in my particular case it was one that I liked," she related. "I always wanted to be a teacher."

She explained that family ties were close in those days and families got together often for discussions.

"The parents talked to their kids to find out what their interests were. And after such discussions my father would sit down with me and say something like 'I think you should be a teacher.'"

She explained that education was always very important to her family and related that "The only beating I ever got in my life was when I was caught trying to play truant." As a young girl she attended Miss Mary Meyers' School which was affiliated with the Moravian Church and located on Back Street upstairs of where the Daily News is now. One day she started off to class, which began at 8:30 a.m., but on the way she got sidetracked.

"I remember it like it was yesterday," she reflected with a sigh. "I went to see a cousin of mine who had to perform some chores for his mother, and by the time I got to school it was 11 o'clock." Her uncle, who was a friend of her teacher, was visiting the class that day and by the time she got home her father was "waiting with a piece of rattan."

After listening to her explanation he told her, "Always remember in life: Education comes first," and he then proceeded to administer "the only sound beating I ever got."

She was quick to point out that she was not normally a "troublesome child—not like children today." While she doesn't think all contemporary children are misbehaved, she thinks that some parents are afraid of their children which is the reason for the children's misbehavior.

Miss Roberts thinks that children are still receiving a good education today, especially in the middle grades, but she would like to see greater emphasis on the 3 R's in the lower grades. She feels that priority also should be placed on rote learning of arithmetic and the alphabet. She remembers, "a little green primer I had in first grade" and thinks that a return to its phonics system in the primary grades would help solve some of the spelling and reading problems experienced by today's students.

Miss Roberts said that when she was growing up there were no public schools that she can remember, and there weren't that many private schools either. When she finished sixth grade that was as far as classes went on St. Thomas at the time, so her parents sent her to Antigua, considered the center of learning in the Caribbean at the time, to attend a teachers college.

After spending two years learning methods of teaching, she returned to St. Thomas to find that junior high school level classes were being established here.

"It was the early days of the American regime, and they were starting to establish patterns and requirements for teaching," she said.

So she went back to study in grades seven through nine—after already having completed two years in teachers colleges—and finally she became a substitute teacher in 1922. She taught at Lincoln, Washington, Nisky, Jefferson and Madison Schools, and the following year she became a full-time classroom teacher. During her teaching career she continued her own education, spending three summers studying at the

University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras and also completing several courses offered locally by Hampton Institute and New York University.

She took a respite from teaching between 1934-38 and helped her father with a taxi service that he owned. She dispatched the taxis and otherwise managed the business but eventually decided to return to her career as a teacher. About a year later she became principal-teacher at what is now the Joseph Sibilly School. She first went to Madison School in 1942 but was then transferred to Nisky Rural School before finally going back to Madison in 1951.

In 1953 she became the full-time principal of the school, and she says things began to change tremendously at that time. "When I first went to Madison in 1942 there were 38 students in grades 1-6," she said. "It was really country then . . . and it was the only school on the East End. But in 1953 the enrollment started to grow because of the influx of people into the country as they started moving out there and buying land and building homes. By the time I retired there were approximately 436 students." And now on that end of the island there is one other public elementary school with another to open in September.

Miss Roberts says that she is continually running into her former students, many of whom are now established in the community and in other parts of the world. She says that her former students have gone into a variety of occupations and some have become policemen, lawyers and doctors.

"They always recognize me but I can't always remember them all," she said. Sometimes she says men will come to her laughing and kiddingly say, "You used to whip me. Do you want to try it now?"

In referring to her use of corporal punishment, she explained, "It was not to be brutal, but sometimes they needed it. Some people have expressed to me later that they couldn't always see the point of whipping them but can now."

JOSEPH ELLIS HONORED

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, recently ceremonies were held to honor Joseph A. Ellis on attaining 35 years of service with the State Farm Insurance Co.

I would like to add my note of congratulations to Joe Ellis on his many achievements. Joe worked in many areas of State Farm operations. He started out in 1940 as a student at the home office claim school. He then worked in the Pittsburgh claims office followed by a move to Meadville, Pa. Later he undertook the position of claims adjuster for the entire District of Columbia metropolitan area. He was then promoted to resident superintendent in the District. After several executive positions at the Seaboard regional office in Frederick, Joe became division manager of the West Virginia Division on January 1, 1974. This is the position that he holds at the present time.

I feel sure Joe will continue to serve State Farm in the manner all his colleagues have come to expect of him. I know too that he will continue to exert his efforts on behalf of his community and family. The tribute to Joe Ellis is well deserved.

CUTOFF OF MILITARY AID TO TURKEY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the cutoff of military aid to Turkey becomes effective today, February 5, 1975.

While we bask in the warmth of victory in the upholding of law and justice by Congress over executive whim and immorality, our joy is tempered with a definite degree of sadness as we witness the lack of progress in negotiations and the human and political tragedy in Cyprus which is quickly becoming "fait accompli" with every passing day.

In twice delaying the suspension of military assistance to Turkey in the face of flagrant and illegal use of American weapons in Cyprus, Congress has allowed more than sufficient time for peace talks to achieve even some progress in settling the most pressing problems on this beleaguered island.

During this period of delay, the administration, by flouting both the Foreign Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Acts, not only did not cut off military aid, but proposed an ominous increase to \$230 million. And during this time-period when Congress has shown more than just a conciliatory attitude toward peace efforts, not only has there been no substantive progress in the negotiations but the Turkish line has stiffened in recent weeks and the talks are actually moving backwards.

Mr. Speaker, this agonizing situation which began with the July 1974 genocidal invasion of Cyprus with 40,000 Turkish troops, and occupation of 40 percent of the richest and most productive part of Cyprus—aided by American military hardware—has worsened with more appalling crimes occurring daily. Since December 18, 1974, when Congress delayed the suspension of military aid to Turkey for a second time, there has been in addition to the thousands dead and many thousands still missing, the shattered plight of more than 200,000 Greek Cypriots massively usurped from their homes and lands, and still today suffering as exiles in the south—a grave and potentially volatile situation.

Added to this heinous violation of every basic principle of international law is the importation of more than 10,000 Turkish Cypriotes from the south by way of Turkey, along with Turkish citizens for the purpose of permanent residency in the north, thereby destroying the demographic character and historic culture of the island. These transplanted intruders today hold new title deeds to thousands of Greek homes, businesses, and acres of land, all as a prelude to partitioning the island into separate zones and eventual annexation of Cyprus by Turkey. A census tabulating the spoils of its military victory has been conducted to determine the captured resources available to the Turks drifting into the enclave daily.

Widespread atrocities—which outweigh any Greek abuses since United Nations and Red Cross agencies have

been barred from entering the Turkish zone—continue unabated. Violence and looting persist with even valuable antiquities being smuggled out of the Turkish sector every day and sold abroad. The names of scores of towns and villages in the occupied north are being changed to Turkish with no relationship between the former Greek and the new Turkish names. The once bustling economy is in ruins with the vital Nicosia airport and the seaport at Famagusta still closed.

The ceasefire which has been broken a number of times with the grabbing of more land by the Turkish army, has had its most serious and most recent incident on February 1, 1975, when residents in northern Nicosia abandoned their homes fearing that the Turkish army might advance to take over other areas of the Greek zone.

Against this infamous list of international crimes, the phantom Turkish Government has stated that the withdrawal of 1,000 Turkish troops out of 40,000 represents a concession to Congress when it asked for "substantial progress" toward peace, and the preservation of the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, this balance sheet of what has occurred not only shows no progress but demonstrates a deterioration of the present unstable conditions, and verifies the proven fact and congressional contention that continued military assistance to Turkey has made the Turkish Government more intransigent and strengthened their refusal to make any concessions toward peace—especially in alleviating the indescribable suffering of the 200,000 refugee-exiles.

The suspension of all military aid to Turkey by the Congress of the United States is not a unilateral or vindictive action but one dictated under our law by Turkey's actions. We would like to have continued aid to Turkey but legal and moral considerations demand that we devote attention to preventing a war between Greece and Turkey that would finally destroy NATO's already-weakened southern flank and risk confrontation with the Soviet Union in the eastern Mediterranean.

A TRIBUTE TO RAY MEYER AND HIS OUTSTANDING CAREER AS COACH OF DEPAUL UNIVERSITY

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, last month Ray Meyer reached a milestone in his coaching career when he achieved his 500th victory as head basketball coach of DePaul University.

In tribute to Coach Ray Meyer, I would like to commend him for the significant contributions he has made to DePaul University and its athletic program, and also to the tremendous string of victories he has compiled.

Ray Meyer is a former Notre Dame graduate who began his coaching career with DePaul University in 1942. During

the past 32 seasons Ray Meyer has produced winning teams 27 times, and has also been voted "Coach of the Year" four times by the Chicago Basketball Writers Association.

I can attest to the constant dedication and enthusiasm he has exhibited during my years with the team. While serving as head coach he has known victory and defeat, but his primary objective has always been the future of his players rather than another victory. Ray Meyer not only demanded excellence on the basketball court but also in the classroom. His career has indeed been great, he is the second-winningest active college coach in the country. But even greater will be the memory and friendship his players will cherish of him as they proceed into the ranks of society, distinguishing themselves in their various walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues, join with me in congratulating Coach Meyer on his singular accomplishment, and wish him continued success in the days ahead.

BLACK HERITAGE WEEK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the heritage of the black person in the United States, too often neglected in the history books, is one of great achievement and accomplishment. The fact is, black men and women have been in the forefront of our progress as a nation. The list of their accomplishments and their contributions toward making the world a better place to live is endless.

This week is Black Heritage Week in Carson, Calif., and has been proclaimed Black History Week for the Nation as a whole. In view of this observance, I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to these Americans, who have given our society so much, yet have received so little public acknowledgement.

Throughout the history of the United States, the black American has played an important role in molding our Nation's development.

However, because of the attention given sports heroes and celebrities, the spectacular achievements of black athletes and entertainers have often overshadowed the equally impressive accomplishments of black scientists, inventors, political and religious leaders, and businessmen.

At this point, I would like to cite just a few examples of the black person's role in American history. This should serve to show us all how oblivious we can be to this group's rich heritage.

The first American patriot to die for his country was Crispus Attucks, a black man, shot by the British during the Boston Massacre. During the American Revolution itself, some 5,000 Negroes served in the Continental Army and Navy.

Nearly a quarter of a million black soldiers and sailors fought for the Union forces during the Civil War. Twenty of these men were recognized for valor and received the Nation's highest medal for heroism, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Jean Baptiste Point DuSable, a black pioneer, founded the settlement of Chicago. Another black pioneer, Matthew Henson, was with Adm. Robert E. Perry when he discovered the North Pole in 1907.

There were more than 5,000 black cowboys in the Old West. A black man, Bill Pickett, invented the art of "bulldogging." James P. Beckworth was a black frontiersman who excelled in trapping and hunting.

The idea of the blood bank was formulated by Dr. Charles Drew, a black surgeon who became the world's greatest authority on blood plasma.

The first black physician in America was James Derham, who established a prosperous medical practice in Philadelphia. The first doctor to perform open heart surgery was black—Dr. Daniel Hale Williams.

The scientific achievements of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver are well known to students, but how many Americans have read the works of Alexander Dumas, author of "The Count of Monte Cristo," and realized that he was of African descent, as were Samuel Coleridge-Taylor and Alexander Pushkin. Black Americans such as Paul Laurence Dunbar and Charles Waddell Chestnutt have left their mark in the literary annals of America also.

Despite the extra burden of discrimination black Americans have had to bear, black men have prospered in business. C. C. Spaulding developed his insurance company to the point where it was worth \$33 million when he died. S. B. Fuller set up a firm in Chicago that manufactures toiletries and cosmetics and distributes them by door-to-door salespersons. The Fuller Products Co. is one of the largest black-owned businesses in America.

Current leaders in the movement for civil rights and equality have such great black men as Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King, Jr., to inspire them. Such heroes have the ability to unite Americans, regardless of color or sex.

The work produced by black artists and designers symbolizes the integral part these Americans play in all aspects of the Nation's daily life. The residents of Los Angeles know the fine architecture of Paul Williams, who designed the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, a Saks Fifth Avenue store, office buildings, and mansions. He surely is one of the world's foremost architects.

The list of accomplishments by black men and women in the sports and entertainment fields is virtually endless.

Americans of all races have contributed to the improvement of the quality of our lives; Black Heritage Week is an attempt to bring national attention to the important part this group has played. We should all take pride in the heritage which has been left to us and to future generations by the black pioneers.

PROTECTION OF U.S. DAIRY FARMERS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, of all the victims of our current inflation and recession, none are harder hit than the dairy farmers of Minnesota, particularly those in the east-central part of the Eighth Congressional District.

The hard-working family farmer not only bears the brunt of today's economic conditions, but also suffers the full force of unfair competition from abroad.

Without help, many of them will go under.

As I traveled through east-central Minnesota after last fall's elections, meeting with various groups, dairy farmers repeatedly told me of the decline in milk prices, and their disastrous effects on the individual family farmer.

At these meetings I learned that one of the principal reasons for this decline was growing competition from foreign dairy products—products imported from countries whose standards of purity and sanitation are not up to the tough standards our Government rightly imposes on U.S. dairymen.

Mr. Speaker, American cleanliness standards require constant care throughout the farm, and equipment that is expensive to buy and maintain. For a family farmer, the prices are almost prohibitive; but once bought, the equipment costs must be added to the price of the dairy product.

Yet foreign dairymen, who compete with the American farmer, are not required to meet equal standards, meaning that their products enter this country more cheaply and undercut our domestic prices to the point where they are driving farmers out of business.

Mr. Speaker, the American dairy farmer is in bitter straits as it is.

The President has just vetoed legislation that would have given farmers milk support prices at 85 percent of parity. Farmers in Minnesota and elsewhere throughout the country are among the hardest hit by today's inflationary cycle and high interest rates, and have no relief in sight.

Beef, which brought 47 cents per pound in 1973, brought 19 cents a pound in 1974. Farmers who sent their calves to market found shipping costs were higher than the market price of the calf—they actually owed money after they sold the calves.

On top of this they are clipped by enforced participation in research and promotional programs.

Family farms have been excluded from many support programs, making young farmers even less able to compete with the more favored giant agribusinesses.

And the FHA, supposedly the farmer's friend and spokesman, stands accused of what amounts to planned indifference to the farmer's needs; of causing 6- to 8-month delays in processing loans; giving them the run-around; and failing miser-

ably to address itself and its programs to today's farm problems.

Added to these domestic problems comes the unfair competition from abroad, undercutting American dairymen and possibly creating a health hazard to the consumer as well.

The Dairy Import Sanitation Act, which I introduced this week, requires foreign dairy producers to meet health and sanitation standards as rigid as those American farmers have to meet.

Each country exporting dairy products to the United States would have to set up its own system for farm and plant inspections, and these systems in turn would be monitored by U.S. inspectors to insure compliance.

I urge the Committee on Agriculture to act on this legislation as soon as possible because I know, from what dairymen in east central Minnesota have told me, they need this help badly, and they need it now.

I insert the following newsletter:

OBERSTAR LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE HIGH STANDARDS ON DAIRY IMPORTS

WASHINGTON.—Rep. James L. Oberstar, D-Minn., Tuesday introduced a bill requiring imported dairy products to meet the same standards of purity and wholesomeness now met by American dairymen.

"We must protect both the American consumer and the dairy farmer and manufacturer who, under U.S. law, must comply with tough domestic sanitation standards," Oberstar said.

"To do less is not only dangerous, but grossly unfair to the American dairy farmer who must spend a great deal of money meeting U.S. sanitation requirements."

Oberstar pointed out that while thousands of pounds of contaminated dairy products are refused entry each year, such a small percentage of all dairy imports is inspected that many more thousands of pounds could reach the grocery shelves undetected.

The Oberstar legislation, the Dairy Import Sanitation Act of 1975, would require that foreign dairy producers and manufacturers meet health and sanitation standards as rigid as those which farmers and manufacturers in the U.S. must meet.

Each country exporting dairy products to the U.S. would be required to set up its own system for farm and plant inspections, and these systems in turn would be monitored by U.S. inspectors to insure compliance.

"Dairy imports rose 19% last year, while FDA inspections dropped from 13.2% in 1973 to only 5.8% in 1974," Oberstar said.

"Clearly, this legislation is needed, to guarantee healthful dairy products on the shelves, and a healthy dairy industry in areas like East Central Minnesota."

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE—A CRISIS SITUATION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that will help alleviate the current emergency situation surrounding medical malpractice insurance.

Medical malpractice suits as well as the cost of malpractice insurance have reached crisis proportions in many of

our States, and it is time to take immediate action to relieve this situation.

The bill I am proposing is patterned after Federal riot and flood reinsurance programs to protect primary insurance companies against catastrophic claims and would establish a federally administered medical malpractice reinsurance fund.

Companies selling malpractice insurance could pay into the pool on a volunteer basis and these payments would support the pool.

Initially the pool would pay malpractice liability claims above \$25,000, and the figure would be adjusted based on actuarial experience. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would work with the State insurance authorities and other knowledgeable people in the area of premium rates for primary insurance.

This bill would also require the Secretary to engage in a number of studies and reports including a study of the direct and indirect costs of medical malpractice claims in all federally-supported health care programs.

It was never the intent of the Federal Government to become involved with medical malpractice insurance, but a combination of things have led us to this serious situation where suits against physicians are increasing at the rate of 10 percent a year, and one doctor in three can now expect to be sued during his career.

The cost of coverage for malpractice insurance in some areas of our country is incredible. In New York, new physicians are paying \$10,000 to \$15,000 per year, and I understand that rates of \$34,000 for some anesthesiologists are not uncommon. These high insurance rates ultimately are paid by the consumer in higher health premiums and hospital costs.

While the cost of malpractice insurance has skyrocketed—by almost ten-fold since 1969—an even more serious situation has developed in a number of States including my State of Texas. New doctors just out of medical school are unable to obtain insurance, which could lead to a serious shortage of doctors since they could not be expected to practice without some type of coverage.

Another serious result of the increase in malpractice suits and the increase in damage awards made by juries—in California last year 30 awards of more than \$300,000 were made—has forced many doctors to practice what they call defensive medicine.

These doctors are reluctant to try a procedure that is risky but could provide a cure, and they are requiring more lab tests to support and verify their decisions. Practicing defensive medicine could lead to a situation where medical science is stifled, and the cost of medicine can only be increased by requiring excessive testing to be done.

While new doctors are unable to obtain insurance, older doctors are finding it increasingly difficult to be reinsured, and as a result older doctors are being forced into early retirement adding to the already serious doctor shortage around the country.

It is extremely difficult to untangle the issues involved in the increase in malpractice insurance and every faction has a legitimate case to present. The doctors feel the insurance companies premiums are excessive; the insurance companies feel justified because of the large awards being made by the juries hearing malpractice cases; and both sides feel that lawyers are to blame since they work on a contingency basis.

We can not waste time debating who is at fault or who is responsible for the dramatic increase in the cost of malpractice insurance. We must take immediate action and I am hopeful that the House will move expeditiously in considering my bill to reverse this serious situation currently jeopardizing our health system.

WHAT'S HOPEFUL FOR 1975?

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these times of economic questioning, I think it is particularly important to listen to individuals whose wide background in economic policy makes them indispensable national resources.

Walter E. Hoadley is such a man. He is presently executive vice president and chief economist of the Bank of America, NT&SA, San Francisco. Previously, he held similar positions with Armstrong Cork Co. and today serves on the board of directors of that firm.

In a recent address to the Commonwealth Club of California, Mr. Hoadley had some important things to say about our Nation's economic health, the need for confidence in our Nation's economic future and the responsibility of all Americans to participate in assuring our Nation's economic survival. His speech was a challenge to his audience, and I would like to share it with my congressional colleagues as a challenge to all of us.

"WHAT'S HOPEFUL FOR 1975?"

(By Walter E. Hoadley)

Now is the time for the seasoned men and women in our country who have experienced periods of great uncertainty, recession, and even depression to rise up and help restore confidence. They are needed to provide steady and positive leadership to blunt the increasingly panicky feelings of average Americans who, at age 27, never have had to live through such a period as confronts us in 1975.

The message for all America is simple—the basic strengths of the U.S. economy and the spirit and determination of our people never fail to see us through to better times. Unfortunately, this message is not now being—certainly not forcefully—told. The younger people can't be expected to tell it believingly to themselves and too many older people don't think anybody will listen. I can report from personal research that most young people are more anxious to hear the views of their elders now than at any time in the post-war period.

NEEDLESS CONFIDENCE CRISIS LOOMS

The most serious aspect of all this is that across the nation now there are increasing signs of an impending needless confidence

crisis. Once full-blown it can greatly undermine all public and private efforts to reestablish an upward course for the economy in 1975. Some of the signs are: (a) almost universal doubt about the future, (b) more and more postponements of major personal and corporate decisions, (c) rising liquidations rather than new investments, (d) increased austerity at home, office, and factory, (e) common references to the "mess" we are now in, and (f) intensified requests for somebody—usually in government—to "do something", but even more doubt that anything can or will actually be done about it.

A confidence crisis is not to be ignored or taken lightly as seems to be the case in most public and private outlook discussions these days. Fear feeds on uncertainty and reinforces a downward spiral in economic activity by making people believe the "safe" thing to do is not to do much of anything.

My psychologist friends also tell me that it's very human in the face of uncertainty to look for a safe haven by reverting back to modes or levels which seemed secure in the past. Pretty clearly this reversion process is now underway with cumulatively negative overtones. But, it is also stoppable in large part by the sheer recognition that mounting fears and emotions can only compound our problems and delay the solutions which we so anxiously want.

The average American is inexperienced and emotionally unprepared to understand or cope with prolonged recession and is largely unaware of what causes inflation. But I find young people everywhere looking for information about what's going on and even more for reassurance that we'll "make it" in 1975—an amazing doubt for many of us who have seen our country weather great storms successfully in the past.

NO ONE CAN WASTE A YEAR

I'm personally disturbed that so many people have literally written off 1975 as total disaster and have chosen to sit on the sidelines and "wait and see." As suggested, this is the best way to aggravate our problems. Moreover, a year is a precious segment of each of our lives—about 2% of the actuarial life expectancy of the average 27 year old—but 4% for the 50 year old—10 of the 65 year old—and as God only knows 100% for some. No one of us and certainly our nation can afford to waste any year and not 1975.

If you're among the many Americans who have already written off 1975, please take another look: (1) the fundamental outlook is far stronger than it may appear in the headlines and (2) unless some more positive thinking occurs soon, the present weakness could be seriously aggravated into a self-fulfilling deeper recession prophecy, which nobody wants. Negative psychology is now far more dangerous than negative economics because the former kills the will to act. We need more positive action now—not more drifting!

Let's never forget that the outlook for 1975 as always is greatly dependent upon the degree of realism of our worldwide expectations and our personal vantage point. Americans are known to be impatient people, persistently seeking quick and simple answers to our problems. We rapidly take the good for granted, assume it will continue indefinitely, and are shocked when it doesn't. We don't take time to note underlying changes until they threaten to overwhelm us. We are traditionally restless with the status quo, yet quickly become apprehensive when change occurs. We abhor uncertainty, but we are the most readily adjustable people in the world.

Fundamentally, we are a confident people, but economic progress has been so persistent that we've almost forgotten to nurture the roots of our system. We've failed to note that our economic progress in recent

years has been so great that other dimensions of life, especially qualitative rather than quantitative values, have pushed such old fashioned economic virtues as productivity, investment and savings into the background. We've hardly learned that the U.S. is far more interdependently linked with other nations than seemed possible only a short while ago.

We've failed until very recently (and already largely forgotten because of the recession) to recognize that the pervasive and long standing slack in the developed world-economy is gone. The problems which now confront us clearly are far more complex than just economic. As a people we've hardly learned the fundamentals of supply and demand economics when we've rather suddenly been confronted with a strong new set of environmental, social, political, and related influences. No wonder we seem confused. Any expectations for return to the good old days can only be totally unrealistic.

YEAR AHEAD CULMINATES MANY BASIC CHANGES

The year 1975 for all these reasons was destined long ago to be flat and anything but serene on many fronts, as even some cursory Monday morning quarterbacking of 1974 will attest. These are enormously changing times for very explicit reasons and it is just not realistic to assume them away as we look ahead. Our nation and the world are shedding the vestiges of deep seated war and postwar periods and struggling to find the priorities, policies, programs, and political and social power structure for the rest of this century. This will take several years. It's our job to make the most of it for what it is—no more no less.

Let's also be careful not to accept at face value the "objective" views of those who capitalize on fear to sell gold and other "sure" assets or advisory services which never seem to have anything constructive to offer.

THE 1975 OUTLOOK IS WHAT WE MAKE OF IT

The most commonly accepted forecast for the United States for 1975 is for a decline in real terms of 1 to 2 percent, price increases of 8 to 10 percent, an unemployment rate of 7 to 8 percent, and an after tax profit reduction of 15 to 20%. Against an expectation of perpetual economic advancement this is a pretty weak outlook.

In fact, the outlook is for the second or third best year in U.S. or any other economic history, with about 85 million men and women at work, record or near record consumer financial assets, minimal excess capacity in basic industries, a topping out of inflation, generous use of the government's time-tested enlarged kit of help for the unemployed and underprivileged, more comparative U.S. advantages over most nations in energy, inflation, capital markets, and financial system strength, unrivaled management expertise, the best educated people in the world in a mood wanting to understand our problems and participate in their solutions, and no war.

This is a pretty hefty set of strengths to help all of us find a solid bottom to this recession close to where we are now—if we'll only demonstrate the willingness to weigh the factual evidence of strengths and not insist on stressing only weaknesses. The key point is not *whether* but *when* the outlook will improve.

CONFIDENCE MUST BE RESTORED PROMPTLY

But, the confidence breakdown has proceeded far enough now that much more has to be done promptly to make sure it does not accelerate much further. This is not time for mere reassurances or generalizations. This is a time for action and I mean some dramatic action to catch public attention:

Here's my program:

1. The public already knows too much about our problems, so, let's not you or I or the media dwell on them inside or outside of government unless we're prepared to offer practical solutions. "Put up a positive answer or shut up" could be a motto.

2. Have government, business and research professionals determine where confidence is the lowest, seek out "why?" at the grass roots level and design practical answers and programs which have personal local significance, and above all get people—lots of people—involved.

3. Launch a national weekly educational T.V. program on prime time—financed jointly by public and private funds—involving the President and other leaders as a follow up to the Summit Meetings to present further opportunities for the public to understand more about the nature of our problems and the practical options and limits to their solution. Stress the interrelations of simultaneous inflation and recession and the need for priorities.

4. Settle for some time to come by Congressional inquiries the questions of future material and other shortages or surpluses—real or imaginary—and prospects that U.S. living standards may not be able to rise much further unless a massive program of new investment gets underway; follow up with appropriate action.

5. Indicate a joint public and private broadscale residential and commercial "fix-up" campaign to help the hard hit building industry.

6. Have Congress adopt a strategic program of temporary "confidence restoring" tax cuts to reassure the public and management-investors that "bottom" to the recession will be found promptly, emphasizing (a) quick reaction techniques through one shot forgiveness or lower withholding with promises of more doses as needed, (b) easing of tax deterrents to durable goods purchases and capital investments, and (c) packaged determination to invoke tax increases as confidence and growth return to offset the eventual inflationary potential of any excessive stimulation.

7. To encourage almost defunct forward planning and remove as much uncertainty as possible, make more specific public and private commitments for a minimum of two years.

8. Have the President and the Congress challenge the citizens in all communities to make 1975 the year in which a determination is made of what precisely is to be preserved for posterity and what civic improvements can be made by citizen participation as one of the key action programs of the 1976 Bicentennial.

9. Have President Ford convene an international Summit Conference to discuss openly the critical questions affecting the world outlook for 1975-76, toward the end of developing at least the outline of a concerted program of well known supportive action to invoke should the present worldwide tendency toward recession intensify.

10. Have the joint leaders of the U.S. public and private life call upon the people to recheck their current behavior against recent experience and urge them to spend, save, invest, or borrow on a more normal level if they have allowed fear to cause serious retrenchment.

This is by no means an exhaustive test, but perhaps will serve to illustrate how some dramatic action, soon, against a realistic appraisal of the dangers of further ebbing of confidence as well as irresponsible inflationary fiscal action—can offer a constructive basis for starting restoration of confidence. This is not only important to the U.S. but to the rest of the world which now fears our country will "export recession" in 1975.

THERE IS NO ESCAPE FROM PLANNING NOW—
MAKE IT CONSTRUCTIVE

No doubt many will still feel much of what has been said here reflects more hope than certainty. In any event, there is at least one more point to be made. It is to remember that not to plan ahead is really to plan to push forward the status quo—both the best and the worst—in all organizations. At the very least 1975 prospects call for a critical cost-benefit evaluation of our key activities to test the strength and endurance of the human and material resources employed against the markets to be served.

A flat year such as 1975 bluntly means in all our lines of endeavor that we're going to have to make our accomplishments pretty much on our own without much help from the outside, that means more than ever we must ask ourselves—how good really are we?

Let's also recognize that there are widespread feelings among 27 year olds and others that business and the private sector are not really important contributors to national welfare—that only the so-called public sector can determine what is in the public interest—and that right now the best course of action is to control business more while government and the public sector take over more responsibility:

Those who hold such views should answer these questions: Why does productivity fall as government activities multiply? Who is responsible for the greatest flow of innovative ideas and follows them through to reality? Who ultimately has to pay the bills for government expenditures?

The point of all this is that no one should assume that the private sector is not adversely affected by the negative actions of government. Moreover, neither the private sector nor the public sector alone can hope to solve tomorrow's complex problems. Both must be involved and both must remain strong for all Americans to have the best life in qualitative and quantitative terms. Don't let anyone tell you otherwise.

Where we have weaknesses and problems—let's get to work to correct them. They're not going to correct themselves in this environment. Where our fundamentals are sound, let's move ahead—albeit cautiously. When we do we'll avoid the inevitable rush and jam when all the present drifters regain their confidence, in 1975 or 1976, start to move ahead again—only to kick themselves for not taking action now.

Will you be one of them? Don't sit there. Let's get up and do something positive today!

DEATH BY HANDGUN: THE CASE
FOR HANDGUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of January 30 printed two contrasting letters under the heading: "The 'Right To Bear Arms' Versus a Life." It seems to me that the two viewpoints expressed in these letters, taken together, provide yet another strong argument for strong national handgun legislation.

The tragic story of Mary Jo Donovan, as recounted by Claudia Anderson Nevins, of Washington, speaks for itself as an example of the senseless deaths that are in part attributed to the availability of handguns.

The following letter by William J. Herb, of Greenbelt, cites the fact that

there are an estimated 20,000 Federal, State, and local statutes presently on the books. While to Mr. Herb this might constitute "some form of gun control," to me it appears worse than none at all and argues forcefully for some form of effective control of handguns, such as I introduced last year.

The text of the articles follows:

THE "RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS" VERSUS A LIFE

Mary Jo Donovan is dead. She died while she was warming up her car on a cold January day in a Maryland suburb of Washington. She died because someone shot her and left a beautiful little boy motherless and a devoted husband and friends without one of the liveliest, most charming, warmest, best humored people we have ever known.

This is not the first letter I have written on gun control. And it probably will not be the last. But I hope to God that it is the most painful, as I doubt that I personally could endure more pain than those of us who knew Mary Jo have experienced. Mary Jo was one of those rare women who had found liberation and was a mother and wife and a career woman who did all of those things well and without complaint or trauma. And she made a lot of people laugh in a time when there is not a great deal to laugh about in the world.

I am tempted to call the National Rifle Association and ask whether they can honestly say that the "right to bear arms" is a sufficient trade-off for the life of one truly fine human being. A right versus a life. Would they think about that? Since hearing that Mary Jo is dead, I have been wandering around in a daze as have most people I know. And all that I seem capable of saying to myself is "Who cares?" I have not been able to decipher what that means, but I want to know when this country is going to get to the point of valuing human life and dignity? I have heard people say that life is cheap in Asia and Africa, but here we have the most senseless killings and a numb acceptance that is frightening.

It would not surprise me if this letter is not printed because of its incoherence. And I can understand that. But I hope that someone, somewhere does read it and realizes that it is intellectually easy to oppose something, but when someone who has been a friend to many and an enemy to no one is sacrificed for nothing, we can only hope that the hopelessness and the bitterness we feel can somehow be interpreted into a positive means of combating the most incredible narrow-mindedness that exists in our nation today.

CLAUDIA ANDERSON NEVINS.

WASHINGTON.

In a recent Post column Jerry Wilson attempts to make much of the fact that a majority of Americans favor "some form of gun control," and to use this as an indication of public sentiment for "extraordinarily stringent" limitations on the availability of handguns. With an estimated 30,000,000 handguns presently in America, this sounds strongly like an advocacy of confiscation. This is a giant, fanciful step from "some form of gun control." With 20,000 federal, state, and local laws currently on the books controlling the possession and use of guns, I submit that we already have "some form of gun control."

Mr. Wilson recognizes that "firearms obviously are needed in some instances . . . for safe defense against criminals . . . and by hunters and trappers." But he emphasizes that this need is mainly in rural areas. Granted, there is little hunting or trapping in highly urbanized areas, but an examination of the number of violent crimes per 100,000 population in rural and urban areas, and a consideration of the inability of the police to prevent violent crimes would lead

to the conclusion that the urban dweller is in greater need of a means of self-protection.

Wilson attempts to illustrate his case for strict gun controls by citing statistics that show that 10,000 people per year commit suicide by using handguns. He reasons that the "availability of handguns" killed these people. It would seem obvious that an individual intent on committing suicide certainly would be able to find an efficient alternative.

I feel that Wilson's faulty brand of reasoning will logically lead to a call for the confiscation of all privately owned guns, whether they be rifles, shotguns, or (as proposed in a Post editorial the following day) handguns.

WILLIAM J. HERB.

GREENBELT.

IS THE WITCH HUNT BACK IN
STYLE?

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, after beholding the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the school systems of my own district and others throughout the country, we must conclude that the witch hunt is back in style.

One does not hear of any really solid investigative work to determine the facts involved in any individual complaints alleging racial or sex discrimination.

Instead, we find the Office for Civil Rights pursuing an obsession with records, files, statistics, reports, and charts showing the racial and sex composition of schools, classes, courses, and even disciplinary caseloads.

Local school officials are endlessly harassed with demands for such data, which can be produced only with large expenses of time and money. Agents of the Office for Civil Rights frequently approach local officials in an accusatory manner, challenging the local jurisdiction to prove itself innocent of race and sex discrimination.

The Federal enforcement officials are actually getting deeply involved in the administration of local schools, mandating racial quotas for each school, class and course, and even insisting on racial balance in discipline.

The civil rights laws as they were intended by Congress are not being enforced. Instead, what we are witnessing is a classic example of a bureaucratic fuddle factory in operation, perpetuating and expanding its empire by creating turmoil in local school systems.

To correct this dreadful condition, I have introduced legislation that would set HEW on the proper course.

This legislation would establish an orderly, legal process for the investigation of civil rights complaints, but it would stop the arbitrary and costly demands for records, files, statistics, and reports that burden local educators.

Stated simply, my legislation would prohibit the Federal Government from requiring such information from local school systems, except when the data is

necessary to pursue individual, specific complaints of race and sex discrimination.

Whenever a local school district resists demands for information, the Federal Agency could petition for a court order releasing the data.

To obtain the court order, the Federal Agency would need to file formal complaints by students or parents and evidence showing "probable cause" that race or sex discrimination has occurred.

This legislation is consistent with American legal tradition. It is a sound approach to enforcement of the laws of the land, but it protects local school districts from unreasonable harassment and impoundment of appropriated funds.

I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PRESIDENT FORD AT RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS BREAKFAST

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 5, 1975

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of President Ford to the National Religious Broadcasters congressional breakfast which was held in Washington on January 28.

I believe all Members of the House and Senate should take the time to read the President's remarks.

He takes a very strong position in support of religious liberty—one that reflects a positive and sincere expression of his own personal views. It is good that these views guide the man who holds America's highest office.

The President's comments were well received by those in attendance who favor strict adherence to religious liberty as guaranteed under the first amendment of our Constitution.

The National Religious Broadcasters Association is among those in the forefront of those concerned with protecting our religious freedom and the right to worship in the manner of our own choosing.

I believe this speech is timely and reassuring. The President has set the tone for meeting the awesome challenges this country faces here at home and throughout the world.

THE 32D ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST OF NATIONAL RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS

Remarks by the President

I am grateful for your invitation to this Congressional breakfast, which I attended fairly faithfully when I was a Member of the Congress, and from which I derived not only a good deal of religious inspiration but also that powerful encouragement which is described in the familiar hymn as "the fellowship of kindred minds."

I might say, in a secular way, I am still hoping for some of that spirit with the new Congress.

Last year I had the privilege of being with you as Vice President, and I guess the first

thing I ought to assure you this morning is that I am not going to do any more job-hopping.

As President, I have been cautioned to be very careful what I say about religious matters. But the separation of church and state, although a fundamental principle to which I fully subscribe, was never intended in my view to separate public morality from public policy. It says that the power of government shall not be used to support or suppress any one faith, but in the same sentence protects the profession and propagation of all faiths.

I took a minute to re-read the First Amendment to the Constitution before coming over here. This is what it says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Now that says an awful lot in one sentence; it sustains some of our most precious rights; it also underscores how inter-related they are. Freedom to exercise one's religion would be meaningless without freedom of speech and assembly; without freedom of the press there could be neither religious books nor religious broadcasters.

As we proudly enter a period of celebrating our Bicentennial of independence as a nation, we must remember that our great traditions of freedom did not suddenly start in 1776. For more than two centuries before the Liberty Bell rang, the processes of conflict and compromise were working on this continent, and the impassioned extremes of religious and political rivalry were tested and found wanting.

In the end, our Founding Fathers sought to establish a new order of society embodying the principles of tolerance and freedom, of unity in diversity, of justice with charity. So the First Amendment was written to ensure the perpetuation of the hard-learned lessons from our colonial history that religious belief can neither be coerced nor suppressed by government; that a free people must retain the right to hear, the right to speak, the right to publish and to read, and the right to come together—all of which had been denied the early American settlers at one time or another.

As for the other freedom, the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, it is hard for any of us who hold public office to imagine a time when this was not permitted. But it was dangerous in America 200 years ago, and it is in many parts of the world today.

I am told that the total listening audience of the National Religious Broadcasters exceeds 40 million persons and that religious broadcasting in this country and throughout the world is growing at the rate of 20 to 30 percent per year. This can be a tremendous force for good, for freedom, and for peace.

While the Founding Fathers never dreamed of radio or television, the personal freedoms they protected make your work possible. The electronic era of communications which is only beginning, as the age of books was only beginning when Gutenberg printed his Bible, holds unlimited opportunities for those who today tell and re-tell the Good News of God's love for man.

As President, I am no less concerned than George Washington was when he observed in his Farewell Address to his countrymen:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports . . . The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

You will note that the First Amendment is stated entirely in the negative; it forbids Congress—because its authors were much more fearful of the tyranny of Parliament than of the King—to make any laws in certain areas of individual freedom.

But President Washington urged all "mere" politicians to respect and cherish the principles of religion and morality. And it has been my experience in the Congress over the years that most of us "mere politicians" really do.

In my first speech as President to my former colleagues in the Congress, I had dedicated groups such as this one in mind when I said:

"On the higher plane of public morality, there is no need for me to preach. . . We have thousands of far better preachers and millions of sacred scriptures to guide us on the path of personal right-living and exemplary official conduct. If we can make effective and earlier use of the moral and ethical wisdom of the centuries in today's complex society, we will prevent more crime and more corruption than all the policemen and prosecutors of the government can ever deter. If I might say so, this is a job that might begin at home, not in Washington."

Through your broadcasts, you reach into the homes of America, and bring to young and old the ageless axioms of Divine truth. All of us need the sure guidance of God in whatever we do. Although there are many faiths and denominations represented at this meeting, a common goal brings us here: recognition of the need to keep strong the spiritual and moral ties that bind us together as a nation. I will not join the skeptics who say Americans have lost faith, hope or love. But I know that each new generation must rediscover these redeeming qualities and translate them into its own way of living, or lifestyle as they now say. You are helping in this renewal and nurture of our deep religious roots.

When I was young, I learned a couple of verses from the Book of Proverbs, third chapter, which have stuck with me all my life. When I took the oath of office as President, the Bible was open to this passage:

"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all the ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths."

That is what I have tried to do, and will try to do, as your President. I think it does no violence to the separation of church and state to commend these words to my countrymen. If it does, I am in good company, starting with George Washington.

LETTER CARRIERS DISLIKE KOKOMO PLAN

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, there is a fine little city called Kokomo. Because of the stubbornness of postal management, it has become the rallying cry of indignant letter carriers all over America and eventually could very well be the cause of a nationwide postal strike.

In Kokomo, postal authorities are conducting an experiment which they hope to implement nationwide. The experiment is really kind of a super time-and-motion study, augmented by computers. It is aimed at standardizing the routes

of the letter carrier—forcing them to take so many steps a minute, make so many stops in an hour, and so on. The end result of the experiment is to make the heavy task of the mailman even heavier by eliminating some routes by extending the routes still existing. Management feels it can eliminate 15,000 routes throughout the country.

The letter carriers resent this. They feel there are no two routes exactly alike, and no two letter carriers exactly alike, and that it is foolish and vicious to computerize and evaluate them on exactly the same basis.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the letter carriers. These are fine, dedicated men who, for more than 100 years, have been the Nation's best ambassadors to the people.

Despite all the experimentation going on, the mail service is swiftly deteriorating. Every day it is worse than it was the previous day. Morale is low. The employees are bitter.

I sincerely hope the postal managers will abandon the Kokomo plan, and will concentrate their efforts on moving and delivering the mail as swiftly as possible. A postal strike would be disastrous to the economy in these difficult times. It can be avoided only if management puts away its pride and yields to the commonsense of its employees.

NURSE TRAINING ACT IN 1975 SESSION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this Congress the fact that no Nurse Training Act has yet been signed into law. That legislation which the 93d Congress passed was pocket vetoed by President Ford and I am concerned about the effects of not providing assistance to our schools of nursing and to nursing students.

It has been projected that this Nation will require a million nurses by 1980 and this estimate does not include the nurses needed for any NHI program. Certainly we cannot meet the nursing needs of our people without Federal assistance.

I would like to share with you a letter from the chairman, Student/Faculty Affairs, at Indiana University Northwest.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: I am deeply concerned over President Ford's veto of H.R. 17085, the Nurse Training Act. In the past, many students at Indiana University Northwest would not have been able to complete their nursing studies without the help of the Nurse Training Act, and many will be unable to complete their education in the future without this assistance. Forty-five (45) of the one hundred ninety (190) students enrolled in nursing courses for the Fall Semester 1974 were on financial aid—fifty-five percent (55%) of these were minority students. While it is true that some of

these students will complete their studies this year under the old act, many will have great difficulty or will find it impossible to complete their studies without aid. In addition, one hundred thirty (130) of the three hundred (300) applicants for admission to the class of 1975 have indicated a need for financial assistance in order to attend school. Since nursing students are not eligible for the National Direct Student Loan, many of these students will be unable to attend school without the Nurse Training Act.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Malone also stated that area hospitals have gone to the Philippines to recruit nurses. New hospitals have opened in the area during the past 2 years and another is opening this year. These hospitals must have registered nurses if quality care is to be provided. She says that capitation funds, under the NTA, have helped her school to meet the demand for registered nurses and without those funds it will be impossible to meet that demand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress can move rapidly toward enactment of the Nurse Training Act that was passed in late 1974.

THE EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE AND THE BALTIC STATES

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Ms. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, the European Security Conference has been in session in Geneva, Switzerland, and Helsinki, Finland, intermittently since June 1973. The Soviet Union first broached the idea of a security conference in 1969 with the aim of stabilizing Europe's future through agreements on security, economics and cultural exchange. The conference has now reached the point where a summit meeting is being planned for early this year to ratify the conference agreements. By some accounts, the size of this summit will exceed both the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the Versailles Peace Conference of 1919.

One of the many issues that has been raised at this conference is the status of the Soviet-controlled Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Soviet Union has urged that the World War II boundaries be accepted by the United States and Europe. A ratification by the West would put a seal of legitimacy on the territorial gains made by the Soviet Union during World War II. An acceptance of the Soviet claim that the people of the Baltic States voluntarily joined the U.S.S.R. would be not only a falsification of history, but also a renunciation of the principles of self-determination and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms on which this country's foreign policy has long been based.

Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 57th anniversary of the Estonian independence. It is appropriate at this time for us to remember the people of Estonia,

Latvia, and Lithuania who lost their independence during the Second World War. I am introducing today a resolution which expresses congressional concern over the fate of the Baltic States at the European Security Conference. We cannot forsake these valiant people in the name of détente.

FRANCE VERSUS OIL DEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it appears that France is combatting its energy crisis with far more vigor and optimism than the United States.

By 1985 the French hope to have all base-load electricity supplied by nuclear power plants. In addition, France is significantly ahead of the United States in building the fast breeder reactor.

The Russians are also ahead in building the fast breeder reactor.

On its editorial page of January 4, 1975, the New York Times challenged the administration to show more drive, estimating that the United States could "even reduce its total oil imports to as little as one million barrels a day by 1985."

As this matter is of maximum urgency to all members, I insert this editorial to be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

FRANCE'S ENERGY PLAN

France's new ten-year program to reduce the country's dependence on imported oil sets an example for the industrial nations, but also emphasizes again the economic power of the oil cartel.

By 1985, President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing intends to reduce the country's dependence on imported fuel from the present level of 75 per cent of energy consumed to 55 or 60 per cent. Conservation, as well as new sources of energy, is to be relied upon. The expectation has been that French economic growth would require energy equivalent to 284 million tons of oil a year by 1985. But the country's economic plan has now been revised on the assumption that a reduction of 16 per cent will be possible to the equivalent of 240 million tons without seriously constraining production.

Increased energy supplies are to be obtained through halting the decline in coal use by opening new mines and by further coal imports. A massive nuclear-power program, already under way, is to be pressed forward vigorously with a target of providing one-fifth of France's energy supply from nuclear-power plants. Whether this can be achieved as early as 1985, however, remains a matter of debate among economic planners. After ten years, France will still be dependent on imports for over half her energy and virtually all her oil.

Some West European countries will be able to do better than that. Britain expects to be a petroleum exporter by the early 1980's with the help of North Sea oil. Holland has natural gas. West Germany still has vast coal resources. But, overall, the dependence of West Europe and Japan on imported oil will remain substantial for many years.

The United States, in contrast, could achieve independence from Middle East oil

before 1985 and even reduce its total oil imports to as little as one million barrels a day by 1985 from the current six to seven million. But a far more vigorous effort is required than that currently contemplated by the Ford Administration.

THE REAL DIFFERENCE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis of the livestock industry has reached such proportions that it is a very real worry as to how many ranchers are going to be able to stay in business and continue producing the quality beef you and I like to have on our tables. The cost-price squeeze continues unabated in rural America, but it is a problem little understood in our cities. Mrs. Robert Pfeil, of Harrold, S. Dak., has sent a letter to the editor of a number of South Dakota newspapers, that tells what our ranchers are up against these days. I want to share that letter with my colleagues so that they, too, can have a better understanding of what is involved in raising the meat they enjoy at the dinnertable:

THE REAL DIFFERENCE

To the Editor:

I am a 365-day-old average calf. My mother is expected to have a 90 per cent chance of raising one live calf per year. Together we are called a unit.

My owner offered to give me to a town citizen the other day to keep and feed until I was ready to butcher. They said they couldn't afford to feed me. My owner asked, "How about me?" The town citizen said my owner had the stuff to take care of me to make the difference.

In this area you are to allow eight acres for my unit per year.

8 acres at \$100 per acre at 8 per cent interest	\$64
Principal on 8 acres at over 40 years	20
Tax on 8 acres and unit	12
Necessary shots (no illness)	4
Pellets or oats after weaning (6 months)	40
Mineral, salt and vitamins	3

This comes to \$143.

How many of these items did you say my owner didn't have to pay for or did you say, Couldn't pay for?

While maintaining me, but not pushing me on this ration, at one year, if I am a heifer, I should weigh 600 pounds. At the current price, if I am good, of 18 cents equals \$108. If I am a steer, I should weigh 675 pounds at 23 cents equaling \$155.25 or average the two to equal \$131.62.

Sorry, I forgot a few things like labor and gas for calving time, checking cattle and feeding, AI expenses or per cent of cost of bull, the expected death loss of 10 per cent or more, vet calls, cow's pregnancy check, insurance, bangs vaccination, mowing hay, bucking, stacking, stack moving, grinding hay, electricity to pump and heat water, repair and upkeep of bunks, fences and sheds, baling and hauling straw, manure hauling, the investment and repair of machinery involved.

Would you tell me again what you really said the difference was?

Mrs. ROBERT PFEIL.

HARROLD.

A NEW APPROACH TO HEALTH: BEYOND NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that one of the most important issues the 94th Congress will have to come to grips with is that of national health insurance. There is a basic human right to adequate health care, and we must move swiftly to guarantee that that right is more than rhetorical affirmation.

The House Ways and Means Committee has already taken an important step in the right direction, with the selection of Congressman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI to head its Health Insurance and Medicare Subcommittee. I look forward to working with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI to fashion thoughtful and comprehensive legislation in this most vital area.

Many of the concepts which I believe important in mapping our policy direction in this field are set forth in a speech I was privileged to deliver last month at a seminar on public policy for health sponsored by the University of Hawaii's School of Public Health, chaired by its most able and resourceful dean, Dr. Jerrold Michael.

In order to contribute to the dialog on the country's health care system, I am submitting for my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the text of my speech:

THE VIEW FROM WASHINGTON: CURRENT FEDERAL HEALTH POLICY AND THE OUTLOOK FOR THE 94TH CONGRESS

(By Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA)

The story frequently told in Washington at this time of the year concerns Senator Theodore Greene, who as a new member of Congress used to have the reputation of attending every social function to which he was invited. He kept a black pocket date book and would check off each function as he attended one after another. On one occasion, Senator Hubert Humphrey spotted him at a corner table lamp, thumbing through the familiar black book, and asked, "Well, Senator, you trying to find out where you're going to next?" "Hell, no," Senator Greene replied "I'm trying to find out where I am right now."

And the mythical Indian Thunderbird, it is said, used to fly backwards because it wanted to see where it had been but didn't give a damn where it was going.

By reading newspaper accounts of what your Federal Government is doing in the Nation's Capitol, some of you may be wondering if any one, from the President on down, knows where we are as a Nation, or in which direction we are headed.

Like the Thunderbird, we can at least see where we have been. Although the scene of the past year certainly has not been a pretty one, we can catch glimpses of encouraging signs—signs which may not only indicate where we are, but which may also point in the direction in which we are headed.

So putting to use that gift of Janus, let us see what has happened in the past and what might lie in the future for us in the area of our special interest—health care policy for our Nation's people.

There is a great tendency, especially at the beginning of a new Congress, to characterize a particular subject of Congressional concern by making out two lists: one, a list of bills passed in the previous Congress, and two, a list of bills the new Congress can be expected to pass. Such lists do serve useful purposes, but, I believe, in the case of health policy, we must do more than that. So while I intend to refer to specific pieces of legislation, both past and future, the references, hopefully, will be related to the theme I will be trying to develop: That health, including but not limited to health care, should be—and must be—a matter of National concern and policy.

To place this discussion in the proper context, we must initially recognize what may be the major political transition of the past few years: the shift of power away from the President to the Congress in the National policy process. This represents a long overdue reversal of trend, triggered primarily by Watergate and its related events.

Prior to Watergate, since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, at the same time that the Federal Government was assuming a much larger role vis a vis states and localities, power at the national level had been flowing from Congress to the President. Although briefly slowed down during the eight years of the Eisenhower Administration, this trend was sharply accelerated during the Kennedy-Johnson years. The gravitation of power to the Executive prompted bold social experiments inspired by Presidential dreams of greatness and history-making.

The concept of the so-called "Great Society," fostered during the Johnson Administration, happily focused on health as a major national objective.

The passage of Medicare early in the Johnson Administration was the first attempt by the Federal government to assure health services to a large civilian population. It marked the conversion point in Federal involvement in personal health services—from a benign (and fairly unimportant) participant in the promotion of specified health services and limited research, to an instant major purchaser of services. Federal health expenditures of all kinds rose from \$5 billion in 1965, to about \$32 billion in fiscal year 1975. Hawaii's share in this fiscal year runs up to about \$62 million. The entrance of the Federal government into the medical marketplace has altered the market in ways which we are only now beginning to comprehend.

Medicare was followed by Medicaid and by other health programs, including new Federal programs to support the training of health professionals. In almost geometric progression the federal share of the American health dollar has become the largest share. About 26% of personal health care expenditures in America today are federal expenditures, more than double the figure of ten years ago.

In any market, a single purchaser who outbuys all others has the power to shape the behavior of the suppliers. This is an important fact to which it will be necessary to return later in this discussion.

Paradoxically, at the same time that Lyndon Johnson was building the power of the presidency to unprecedented levels, he was also dispersing power to a new constituency, previously excluded from key decision making processes. The Community Action Program, through its emphasis on Partnership for Health, brought consumers into a major policy role in the health planning process and elevated the American democratic idea of participatory democracy to new heights. The unprecedented programs of the Great Society vested individuals in grassroots organizations and groups with the power to make decisions which affected their own lives.

Thus, there was a new equation of power.

one which involved two major concentrations, the President and the grassroots communities. Had presidents not abused the power, this shifted balance might have remained as a new basic structure for decision making. However, as we are regretfully aware, presidential abuse of power created a need for drastic readjustment.

This readjustment was dramatically accomplished to a large degree by three major achievements of the 93rd Congress. They are the War Powers Act, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, and the Congressional pursuit of Watergate misdeeds, all of which have reduced the President's powers vis a vis the Congress.

In the framework of a new balance of power which combines the complementary forces of a life-sized, not larger-than-life, presidency; a strengthened Congress; State and local governments with the authority to pursue important policies; and citizen participation in every local decision, we can look more sharply at what the 93rd Congress did, and the outlook for the 94th.

Undoubtedly the most important health legislation enacted by the 93rd Congress is the Health Policy and Planning Act. This new law will reorganize Comprehensive Health Planning, Regional Medical Programs and Hill-Burton, in a way designed to increase the effectiveness of these established programs in meeting the new needs now being recognized. This reorganization effort reveals a recognition on the part of Congress of the new balance of power which has been struck, and its willingness to relinquish as much Federal control over local health activities as possible without jeopardizing the program itself. Hopefully, decisions will be made by local provider and consumer groups and designated State agencies, and the process of developing local health plans, certifying services and facilities for need, and cooperating with local PSRO's—provider controls—will be better advanced under the new law.

The underlying principle of this new legislation is to limit the Federal role to the making of broad policies for health promotion.

Let me add a personal note at this point. Many of you in this room have been instrumental in assuring passage of this bill—do not lose your momentum in Hawaii. Now is the time to develop your new planning structures for our state. Now is the time to shape rather than await the future.

Looking now to the future, the 94th Congress promises to be an activist Congress, one that will clear from the agenda many items of long standing.

To begin with, the new 94th Congress will wind up some of the unfinished business of the old Congress. In the last days of the 1974 session, Congress passed legislation to extend and revise Family Planning programs, Community Mental Health Centers, Neighborhood Health Centers and other important local health services. Regrettably this bill was vetoed by President Ford, who seems bent on going down in history as the most vetoing President. The new Congress convening tomorrow can be expected to pass substitute legislation to correct this presidential error in very short order.

The 94th Congress will also pass health manpower legislation to replace the measures which, though passed by both House and Senate, ended up deadlocked in conference. The most important and controversial feature of the health manpower bills in the last Congress were provisions aimed at assuring adequate supplies of health manpower to every community in America. This feature recognizes the right of every individual to have access to health services. It will undoubtedly be retained in some form in the legislation the 94th Congress will enact.

The most controversial of all of the health issues which will be considered by the new Congress in the next few months will no doubt be National Health Insurance. This is not only a proposal whose time has come, but one which has also withstood the ravages of time, maturing and mellowing along the way. As originally proposed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, National Health Insurance would have given every American the right to acquire medical services as needed. Every other President since Roosevelt has endorsed the concept of national health insurance and has added embellishments to the basic idea. So many approaches to national health insurance are possible that more than 20 versions were introduced in the 93rd Congress.

National health insurance should be aimed at one single goal. This goal must be to guarantee that every single individual's right to health is not denied by any external factor, such as geographic remoteness or lack of ability to pay.

We are indeed fortunate here in Hawaii to enjoy unparalleled medical coverage of the population. Even here, however, there are gaps in coverage, and individuals are unable to acquire the services they require.

A first objective for any program of national health insurance, therefore, must be to guarantee to all persons the services which are now being provided only to some individuals. This must be done with no diminution of the quality or availability of the services which some now receive. The objective—an objective which we can reach—must be to raise the lowest levels of service so that they are equal to the best.

This is what the National Health Security Act would do. It would provide a basic guarantee to every person in the United States that there will be no denial of medical services on account of lack of ability to pay. A guarantee of medical services will be a milestone toward guaranteeing health as a right of every American. By bringing the services of physicians and other providers of basic care within the economic reach of everyone—essentially by reorganizing the setting in which these services are provided—the National Health Security Act will bring to fruition an American dream that has been ignored for far too long.

As can be expected in any new and extensive program, there will no doubt be shortcomings and pitfalls. We will need to guard against lowering the quality of care being delivered, as the quantity of delivery increases. We will need to guard against overutilization. We will need to cope with the potentially inflationary effects of imposing major new demands on an already strained system. These are problems which will be the subject of intense Congressional scrutiny. But, if I may make a prediction, after all is said and done, the 94th Congress will enact legislation very much like the proposed National Health Security Act and take a giant step toward assuring every American the basic right to health care.

Momentous as this step promises to be, I would like to suggest to you today that, even now, we must look beyond the enactment of national health insurance.

Even now, we know that adding medical services beyond a certain quantity—perhaps a quantity we have already reached—does not raise the level of health in a community. In other words, as some insurance commercials keep reminding us, there is more to health than paying bills for health care, or providing that health care.

It will not be enough simply to provide quality treatment to every victim of injury and disease. Such treatment can be given only after the suffering has begun, and the outcome is never certain. It is too wasteful

and foolish to let our scarce health resources be expended in this fashion.

There are many diseases and conditions which we have the knowledge to prevent. Once we have met the challenge of providing medical services adequately and equitably, it will be possible to devote greater energies toward finding policies, programs and methods which will promote and protect normal growth and development, instead of concentrating on repairing the failures of our system to support health.

A new approach to health must prevail. Health must be recognized as a human right, and new organizational, professional and service models must be created to promote it. An integrated network of services which combines the domains of nutritionists, environmentalists, immunologists, family planners, community mental health workers and others must be developed. An array of services must be made available in every neighborhood, every community, and every town which will foster and promote normal growth and development. The goal of conquering disease by prevention rather than cure must become universal. In the year that smallpox will finally be eliminated from the earth, it is timely to express this new health policy.

The new organizations which will be needed must employ newly trained professionals to provide services which do not yet exist. These services will have to be organized and directed on the local level, and the crucial decisions will have to be made by the consumers of these services, working in partnership with providers from the whole health service spectrum. The new programs must emphasize the importance of prevention as a health concept and stress health, rather than medicine.

Services will have to be provided by community people, who have the training and the knowledge to move freely about in their own communities, helping individuals to promote and protect their own health. These new professionals should be capable of providing basic repair services as well as referrals to physicians for illness and injury, but their main efforts would be directed at minimizing the incidents requiring these services.

We know that nutrition, environment, exercise and personal habits are closely related to maintaining a good state of health. We know also that smoking, alcohol, and other kinds of substance abuse cause degeneration of health. There is no reason why we cannot begin to identify the kinds of services which are needed in local communities to protect health, and methods to deliver these services and start training people to bring these services to their own home communities. For example, an important health measure enacted last year was the Safe Drinking Water Act, which sets up the state as the primary enforcement agency of national water quality standards.

I was extremely pleased to learn only a few weeks ago of a five-year "Forward Plan for Health," formulated by HEW and "leaked" to the Washington Post, which places major emphasis on prevention, rather than cure. The plan would shift the vehicle for health delivery more toward the local level, while the Federal Government would help by assuring pure drinking water, promoting inoculations of groups susceptible to diseases for which effective vaccines are available, reducing occupational health hazards, and funding more basic health research.

If this conference is to serve as a meaningful forward thrust in the area of its special interest, we must here and now fully commit ourselves to the concept that good health is a basic human right.

We must then make long range plans consistent with this basic right, and we must include as many as possible within the plan-

ning process. This is the challenge that awaits us—be we health professional, legislator or private citizen.

Thank you.

**CLEAN AIR WILL REQUIRE BOTH
STRINGENT EMISSION STAND-
ARDS AND LAND USE AND TRANS-
PORTATION CONTROLS**

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we have struggled with the proposals to clean up our presently unhealthy air from the pollutants our modern technology produces, we find ourselves increasingly confronted with hard choices. We wish to increase employment to keep up with the growing work force. We wish to increase energy supplies to avoid energy shortages. And we wish to have a long and healthy, as well as a satisfying, life. Air pollution jeopardizes this last goal very directly by deteriorating our health. Yet increased employment, which is based on even faster climbing energy consumption rates, to produce goods that produce even more pollution, is detrimental to our entire way of life.

We do not have to employ people in jobs that continue this cycle. People could be employed in labor-intensive industries, such as insulating homes, making and retrofitting solar heating panels, and the like, instead of producing automobiles that waste valuable resources, destroy communities, require vast amounts of scarce oil to operate, as well as injure and kill people. If we addressed this issue head on, and dealt with it now, we would avoid the larger problems that are inevitable if we pursue the ways of the past.

I discussed a few weeks ago the President's proposal to freeze auto emission standards, instead of cleaning up the automobile exhaust, as now required by law. Quite simply, we cannot afford to allow the excess pollution the President is urging, to enter the air we must breathe.

But what if we do succeed in cleaning up the automobile to the degree required by law? Will we then have clean air?

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we will not. Some years ago a number of elected officials, including myself, said that the internal combustion engine must be banned from our urban centers. We introduced legislation to do this, but the Congress, in its wisdom, chose to require maximum emission standards for each vehicle. These emission standards have been met by a variety of engine technologies, mostly the internal combustion engine with modifications, and if all autos in the United States meet the standards currently required by law, we would still have harmful concentrations of air pollution.

This pollution would exist, because of the number of automobiles that exist, even though each one is cleaner, because of the increased miles each auto is traveling, and because of other sources of air pollution. We did not ban the internal combustion engine, but we still have to reduce its use.

This brings me to a subject that I am reluctant to raise, and that is the need for land use and transportation controls. The Environmental Protection Agency has, by court order since they, too, were reluctant, promulgated regulations dealing with land use and transportation controls. The Clean Air Act Amendments, which many Members of this body voted for, required these tools of pollution be used when necessary. They are necessary now.

Many of my colleagues have decided that this legislative authority must be repealed. I must disagree. I will elaborate on my objections in the near future, and at appropriate congressional hearings, but at this time I do wish to advise my friends to tread softly on this issue. It is easy to oppose an arbitrary regulation or a poorly drafted one. But the need for land use and transportation controls as part of the overall efforts to clean up the air is neither.

Mr. Speaker, the February 3 issue of the Los Angeles Times had an article entitled "Air Quality in Basin Deteriorated in '74," and I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

**AIR QUALITY IN BASIN DETERIORATED IN 1974—
OXIDANT LEVELS UP IN SIX-COUNTY AREA;
SETBACK ENDS 2 YEARS OF IMPROVEMENT**

(By Larry Pryor)

Data collected by the state Air Resources Board indicates that air quality in the South Coast Air Basin deteriorated during 1974, almost equaling levels not reached since 1971.

In particular, levels of oxidant, the principal constituent of smog, escalated noticeably in the eastern part of the six-county basin, hitting an average hourly peak in Upland of .63 parts per million (ppm), the highest hourly peak since 1970.

However, air quality analysts are unwilling to say yet whether 1974 represents a step backwards in the effort to control smog.

"We can't say things are getting worse," said Jack Paskind, head of air quality monitoring for the ARB. "Compared to 5 years ago, it's better."

The yearly maximum hourly average for oxidant dropped from 11.3 parts per hundred million in 1967 to 8.0 in 1973, then edged up to 8.7 in 1974.

But it is too early, Paskind said, to determine whether the 1974 readings represent adverse weather conditions or a new upward trend in smog readings.

"The only way to get a feel for 1974 will be in 1975 or '76 when we see what the three-year averages look like," he said.

Nevertheless, ARB staff members said that 1974 smog conditions in the basin were definitely worse than the two previous years, which were meteorologically favorable.

In 1973, during the heavy smog months of July, August and September, oxidant readings of .20 ppm were equalled or exceeded on 76 days in the basin. This climbed to 84 days in 1974.

The average oxidant peaks during those three months rose from .47 ppm in 1973 to .51 ppm in 1974. At Upland, the hardest hit area in the basin, the average oxidant level for the three months rose from .28 ppm to .31 ppm.

Within Los Angeles County, the days on which the state standard for total oxidant (a 1-hour average of .16 ppm) was equalled or exceeded rose from 185 in 1973 to 215 in 1974, almost equaling the 1971 total of 218 days.

Nevertheless, this represented an improvement over the peaks of 322 days reached in 1958 and 271 days in 1966.

Last month the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District interpreted data gathered within the county as confirmation of a "continued downward trend (in smog readings) that began in the late 1960s."

In a formal announcement, the APCD said that this "improving trend in 1974" confirmed earlier district projections that air quality standards will be met in the early 1980s.

"Recent improvements in air quality are the result of better emission control systems on new motor vehicles. Air quality will gradually continue to improve each year as later model and better controlled motor vehicles comprise an increasing percentage of the total vehicle population," said county air pollution control officer Robert G. Lunche.

But Lunche's optimism was not shared by air quality analysts at either the state or federal level. The national standard for oxidant would allow an hourly average of .08 ppm to be exceeded only one day a year.

"By the looks of things, they will get to the carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen standards in the 80s, but not get to the (.08) 1 hour per year of oxidant in the South Coast Air Basin," said Paskind of the state ARB.

The persistence of oxidant measurements, despite tighter motor vehicle controls, raises the possibility of whether national air quality standards for oxidants can ever be reached in the basin.

Air specialists at the state level estimate that natural emissions of hydrocarbons from oil and gas fields underlying the basin may be sufficient to cause the federal standard to be exceeded.

The federal Environmental Protection Agency estimated that a 90% decrease in hydrocarbons would be required to achieve the oxidant standard in the basin, since hydrocarbons are a prime ingredient for the creation of oxidant.

However, the ARB estimates that 15% of the hydrocarbons emitted in the basin come from natural sources and are uncontrollable.

Recognition of this "background" problem may eventually lead to the South Coast Air Basin being exempted in some manner from meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for oxidant.

The problem with such an exemption, however, is that the standard is based on health effects, particularly on the effect of oxidant on the young, the aged and the ill.

After an extensive review, the National Academy of Science last year affirmed the medical basis for the standards, even though public officials charged with meeting the standards question whether they are attainable.

This puts public officials, at all levels of government, in a difficult position, since a relaxation of the oxidant standard might mean that some segment of the population would suffer. "It's a question of who's health are you going to write off," said one attorney familiar with the federal Clean Air Act.

It was suggested, not entirely in jest, at a recent meeting on air pollution control strategy that billboards might be erected in the South Coast Air Basin stating that this area is one place in the country where public health standards cannot be met.

"This is a problem residents of the South Coast Air Basin themselves will have to decide," one participant said.

"When natural background air quality exceeds the standards, one might want to be

cautious about moving to that area," said Leon Billings, an aide to Sen. Edmund Muskie (D-Me.), who will be holding hearings on revisions to the Clean Air Act later this year.

"The Environmental Protection Agency is good, but not that good," Billings said.

At the meeting, sponsored in Oakland by the California League of Cities, Billings suggested that if high oxidant background levels could be proved, which EPA is not yet ready to concede, then the South Coast Air Basin might be placed on some sort of variance, taking natural emissions into account.

Such a variance, he said, could be accomplished administratively, without having to revise the act. "The law is flexible enough to revise an air quality standard to take background into account," Billings said.

If meeting the national standards by 1977 as required by the act proves totally unreasonable for Southern California, as most air quality experts expect, Billings said that counties and industries within the air basin could be placed on compliance schedules.

This would require emissions from mobile and industrial sources to be reduced according to a clearly defined time schedule. Failure to meet the deadlines could result in civil and criminal penalties.

This approach has the advantage of retaining the national standard for oxidant but stretching out ways to reach the standard over a realistic but effective time period, Billings said.

A failure by local governments to act in good faith to reduce emissions during this time period, principally through tighter land use controls, could result in a "cutoff of water pollution control funds and a few other goodies we could throw in," Billings said.

The biggest problem facing local government in attaining better air quality, according to top ARB and EPA officials attending conference, is that any steps taken to relax controls on automobiles means a greater burden on land use controls to reduce vehicle traffic.

Whatever concessions that are made to the auto industry at the federal level, in other words, could put local officials in an increasingly untenable position as they are required to scale down or cut off growth in their communities or face federal penalties.

FEDERAL FIREARMS CONTROL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to announce that the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Committee on the Judiciary will conduct the first of a series of comprehensive hearings on the subject of Federal firearms control immediately after the coming recess. During this initial phase, Members of Congress will be given an opportunity to express their opinions on this timely and serious problem; in subsequent hearings, representatives of organizations and the general public will be given an opportunity to be heard on this issue.

The hearings will be held on Tuesday, February 18, in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building, and on Thursday, February 20, in 2226 Rayburn House Office Building. Both hearings will begin at 10 a.m. Those Members wishing to testify

or to submit a statement for the RECORD should address their requests to the House Committee on the Judiciary, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

THE SENIOR AIDES PROGRAM

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the experience and maturity that senior citizens lend to community service projects constitutes an invaluable resource for our Nation. Each town and city suffers the grievous ill of men and women in need crying out to one another for help and understanding.

Senior citizens, active in the Senior Aides program have found just such a "calling" in the Fifth District of Connecticut. I cannot help but marvel at the contribution Connecticut seniors have made to institutions caring for the mentally retarded, schools serving young boys and girls and adults with learning disabilities and hospitals caring for individuals with physical handicaps. Letters have flooded my office from senior citizens unwilling to give up the emotional and psychological boost the program provides and likewise, from institutions and individuals who have benefited from the serious commitment seniors have pledged to make life better for their neighbors.

The program, funded under title IX of the Older Americans Act authorized \$12 million in fiscal year 1975 to operate Senior Aides. Presently, five national organizations or "contractors" administer the program on the local level: First, the National Retired Teachers Association; second, the National Council on Aging; third, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; fourth, the National Council of Senior Citizens; and fifth, the National Farmers Association Green Thumb Project. The project is generally part of the Office of National Programs in the Department of Labor.

Contacting the Department of Labor dredges to the fore the long struggle waged during the last year to extend the program and authorize funds. The administration called for the careful annihilation of Senior Aides, claiming that the needs of American seniors were fractured and inestimable by a national organization. Instead, the executive branch proposed that as a way to trim the budget, the programs funded under title IX cease and desist and the local grantees of revenue sharing—any unit with a population exceeding 100,000—assume the responsibility if they so desired.

Congress reacted by proposing a \$10 million authorization on the House side and \$20 million on the Senate side. The conference committee, settling for the current \$12 million, preserved the program and provided a way for the continued useful integration of senior citizens into society. Congress legitimized public service jobs for seniors on a national scale. The jobs that the program

funded enhanced the dignity of American seniors and proved that they have a valuable contribution to make to American communities.

In response to the glowing letters of commendation for past performance and anxiety for the coming fiscal year, I have contacted the Department of Labor requesting a continuation of the program. I urge my colleagues to take notice of this serious threat to a vital and talented segment of our population. The wisdom and maturity of experience may temper the impatience and exuberance of youth and lead us to the practical, realistic, and workable solutions to the "people" crises cropping up in our cities and towns each day. How better can we utilize talent than to provide individual help and counseling for those individuals with special problems and to provide a ready work force with all the needed expertise?

Recognizing the impossibility of categorizing an individual over 60 years as useless to society and relegated to either a life of ease and aimlessness or life of hardship and poverty, I have also examined the emergency job programs for senior citizens involvement. Section 701 provides for the inclusion of "part-time work for individuals who are unable because of age, handicap, or other factors to work full time." Further inspection revealed that this new law may provide funds for seniors who are unemployed.

Each area that meets the population requirement of a grantee should seriously consider unemployed seniors for such jobs. We must avoid the waste of human resource that older citizens provide and capitalize on their experience in the next 2 years. We should call on them for a wellspring of ideas, and in turn, I hope we will be able to ease their continued and meaningful integration into society.

TRUTH ABOUT OUR ECONOMY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Ford's economic message is an open and frank assessment of America's economic difficulties. The President has concluded, quite wisely I believe, that the American people deserve and need to know the truth about our economy, regardless of how depressing the truth may be.

The President believes that it is up to Government to exercise unprecedented fiscal discipline with regard to spending policies. This will require a considerable degree of courage on the part of Members of Congress. For we have become accustomed to having just about anything we want.

Another major aspect of the President's analysis is the importance of the private sector to do what it can to stimulate production and restore consumer confidence. Many private businesses and industries have already responded to the President's call for help. They are initiating special programs involving cash re-

bates aimed at getting people to purchase surplus goods.

One such program has been instituted by the Apache Corp. of Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Raymond Plank, the president of Apache, recently wrote to me to explain his program with the expressed hope that others in the private sector will emulate his effort. The Apache program provides cash incentives to the first 10 percent of the employees who purchase new American-built automobiles or major appliances.

Mr. Plank writes:

We recognize that governmental action is urgently needed, but, if the private sector can also be sufficiently innovative, our initiatives could supplement yours in important ways.

I wholeheartedly concur with this analysis and applaud this gentleman's concern and initiative—as well as the many other businessmen like him who are trying to help cure our economic problems.

We can get the economy back on a healthy course—but only if Government, business and the consumer all work together. It is my hope also that the private sector will join the national effort to restore our economy's health.

CHINESE NEW YEAR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, February 11 marks the beginning of the Chinese New Year. It is the "Year of the Hare"—4673. I would like to take a few moments to wish my constituents and the 435,000 persons of Chinese ancestry in the United States a most joyous holiday.

This group's relatively small proportion of the population is no indication of the intensity and energy with which they celebrate their New Year and its spectacular Dragon Parade.

Yuan Tan, the Chinese New Year, traditionally falls on the first new Moon after the Sun has left the sign of Capricorn and entered Aquarius. In non-Zodiac terms, this places it between January 21 and February 19, marking a time when the great cold of winter is receding and when the springtime awakening of the Earth is expected. Men close their accounts with the old year to face the new one with fresh spirit.

The 14-day celebration is not simply a time of noise and light, it is dominated by symbols of the Taoist religion, primarily the Yang forces putting to rout the evil spirits which have accumulated through the year. Behind all the boisterous merrymaking is a series of traditional rituals which symbolize the Chinese concept of the multiplicity of man's ties with, and responsibilities to, the seen and unseen world.

Mr. Speaker, Chinese New Year is a very special time. A rich picture passes before our eyes, a vision of traditional China, bound to strict rules and values, but bursting with life within these restraints.

Certainly all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to those of Chinese ancestry for allowing us to join in their celebration and to experience the rich pageantry of this traditional holiday.

RETIRED OFFICER, VETERAN OF VIETNAM, OBSERVES SOUTHEAST ASIA FLIGHT

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a retired naval officer who has served in Vietnam both as an officer and a civilian, has furnished me with a copy of a letter he has written to the President outlining views he has gained as an on-the-spot observer of events in that tragedy-ridden region. He is Capt. John McCormick, U.S. Navy, retired, of Coronado, Calif. Because his views are so pertinent, and so directly concerned with events and proposals that face us today, I feel that they should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress who will be asked to act upon legislation to provide additional funds for Vietnam and Cambodia. The letter follows:

CORONADO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1975.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing this letter to express my views on the Vietnam situation and I hope that whoever on your staff opens this letter thinks it important enough to see that you get to read it, albeit a bit lengthy.

To introduce myself so you will know I am no kook and am not usually given to writing such letters—I am a retired U.S. Navy Captain, having served my country for 35 years (1931–1966), a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and one of three brothers who, between us, served 94 years in the U.S. Military: my eldest brother James, 34 yrs. U.S. Navy, retiring as a Rear Admiral; my next brother, Schuyler, 25 yrs. U.S. Marines, retiring as a Col. My oldest son, John, Jr., served as an Ensign, USNR, voluntarily with the Marines in Vietnam, where he was killed at Quang Tri in 1967. I write the above, not for sympathy, but to prove that I am a dedicated American and as a patriot am concerned about what has happened and is happening in Vietnam today.

In March, 1974, I was offered and accepted a job as a Civil Servant, GS 14, with the Defense Attache's Office (DAO) in Saigon. Although I did not solicit this job I took it because I thought I might be able to help the South Vietnamese in a small way to attain self efficiency. Upon reporting for duty I was assigned as Chief of the Technical Section, Navy Division, DAO. I was astounded at the magnitude of the DAO complex and the large numbers of useless personnel (my opinion) attached to the DAO. This is not to say that there were not some dedicated workers who were endeavoring to help the South Vietnamese. My group spent most of our time putting out "Fire Drills," generated by the General (USA) or some of his high ranking officers—most of these fire drills were not helping the VN in their war efforts.

I worked out of a small building designated as the Vietnamese Navy Technical Bureau, headed by a very competent and dedicated VN Navy Captain Du (pronounced YOU). Capt. Du was my counterpart and as

such I got to know him pretty well. Through various sources I found out that he was on the VN Navy Admiral's "----- list" and that Adm. Chon was trying to frame him, demote him and ultimately get rid of him. The real reason for Capt. Du being in disfavor was that he was one of the few honest officers who had at one time tried to stop the "kickback" system existent amongst the VN Hierarchy. This can be checked out by a Commander Herb Wood, USN, whom I believe is now serving in the Washington area.

I sincerely believe that the real reason that the So. Vietnamese cannot defeat the VC and No. Vietnamese is due to the corruption of the Thieu government and most of his high ranking officers. The "flower soldier" system which US Ambassador Martin will probably tell you has been eliminated is very much in existence. In case you are not familiar with the term "flower soldier"—this is a person whose name appears on the military roles, but through a private agreement with the ranking officers he is permitted to continue his work as a civilian while his military pay is pocketed by the brass.

During the VC push on DaNang in August I asked my friend, Capt. Du why the South Vietnamese with supposedly a million troops under arms could not lick 20 to 30,000 North Vietnamese. His reply—DaNang was being defended by regional farmers with no desire to fight and flower soldiers who didn't exist. He said he had just spoken to a classmate of his who headed the VN Navy Seals, a tough fighting unit in DaNang. He had sent them out into VC territory around DaNang to fight the VC. The Province Chief had promised them food rations (which they never received). They captured a sampan loaded with supplies for the VC. When they brought it back to DaNang the owner complained to the Province Chief who then reprimanded the Seals. Obviously the Province Chief was in on the take.

There is very little if any motivation to fight amongst most of the South Vietnamese. An enlisted man can buy his way out of a transfer to a dangerous area if he can come up with sufficient money. This money is then put in the pot, collected by the adjutant, and then divided up amongst the higher brass.

If you have never read W. J. Lederer's book, *Our Own Worst Enemy* I recommend you do so. It was written in 1968 and much of its contents is still pertinent. Of course the black market is very prevalent—a blind person could not miss it. I remember my son writing that even he had to buy some of his supplies on the black market.

Getting back to present day Vietnam I'm sure there are multitudes of reports flowing into your hopper from the U.S. Embassy and the U.S. Military. I know the South Vietnamese are hurting from a shortage of ammo. Whether they use the ammo they have wisely or not I am not qualified to say, although I have heard inferences from VN Navy Officers that their Army shoot at a lot of imaginary targets to make people think they are fighting the enemy.

To me this Vietnam War has been the biggest debacle ever foisted off on the American public. I cannot understand a government forcing our armed forces to fight a defensive war with their hands literally "tied behind their backs". I cannot understand a government with supposedly intelligent leaders not studying history and learning lessons from it. Time and time again I have heard the expression, "This is their country—we must do it their way (and condone their corruption)". This makes me want to retch. When we were suckered into this Vietnam War we *did not* have to condone the corruption. Instead we pussyfooted around playing into the hands of the Communists. We lost 50,000 fine young men and an even worse tragedy, was the hundreds of thousands of young men either physically or mentally maimed—

this due to a pussyfooting government which was either too cowardly to fight an offensive war to win or was very badly misinformed by our representatives in Vietnam.

Without dealing further with our past mistakes, Mr. President, I think it is high time that our government stop playing political football with the American people. Since you are a Republican and the majority of Congress is Democratic I realize you have a problem. I believe you to be an honest and sincere man, which is more than I can say for some of the Congress. Since it is doubtful that you would ever see this letter unless I take an unusual step I am sending copies of this letter to members of Congress in hopes that at least one of them will pass it on to you personally.

I agree with you that South Vietnam is in dire danger of collapsing. However, just giving them more money is not the answer. As long as the Thieu government and the present corrupt military leaders are in control nothing can save this poor country from falling to the Communists. The people know their leaders are corrupt and have no will or motivation to fight. (It might be of interest to note that the high ranking officers are seldom found in the danger zones). I have heard it said many times, "Oh, but it's an Oriental way of life to be corrupt". I have had a fair number of year's experience dealing with Orientals and I find them in general more honest than Caucasians.

This letter has been too long but I had to get it off my chest. I realize that criticism should be constructive. I believe it is necessary to supply ammo to the South Vietnamese ASAP, but I would keep it under American surveillance so that it could not be sold to the VC and that controls be instituted to keep it from being wasted. Then I think the South Vietnamese Government should be told in no uncertain terms to clean house or we pull out completely and immediately. It should not be too difficult to determine which government and military officials are corrupt. Most of them have bought villas and properties with OUR monies and many have "out of the country" bank accounts. You don't do these things on the pay of VN military officers.

I thank God that I am an American free to write such a letter as this, and pray that God will continue to grant us his favors. Good luck, and may God bless you in your efforts to pull this country out of the mire.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. MCCORMICK,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Retired.

A SALUTE TO RIVERSIDE, ILL.

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the village of Riverside is celebrating this year the 100th anniversary of its founding, only 1 year prior to the 200th birthday of our great Nation. In fitting tribute to the history of Riverside, Mrs. Valerie Kunz, a columnist for the Citizen newspaper, which serves Riverside and a number of other suburban communities west of the city of Chicago, has prepared a column for publication in the Citizen which details the history of Riverside.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include her article, entitled "A Salute to Riverside," in the RECORD.

A SALUTE TO RIVERSIDE, ILL.

(By Valerie Kunz)

Lying seven miles to the west of the city of Chicago, in the shadows of the skyscrapers, the village of Riverside, Illinois, nestles on the banks of the Des Plaines River, on the high ridge that runs west from Lake Michigan.

This century old village, conceived by an investment syndicate in the 19th century headed by Emery E. Childs of New York, was executed by the genius and determination of Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux into a masterpiece of aesthetic urban planning which, even today, has few rivals. Thus the creation of America's first successful planned suburb, purely residential in character, offered to the affluent of the burgeoning city of Chicago an escape from squalor to the ease and comfort of healthful suburban living.

The area destined to become Riverside was first visited by white men in the year 1634 by Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet who had explored as far south as Saint Louis and were making their way back to Green Bay. Friendly Indians spoke of a portage that would have many miles of travel. The area was high and contained many springs around the river. Marquette and Jolliet found the area to be the home of a prosperous Indian camp, without mosquitoes and with good game. It was well protected by nature against enemies.

In 1827 a federal grant was given to the State of Illinois to aid in the construction of a canal at the portage, to implement travel from Chicago to the Mississippi, and in 1833 the Indians signed an agreement giving up their rights to five million acres of land in Illinois and Michigan. The canal lies about a mile south of the village.

Further impetus to the settlement of the area was the completion in 1863 of the double track from Chicago west to the Des Plaines River by the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad.

Spurred on by the transportation developments in the area, a Chicago businessman and city treasurer began to buy tracts of land along the Des Plaines River. When his holdings reached more than a thousand acres, he built a private estate complete with racing track, livestock farm, and horse stables. As the owner of the famed Sherman House Hotel, David Gage entertained important Chicago and internationally known figures at his "Riverside Farm", destined to become the "Riverside" of Olmsted and Vaux.

Gage sold his farm to the investment syndicate, and Olmsted and Vaux were retained to design a proper setting for the model community which was calculated to return to the investment company owner around seven million dollars in profits.

Although many problems beset the Riverside Improvement Company, Olmsted and Vaux persisted in their plan, designing the village in a curvilinear fashion, using the river as a focus and refusing to disturb the topography of the region.

They created a park with depressed carliageways, which were well drained, drilled wells for an adequate water supply which surprisingly turned out to have natural fluoride, most beneficial to the residents' dental health, installed gas lighting which exists even today, and installed a proper sewage system which still exists, with improvements. Each residence site was to be at least ten feet above the high water mark of the Des Plaines River. The trees and shrubs were placed to add to the aesthetic value of the park-like setting, with at least two trees specified on the parkways for each residence. Trees and shrubbery already growing on the site were saved, if possible.

The "Chicago Tribune" of Sunday, May 9, 1869 reports a group of 500 of Chicago's most prominent citizens and their families travel-

ling by train in ten Pullman dining, drawing and saloon cars furnished by George Pullman himself, with David Gage as host, to Gage's "Riverside Farm" site, and enjoying the hospitality of the farm, track and spa. A sales presentation of the amenities of the proposed village with its elegant villas and the great hotel planned as a center of recreation and social life for the entire Chicago area was made and the sales began.

Sales did not boom as expected in the beginning, however, but the Chicago Fire of 1871, which destroyed all of that vermin filled, pestilence ridden, jerry-built boomtown on the banks of the Chicago River and Lake Michigan proved to be the catalyst to the new suburb's success, and sales soared.

The Village of Riverside came into being in 1875, with the first election held on August 8 at the railroad depot, with 29 votes polled.

Like a proud dowager, the Village of Riverside has known high times and quiet times, but has always handled the period with dignity.

When, in the early 1900's, a number of the original large homes became vacant, the Village Board, then as now an elected, volunteer and unpaid group of citizens, passed ordinances prohibiting the establishment of nursing homes, boarding and rooming houses and private schools.

From time to time attempts have been made to change the original plans of the village as conceived by Olmsted and Vaux. Each has met with defeat, save for one instance when homes were built on a small section of the River. The village remains as planned, with 40% in parks and open lands for the enjoyment of those living in the village, and with a charming variety of homes, each set back from the winding roads, and having no grid-pattern layout as is usual in the case of most developments.

The famous and near famous have made their homes here and, indeed, each generation brings a new offering of those who appreciate living in this sylvan glen.

William LeBaron Jenney, the father of the modern skyscraper, built his home in Riverside and entertained international society lavishly. He designed the village water tower which exists and is functioning today, and which was given national historical landmark status in 1969. In 1969 the State of Illinois designated Riverside as a State Historical Landmark and in 1970 the entire Village was formally certified as a National Landmark—a fitting tribute to two of America's greatest landscape architects, Frederick Law Olmsted and his associate, Calvert Vaux.

Today as the village celebrates its Centennial throughout 1975, a renaissance is taking place. An awakening to the value of the huge old homes, with their vaulted ceilings, dance halls, and excellent structure placed on huge lots that are well landscaped and offer beautiful views, is once again attracting young families, many of them architects, who are restoring and refurbishing these mansions to their former glory and, many times, to a glory they never had before.

The parks and the parkways, still beautifully kept by the village, are an ecological attraction not found elsewhere. Property values are soaring and no house stays on the market for long, should the owners not have a relative to take it over.

Each day that passes is a lasting tribute to Olmsted, Vaux, and those who have steadfastly held their trust over a century.

Visitors to the Chicago area are invited to take a bicycle tour of the grand old town during this Centennial year, or to visit during Centennial Celebration July 27 through August 10, 1975. One caution, however; you may join the many visitors who decided to stay and you, too, might become a Riversider.

(NOTE.—A debt of gratitude is to be paid to Jeffrey R. M. Kunz, who researched and

wrote "At the Riverside" as his Honors Thesis submitted for graduation from the University of Wisconsin, 1971. Kunz, now a student at the University of Wisconsin Medical School, studied original records at the Library of Congress prior to writing his thesis.)

AUTO EMISSION CONTROLS

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the matter of automobile emission controls is a serious problem, in terms of its impact on the economy caused by lower gasoline mileage, the higher cost of cars with strict emission controls, and employment among auto workers.

The problem must be approached with an awareness of the several considerations involved, and a recognition that none of the choices available will be an easy way out.

The automobile accounts for about 40 percent of the oil consumed in the United States, so it is obvious that maximum fuel economy is desirable. But since the mid-sixties, automobile fuel economy has declined significantly. Four factors affect fuel economy: vehicle weight, power options, driving patterns, and emission controls.

The most significant of the four is vehicle weight. Both safety requirements and luxury options such as air conditioning have been pushing car weights up. Increases in car weights over the past 5 years have cost a fuel penalty of 6 to 7 percent.

Air-conditioning incurs a fuel penalty of between 9 and 20 percent, depending on the temperature and driving habits.

Automatic transmissions account for a 2- to 6-percent fuel penalty.

Emission controls in 1974 models reduce fuel economy by 5 to 15 percent compared to 1970 models, but most of this has been recovered in 1975 models through the use of the catalytic converter. Preliminary test data indicates that the 1975 models have an average fuel economy improvement of about 13 percent over 1974 models at the lower emission levels required by the 1975 interim emission standards. In other words, emission controls have meant at most a fuel economy penalty of 2 percent comparing 1975 with 1970 models.

The statutory emission standards for 1975 have already been pushed back to 1977. Further, a Federal district court ruling on January 28 abolished Environmental Protection Agency regulations on leaded gasoline scheduled to begin this year.

While these actions are not permanent solutions, they do allow time to dig further for workable answers with both investigation and debate of all the alternatives which are available to maximize auto fuel economy. The present delay of 1975 standards until 1977 is already providing us with time for tech-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nology and diplomacy to develop acceptable solutions which we all seek.

At this point, I think the wise course for Congress is to consider a further delay beyond 1977 next year, when we will have a more accurate picture of the alternatives available to us in deciding which avenue to pursue. If in 1976 we find that the Nation still cannot afford to implement the 1975 emission standards because of fuel penalties, then I will support the further delay of the 1975 standards beyond 1977.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACT OF 1975

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress took certain steps to open up the legislative process: it passed a long-needed campaign reform law and opened the doors of its committee rooms. This year the Democratic Caucus took several much-heralded steps along the same path.

Today I am pleased to join my colleagues, Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin and Representative TOM RAILSBACK of Illinois, in cosponsoring the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act of 1975 as another important step forward. It expresses my firm support of the principle that the people have a right to know the facts about those who seek to influence public policy. This principle guided me as a candidate in my campaign last fall. In electing me, the voters gave me a clear mandate to work, as their Congressman, for their right to an open Government.

Lobbyists play an important part in the legislative process. They promptly provide accurate and concise information on the range of issues with which the Congress must deal. However, both the Congress and the public must be able to determine quickly and easily the true source of the information being supplied.

It has been more than 30 years since Congress passed legislation requiring information about lobbying activities. The present law has proved inadequate, ineffective, and incapable of curbing lobbying abuses. The loopholes are wide, and there are no meaningful provisions for enforcement.

The new bill proposed does not in any way restrict lobbying activities. It simply requires lobbyists to identify themselves and their employers clearly, to disclose financial terms under which they are hired, and to disclose each aspect of the policymaking process which the lobbyist expects to seek to influence.

The legislation would apply to both executive and legislative branch lobbying and would be administered by the Federal Election Commission.

I urge strong bipartisan support for this next step toward a more open Government.

ADMINISTRATION REQUEST FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AMENDMENT

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, I am today introducing a bill "to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide the United States with the flexibility to carry out the national interest or humanitarian objectives of that act."

The text of the Executive communication from the Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the request and bill follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, D.C., January 30, 1975.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide the United States with the flexibility to carry out the national interest or humanitarian objectives of that Act".

The Department of Agriculture recommends that the draft bill be enacted.

The draft bill would amend the availability criteria for commodities which may be disposed of under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (familarly known as "Public Law 480").

At the present time the last sentence of section 401 provides that no commodities shall be available for disposition under this Act if such disposition would reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below that needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time of exportation of such commodity. The bill would add to this provision the clause "unless the Secretary determines that some part of the exportable supply should be used to carry out the national interest or humanitarian objectives of this Act".

The proposal is offered in furtherance of the request made in the President's address to the joint session of Congress on October 8, 1974, in which he stated that authority is needed to waive certain of the restrictions on the disposition of commodities under the Act based on national interest or humanitarian grounds. In times of temporary shortages it becomes essential that the food assistance program under Public Law 480 not be discontinued abruptly—particularly in cases where continuation of the program is needed for the foregoing objectives.

Such authority would be used sparingly, and only to meet needs of the highest priority. It would allow the United States to make a significant contribution toward alleviating human suffering and maintaining the economic stability of friendly foreign governments.

At the same time, use of this authority would have little impact on total supplies of any commodity, as quantities exported under Public Law 480 represent very small proportions of supply and total exports for most commodities. For example, under the Act exports of wheat, feed grains, and their products in fiscal year 1974 amounted to 4.9 and 2.5 percent of total exports for those commodities, respectively.

Enactment of the bill would not directly

result in increased budget outlays. Use of the authority provided by the bill would be made within the context of existing budget constraints.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation, and that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Acting Secretary.

H.R. 3033

A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide the United States with the flexibility to carry out the national interest or humanitarian objectives of that Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 401 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by striking the period and inserting a comma and the following: "unless the Secretary determines that some part of the exportable supply should be used to carry out the national interest or humanitarian objectives of this Act."

VERMONT GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S
UNANIMOUS ENDORSEMENT OF
DAIRY BILL

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified by the action taken on Tuesday, February 4, by the Vermont General Assembly. It unanimously passed a resolution calling for congressional enactment of a bill I am introducing today. The bill calls for a milk price support set at not less than 85 percent of parity with quarterly adjustments to insure that dairy farmers are not caught again in a vicious short term economic squeeze. The nature of the resolution's passage demonstrates the overwhelming sentiment of Vermonters, as well as the dedication of the general assembly.

I am proud to include this resolution in the RECORD:

JR-H14—JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO
MILK PRICES

Whereas, the price of fluid milk has dropped precipitously over the course of the nine month period from March to December, 1974, and

Whereas, the costs of items the dairy farmer must use to produce his product have risen dramatically, and

Whereas, the combined effects of these market disfunctions have forced many farms into bankruptcy and threaten countless others, and

Whereas, the Secretary of Agriculture's announced parity support floor of 80 percent is far short of what is desperately needed, and will become continually more inadequate without quarterly adjustments to assure a stable and equitable return for dairy products. Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives: That the General Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation introduced by Representative James M. Jeffords calling for a milk price

support set at not less than 85 percent of parity with quarterly adjustments, and be it further

Resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send copies of this resolution to our Congressional Delegation.

THIRTY YEARS AFTER THE YALTA
CONFERENCE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks the 30th anniversary of the Yalta Conference. Last Sunday, February 2, 1975, in Milwaukee at a special meeting of the Polish American Congress, Wisconsin State Division, a statement was unanimously adopted concerning the 30th anniversary of the Yalta Conference.

Present at this special meeting and concurring in the action were representatives of various fraternal, civic and veterans organizations. Officers of the Wisconsin chapter of the PAC include Mr. Edmund Banasikowski, president; Mrs. Leone D. Wozinski, Dr. Edward Tomasik, Attorney Alexander Sklenarz, William Kowalkowski, Walenty Wozniak, vice presidents; Leopold Sklenarz, secretary general; Jerry Sadowski, treasurer, and Edmund Skonieczny, recording secretary.

In keeping with my policy of making available all views on any given subject I am placing the statement in the RECORD at this point for the reading of my colleagues:

THIRTY YEARS AFTER THE YALTA CONFERENCE

("They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." The Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1941.)

The above rallying battlecry of the United States and Great Britain against Nazi tyranny which was seeking to subjugate the world—rang clearly around the globe and brought new hope to the oppressed nations and new confidence in the sacred ideals of humanity.

Almost two years before this pronouncement, Poland, attacked by the Hitlerite hordes, was the first nation which dared to make a heroic stand against the crushing force of the German Armed Forces. With all Poland overrun, with its capital in complete ruin after German bombardments, with thousands killed in battles, Poland continued to fight against the invaders on its own territory and abroad. The Polish Underground Army fought hundreds of skirmishes in the field and forests; it boldly attacked the invader in the cities and successfully sabotaged German military efforts. Thousands of Poles perished fighting on their own soil; other thousands filled German concentration camps and died slow deaths until they reached the gas chambers.

At the same time, thousands of Polish soldiers penetrated the frontiers of neighboring countries and after arduous and perilous journeys reached France where the Polish Army was reorganized again in full battle readiness. This indomitable Polish spirit which never accepted defeat astonished the world. President Roosevelt paid the highest

tribute to it when he called Poland "the inspiration of the nations."

Under Polish banners which proudly displayed the national motto, "For your freedom and ours," the Polish forces on land, sea, and in the air battled at the side of their American and British allies, firmly believing that all the battlefields marked the road leading to a free and truly independent Poland with her "sovereign rights and self-government restored."

From the cold fjords of Norway through the fields of France and Italy to the hot sands of Northern Africa, Polish blood flowed in profusion for what Poles believed to be a Common Cause. With the same faith in their hearts, Polish airmen fought in the Battle of Britain and in thousands of air operations over Germany. The Polish Navy covered the Allied convoys and suffered heavy losses. When a Polish unit was first to place its standard on the monastery of Monte Cassino, all Poles abroad and at home felt as if this standard were placed in the heart of Warsaw.

If somebody asks the price of freedom and independence, Poles may sadly reply: "Are six million dead a high enough price for our freedom?"

The Second World War was nearing its end in 1945 when the Soviet intentions of enslaving Poland became evident as the Soviet Union once again used the insidious trick of nominating a puppet government.

On January 19, 1945, the Polish Government in Exile in London, the only true representative of the Polish nation, in a memorandum to the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States, proposed an amicable settlement of the Polish-Soviet dispute, declaring a determination to conclude an alliance with the USSR guaranteeing the security of both States. The memorandum stated, however, that "remembering that Poland, as one of the United Nations in the struggle for the freedom of the world, made immense sacrifices in material and spiritual values, and lost nearly one-fifth of her population killed in the battles, massacred in penal camps and ghettos, perished in prisons, in banishment, and in forced-labor camps—the Polish Government cannot be expected to recognize decisions unilaterally arrived at." The memorandum also stated that the recognition of the puppet government in Poland "would be tantamount to the recognition of the abolition of the independence of Poland, in the defense of which the present war was begun."

In the conference held at Yalta between February 7-11, 1945, involving Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, decisions were made concerning Poland which stunned, not only Polish soldiers abroad and the whole Polish nation, but also ten million Americans of Polish descent.

In a note of February 18, 1945, the Polish Government reminded the British government of its perfidious assurance that "His Majesty's Government would not be likely to contemplate entering into an agreement with a third party which would injure the interest of so loyal an Ally . . ."

The recognition of the so-called "Provisional Government in Lublin" composed mainly of agents of Comintern and the approval of annexation of practically one half of the territory of Poland by the Soviet Union constituted a deadly blow to Poland's freedom.

The noble effort of Congressman Barry on February 26, 1945, in the House of Representatives was in vain when he demanded the rejection of the Resolution of the Crimea Conference which established the eastern frontiers of Poland along the Curzon Line.

Poland's fate was sealed. Not only was Poland robbed by the Soviet Union of half of her territory but the other half became

what is known as the Polish Peoples Republic under the Kremlin henchmen and thus deprived of any possibility of having a free representative parliament or government with democratic freedoms.

The tragic fourth partition of Poland became "fait accompli" because of the Judas kisses and despite the praise of Poland's heroism by her allies.

The Polish American Congress lodged a protest against the decisions of the Yalta Conference. Poland was "sold down the river," and, if anybody needs a witness, let him read the book, "I Saw Poland Betrayed" by United States Ambassador Bliss Lane.

There were some efforts to exonerate Roosevelt along the line of argument that it was not the Yalta agreement itself that was bad but the manner of its execution by the Soviet Union. In this regard, British RAF Marshal Sir John Slessor stated clearly: "It is usually said that it is easy to be wise after the event, but after all Yalta and Potsdam came after the events of August and September 1944. How after the fall of the Warsaw uprising any responsible statesman could trust a Russian communist further than he could kick him is beyond human understanding."

Roosevelt was aware of the real situation since he was forewarned by the Polish Government in Exile in London. He knew that sixteen Polish delegates, who were lured by the Soviets under the pretext of friendly discussions, were arrested and deported to the Soviet Union and he also knew that the members of the Polish Underground Army were being arrested by the advancing Soviet Army. He could not claim that he was not aware of the true Soviet intentions toward Poland.

The Yalta conference, which threw Poland into the Soviet orbit, was a close copy of the Munich sellout.

In the February 13, 1945, Congressional Record, Congressman O'Konski of Wisconsin spoke thus to the House:

"I predict to you now, Members of the House, that . . . the Black Sea Conference of appeasement is going to have telltale disastrous effects for all the time to come.

"The crime of Crimea has denied freedom to 100,000,000 Europeans. That is just the beginning. The crime of Crimea puts a stamp of approval for slavery in Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. On Black Monday, February 12, 1945, ironically Lincoln's and Kosciuszko's birthday, the Big Three approved slavery for Poland too. The crime of Crimea has handed 100,000,000 human beings into bondage. Black Monday, February 12, 1945, will go down in world history as the most ghastly international crime of the ages for which the world will pay a heavier price than we paid for World War II. What a sorry spectacle that almost a million of our own boys gave their lives for a new kind of bondage, a new order in Europe. . . . Only Moscow has reason to rejoice. All other decent people today have just reason for sorrow."

Thirty years elapsed since the Yalta conference, and now, from the distance of time, it is obvious how prophetic were the words of Congressman O'Konski.

One hundred million people in East and Central Europe, instead of facing the East with American help and manning the ramparts for the Western World—are today armed by the Soviet Union and menacingly facing the West. The Soviet empire now stretches to the heart of Germany. Emboldened by the Soviet success, Communism raises its ugly head in all European countries.

The free world lost half of Europe as a great potential ally in possible future world conflicts.

When we look back to check where the Western World completely erred and thus created the present highly dangerous position, we can easily point to the Yalta Conference. It is there that the Western World took the wrong turn and wandered into the area of danger.

Poland's fate was handed to the executioner, who just about thirty-five years ago committed an act of genocide at Katyn by murdering 15,000 Polish officers who at that time were prisoners of war and entitled to all the rights which that status confers in the civilized world.

The Soviet authorities denied responsibility for the crime and maintained that it was committed by the Nazis. But this lie is denounced by the official report of the "Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre: House Report No. 2430, Union Calendar No. 762. This Committee was created in accordance with a resolution of Congress dated July 2, 1952. In the report we read:

"This committee unanimously finds beyond any question of reasonable doubt that the Soviet NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs) committed the mass murder of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia. The evidence, testimony, records and exhibits recorded by this committee through its investigations and hearings during the last nine months, overwhelmingly will show the people of the world that Russia is directly responsible for the Katyn massacre. Throughout our entire proceedings, there has not been a scintilla of proof or even any remote circumstantial evidence presented that could indict any other nation in this international crime. It is an established fact that approximately 15,000 Polish prisoners were interned in three Soviet camps: Kozelsk, Starobelsk and Ostashkov in the winter of 1939-40. With the exception of 400 prisoners, these men have not been heard from, seen or found since the spring of 1940 . . . we are equally certain that the rest of the 15,000 Polish officers—those interned at Starobelsk and Ostashkov—were executed in a brutal manner. Those from Starobelsk were disposed of near Kharkov, and those from Ostashkov met a similar fate . . . the Ostashkov prisoners were placed on barges and drowned in the White Sea. . . . No one could entertain any doubt of Russian guilt for the Katyn massacre."

The Polish Warsaw regime is but a tool in the hands of the Kremlin and blindly follows its dictates in foreign and domestic politics. The same Communist Party in Moscow which ordered the massacre in the Katyn forest is exerting its power over Poland. Soviet Ambassador Pilotowicz, the Russian Viceroy in Warsaw, holds the scepter of real power. The Polish "Bezpieka" is but an extended arm of the Soviet KGB. The Soviet government continues the Tsarist tradition in foreign affairs, as it was summed up by the Russian historian Karamzin in 1826: "Distrust of the friendship of those whose interests are not in accordance with ours and neglect of no opportunity to damage them."

It is not astonishing that while we condemned Nazi murderers at Nuremberg, nobody even suggested a similar tribunal against the Katyn murderers? The same experience which led to the shame of Yalta dictates silence in the murder of those 15,000 Polish officers. This blatant parody of international justice speaks amply about the complete corruption of moral principles applied in world politics.

The Polish American Congress declares that it does not recognize the Yalta decisions as binding the Polish nation and does not recognize the Warsaw communist re-

gime forced upon Poland by the Soviet Union as the legal representative of Poland.

The Polish nation still staunchly defends its tradition, its culture, and its loyalty to the Church in increasingly difficult conditions. No force can break that indomitable spirit.

Poles still believe that the walls of that gigantic, grim, and blood-spattered Soviet prison of nations will collapse one day and millions of captive people will again enjoy the blessings of freedom.

History gave us two painful lessons at Munich and Yalta and taught us that our own security cannot be bought at the expense of others. World freedom is indivisible. Those two errors brought highly dangerous results and there is now not much room left for any more errors. The next one may be final.

A TRIBUTE TO EARL HOLDSWORTH

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, if the measure of a man is that which he gives of himself—to his family, his friends, his community, and his Nation—then Earl T. Holdsworth must surely be considered as one of the greats of his hometown of Trumbull and of the State of Connecticut.

For several decades, Earl has devoted himself to making life more interesting and more fruitful for those around him. He has worked with children through the Cub Scouts, becoming the first cubmaster for Cub Pack 97 which he organized in Trumbull in 1946. His community directly benefited from his participation in various improvement associations, as a member of the representative town meeting and the Republican Town Committee.

While most men would consider their lives quite full and their service to their community more than enough with such a record of involvement, not so Earl. His interests extended to the public safety, and as both chairman and secretary to the police commission, he worked to improve the facilities and capabilities of the force.

Both his community and his State reaped the fruits of Earl's knowledge and dedication when he was elected to the Connecticut House of Representatives in 1968. It was a special privilege for me to work with him in the general assembly, to see legislation of interest to all residents be examined, nurtured, and implemented under his watchful eye.

Considering Earl's outstanding record of accomplishments and of public service, it is difficult to find the proper words to express our heartfelt thanks for his involvement in the community around him. I am hopeful that, at least in part, a tribute to Earl Holdsworth on Friday, February 7, 1975, will at least partially convey our appreciation for the genuine human concern evinced by this fine American.

LEGISLATION TO TERMINATE THE
MUTUAL AID PACT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret these days that many of our airlines are in financial difficulty. Many of their problems result from the current energy shortage. We can only wait for the development of a strong energy program and the exploitation of new energy sources to alleviate the aviation fuel shortage and combat this aspect of the problem.

There are, however, other problems. I am certain many of my colleagues have not forgotten the legislation we passed in the 93d Congress to aid Pan Am and other U.S. international air carriers against the discriminatory practices they receive in foreign lands. The International Fair Competitive Practices Act of 1974 insures that our airlines can compete on an equal footing with those of other countries.

Today I plan to reintroduce a measure that is also in the spirit of free and equal competition and addresses a problem that I suspect is also affecting the present ill health of our airline industry. In 1958 the Civil Aeronautics Board created the Mutual Aid Pact to account for the windfall profits accruing to airlines whose employees were not striking. The result, today, is a system that regards the mismanagement of airlines and undermines the operation of the free enterprise system in the airline industry.

As many of my colleagues know, the Mutual Aid Pact now subsidizes 50 percent of the operating costs of a struck airline for the first 2 weeks. This decreases each successive week after that by 5 percent until it reaches a rate of 35 percent where it remains to the end of the strike. These payments are made out of whatever windfall profits accrue to other carriers who are not struck. I think a comparison between the level of these subsidies and the insignificant strike benefits of most airline employees—in fact, four unions have absolutely none—will convince my colleagues that this policy removes the incentive on the part of the airline management to negotiate.

Prior to the implementation of the Mutual Aid Pact, the average length of a strike in the airline industry was 15 days. It has now ballooned to approximately 100 days, and it is not uncommon for an airline to register a profit during a strike.

Our economic system promotes excellence through free competition. I maintain that the Mutual Aid Pact attacks this system by disrupting the balance of collective bargaining in the airline industry. Employees can no longer bargain on an equal basis with management. The result is long strikes and the deterioration of air service. Companies who are mismanaged, who have been unable to maintain good management-employee relations are rewarded by subsidies while those who have cultivated good employee relations and developed healthy working conditions are penalized.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When Pan Am recently withdrew from the Mutual Aid Pact, it announced that it had paid out approximately \$50.9 million to other airlines while receiving only \$5.3 million in return during its four short strikes. It is obvious that Pan Am would be in better financial shape today were it not for the Mutual Aid Pact.

The Mutual Aid Pact has become a crutch to particular airlines who can use it against its workers. But its use is also a detriment to the general health of the airline industry by pulling down the strong in their support for the weak. Ultimately, of course, it is the public who suffers.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the logic of this policy and I hope that my colleagues share my puzzlement as to its continued utility.

ORVAL HANSEN: A DISTINGUISHED
RECORD

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest persons with whom I have had the privilege of serving during my time in the House of Representatives is the Honorable Orval Hansen, our former colleague from the Second District of Idaho.

I had the good fortune of serving with Orval Hansen on two committees, the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on House Administration, and on the same subcommittees as well.

Although Orval Hansen is a Republican and I am a Democrat, I know of no more thoughtful or fair minded or hardworking Member of the House than he, and I would add my own to the many good wishes that have been extended to him and his delightful wife, June, by his former colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial, "Orval Hansen: a distinguished record," published in the January 9, 1975, issue of the Post-Register, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

The editorial follows:

ORVAL HANSEN: A DISTINGUISHED RECORD

Orval Hansen of Idaho Falls, Idaho's departing Second District Congressman, leaves Congress with an extraordinary legacy of accomplishments. He not only was one of the hardest working members of the House of Representatives in his terms there but one who strained continuously to survey the needs and problems of his constituents. His constant racing back to Idaho to both report and listen kept him in close touch with the people of his district. But it was a wearing standard of operation and severely limited the time he could allot his private or family life.

He also pioneered the opening of four offices in Southern Idaho as reporting and listening posts. With this kind of time burden, it is amazing that he found time to introduce or co-sponsor 200 different measures in Congress while serving in D.C.

Orval Hansen's chief asset was the precious one for all deliberators—a fine sense of good judgment. A scholar who studied abroad as

February 6, 1975

well as a legalist, Hansen never made snap judgments. Such were alien to his mental process. At times, he would seem just a plodder. But he was seeking perspective—that rare divination of what is most-right in a complex array of choices. He could not be snowed by anyone—lobbyist, government agency, legislative specialist, or even a constituent. He was always his own man.

And he had a faculty of being at the right place with the right idea—like his most recent proposal of making surplus potato production (especially processed potatoes) available as emergency food aid overseas without creating supply and price problems for the American consumer. The dehydrated potato is really an ideal way of succoring the world's hungry in the current situation.

Orval Hansen was not always where the corporate executive would like him. Nor was he always in the right place for the environmentalist. He often liked the middle road that too often pleased all too little. But truth, great philosophers have said, is a careful extraction from the poles. And so it was with Hansen. This newspaper did not always agree with him on every issue certainly—but Orval Hansen was a congressman you could call on the phone and disagree with at great length and come away with an appreciation of the studied thought process which put the Idaho congressman at his position.

Former Congressman Hansen knew what exchange of ideas and debate was all about. He prized it as a medium of decision-making. He never got so fixed in a decision that new input from whatever source would not alter or even change his mind if he felt he had missed something in his judgment pilgrimage. Pride never got in the way of the "best decision." His easy openness invited people to challenge his position because you could always have the feeling, after the exchange, that this is what he expected of you—and pleasantly so.

Orval Hansen's chief assets, his deliberative manner and his repugnance for quick judgments, proved his undoing. These assets served him in good stead as master diplomat in helping maneuver a new structure in the AEC when the in-grown autocratic "old order" had nearly stalemated the agency's indispensable research spontaneity. He was criticized for not moving hastily but soon the flowering of his patient behind-the-scenes contact work, inside and outside of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, unfolded. He is one of the architects of a new leadership in the AEC which, unfortunately, is being partly dismantled in the new Energy Research and Development agency. Not that the new agency itself is not a necessary blending. It is the unknown qualities of the newly imported leaders yet to be tested.

But these assets were not assets when his reluctance to disengage from President Nixon quickly enough proved his un-doing in the election. It was second nature for Hansen to insist a man, especially a president, was innocent until proven guilty. And President Nixon's final demise occurred on the eve of the Idaho general election. The President's admission of lying was likely such a shock to the Idaho congressman at the time that he had difficulty handling it. His statement on eve of the election reflected this. It hurt him badly.

If one examined his record, Hansen was not an abject Nixon supporter. The President, we must remember, had some good legislative programs as well as bad. But the White House corruption odor had not drifted with sufficient offensiveness to the Idaho congressman's office . . . most likely because he was too busy campaigning to apply his analysis to it. And because polls showed early in his campaign that he was a two to one choice, reversed with events in the White House the last two weeks, he did not campaign as vigorously as usual. And Cong.

Hansen was never the charismatic vote-puller. It was not in his genes to be flamboyant.

So, Cong. Hansen is now Citizen Hansen. But Idaho should mark his tenure well . . . because it is an especially distinguished one. The thoughtful deliberation, the mental breadth and poise of the man, is only rarely seen in the House of Representatives.

**PENN CENTRAL MAY FOUNDER
DURING CONGRESSIONAL VACA-
TION**

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will be closing up shop and going home for more than a week in observance of the Lincoln and Washington holidays. When we return, there is a good chance that the Penn Central Railroad will be out of business.

Penn Central is fast approaching the climax of a cash crisis that began in December—and has cried out for congressional attention for more than 2 months. On February 14—in the middle of our recess—the Penn Central will begin declining shipping orders and plans to shut down its operations altogether around February 25, unless Congress provides emergency financial assistance to enable this troubled giant to meet its payroll obligations.

All funds available under section 213 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act are exhausted, and Penn Central, so long wracked by gigantic debts, has no chance of obtaining even interim credit elsewhere. We, Mr. Speaker, are the last hope of one of our Nation's biggest and most vital transportation corporations. And now, during Penn Central's darkest hour, we are packing up to go home.

I have today received a telegram from Governor Carey of New York, calling further attention to this serious problem. I ask that this telegram be reprinted in this portion of the RECORD.

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Legislation is urgently needed to prevent the Penn Central from commencing reduction in its operations on February 14th and total cessation of services toward the end of the month. Otherwise there will be a grievous economic impact upon the State of New York already suffering from the adverse effects of recession.

Penn Central reports that it has run out of cash and has exhausted possibilities of obtaining financial assistance other than from the Federal Government. I urge you to support legislation amending the regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 which would provide the railroad with emergency funding to maintain service vital to the State's economy. The legislation should also provide for the inclusion of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad under the act. S-281 does this.

HUGH L. CAREY.

The success of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act in developing a viable and effective national rail transportation

system will be jeopardized if Penn Central is forced to shut down in this manner. Thousands of employees will be cut off from their pay. Thousands of shippers and businessmen will absorb drastic costs and hardships. The outlook is one of unmitigated disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I most emphatically object to our going on a recess without having dealt with this problem. Penn Central's representatives have been here all week trying to spur us on to action. The Senate has approved a bill meeting the crisis and providing the emergency funding. But the House, without addressing itself to this need, now proposes to go home.

What will we tell the legions of new unemployed that will be created when Penn Central closes its doors? That we were too busy to attend to their problems?

What will we do to protect the thousands of small businessmen and shippers all over our Nation who depend on the Penn Central and whose livelihoods are about to be gravely endangered?

Mr. Speaker, let us undertake some remedial action, and let us take it now. When we come back, it may be too late.

**"MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF
INDEPENDENCE"—1775**

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as America makes preparations to celebrate the 200th birthday of the founding of our Nation, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues another bicentennial celebration. This one is in Mecklenburg County, N.C., a part of the Ninth District, which I am proud to represent.

On May 20, 1775, a spirit of independence was running strong in Charlotte, the principal town in Mecklenburg County, as 26 leaders in the community met and signed the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. These "free and independent people" took the lead in separating themselves from British suppression and tyranny. That historic date was placed on the North Carolina State flag in honor of the brave men who signed that document and who took that bold step. Today, North Carolina license tags for 1975 carry the motto "First in Freedom" for the same reason.

With these thoughts in mind, I am today introducing a joint resolution, signed by the entire North Carolina delegation, calling on the President of the United States to proclaim the date May 20, 1975, as "Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Day," commemorating the bicentennial of the declaration of independence from the British crown of Mecklenburg County, N.C.

**IAM LODGE 1998 IN HONOLULU
RECEIVES COMMENDATION**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as one who was invited to the installation-of-officers banquet of Local Lodge 1998, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers—IAM—which was held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on January 11, 1975, I was pleased to note that the occasion also marked a special commendation for the lodge's leadership and spirit in dealing with some of the problems confronting American labor today. The commendation came as part of a speech delivered by William Ryan, a representative from IAM's Grand Lodge in Washington, D.C.

Using broad strokes, Mr. Ryan painted a vivid picture of the fundamental problems of working people. He placed at the doorstep of the Nixon White House full responsibility for unemployment, inflation, and the energy crisis, as well as economic policies which have resulted in a redistribution of the wealth of the American people "out of the pockets of the poor and into the pockets of the rich." What is needed today to cope with these problems, according to Mr. Ryan, is the "right kind of leadership—the kind we had when Franklin D. Roosevelt set up the Manhattan project and when John F. Kennedy set up NASA to put an American on the moon."

William Ryan is well qualified to speak in behalf of labor. From 1953 to 1968 he was president of district 44, a Government employees district of IAM in Watertown, Mass. From 1968 to 1973, Mr. Ryan headed the Government employees department of IAM, and since 1973 he has served at IAM's Grand Lodge as one of three hard-working legislative representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the text of Mr. Ryan's speech follows:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM RYAN

Brothers and Sisters: I appreciate this opportunity to be with you tonight. I bring with me the greetings and best wishes of all of the people at Grand Lodge—especially those who have had the pleasure of working with Lodge 1998—and who join me in congratulating the officers you have elected to lead you in the coming year.

From all the signs and indicators it is obvious that the tasks and responsibilities of leadership are going to be more challenging in the coming year than they have been in the past. I know that every day people come to these beautiful islands to get away from the troubles and turmoil of the mainland. And nothing would make me happier than to be able to give you an optimistic picture of the weeks and months that lie ahead. But the labor movement has never tried to solve problems by ignoring them or pretending they don't exist. And today, the fact is, we face some very fundamental problems—problems that will affect our ability to survive and to make progress on behalf of those we serve.

I think that everyone is aware that basic changes are taking place today in the way the world's wealth is being distributed. More

and more of the dollars that American workers have used for food, shelter, clothing and other necessities are now going to pay for oil prices that have quadrupled in less than two years.

Not only is this draining America of dollars but it is adding further flames to what has become a raging fire of inflation.

Economists, newspaper columnists and government spokesmen are well aware of and alarmed by this vast redistribution of the world's wealth that is now taking place.

They are aware that higher energy costs threaten to strip the industrial countries—like Japan, Western Europe and the United States—of the dollars that are needed to finance economic expansion. Certainly, this will cause serious economic dislocations. But long before the redistribution of wealth from Western economies to the Arab world an equally significant redistribution of wealth was going on right here in the United States.

Most people didn't think of wage and price controls as a device for redistributing the nation's wealth. But that's exactly what it was. It took money away from working people and gave it to people in the upper income brackets.

Wage controls were very easy to police. Therefore wage controls worked. But price controls were never really enforced. And by the time Mr. Nixon finally took them off prices were rising at an annual rate of 9% a year.

This is not the only way the wealth of the American people has been redistributed out of the pockets of the poor and into the pockets of the rich. It's been done over the past few years through tax laws and special exemptions that give corporations all kinds of breaks that individuals do not enjoy.

It's been done over the past few years by corporate profits that have increased while the gross national product has been declining. What this means, quite simply, is that the 200 or 300 monopolistic corporations that control our economy are taking a large slice out of a smaller pie. This means, in effect, that everyone else has to make do with less. Recently Congressman Henry Reuss of Wisconsin pointed out that as a result of the economic policies of the Nixon Administration, \$10 billion a year—in each year of the past five years—has been transferred out of the pockets of the lowest four-fifths of the nation's income groups and into the pockets of the top one-fifth.

So the problems of working people really didn't start with the Arab embargo or the quadrupling of the oil prices. And over the long run, I think that this is a problem that can be solved with the right kind of leadership.

By the right kind of leadership, I mean the kind we had when Franklin D. Roosevelt set up the Manhattan Project and when John F. Kennedy set up NASA to put an American on the moon. With that kind of leadership we could, in a few years, tell the sheiks and shahs of the Middle East to stick their oil in their ear.

There are many kinds of alternative sources of energy that are waiting to be developed. In Japan they have already shown what can be done with roof-top solar power heaters. 40% of Japan's hot water needs are already being supplied by 2.6 million heaters powered by solar energy. Scientists believe that the sunlight shining on a 150 square mile patch of desert, if used efficiently, could provide the United States with all the energy it needs. There is no end to human ingenuity. One solar scientist, named Pete Glaser, has already drawn up blueprints for a huge solar power cell in space capable of converting the sun's energy into electricity and transmitting it to a receiving antenna on earth.

Unfortunately, all the scientific ingenuity in the world isn't going to do us any good

if someone doesn't provide leadership. We need leadership to begin moving against the problems of unemployment that are threatening the most serious economic collapse since the 1930's. It is hard for someone who has been around as long as I have to realize that most of the people in the work force today are too young to remember the great depression. Many of today's workers have not even wanted to hear about the great depression because they said, it could never happen again.

Well, tell that to the workers in Detroit where unemployment has already reached depression levels in the auto industry.

Tell it to the millions of people whose unemployment insurance is beginning to run out and who have no prospects for new jobs in the future.

Tell it to the hundreds of thousands of teenagers who graduated from high school last June and who still haven't found their first permanent job.

These basic problems, ranging from energy to inflation to unemployment, cannot be solved by individual action, no matter how well meaning.

Now, more than ever, the working people of America must combine to seek economic equity both at the bargaining table and in the halls of Congress.

As an old government worker and as a long-time representative of government workers I am well aware of the handicaps that government workers have as compared to their counterparts in private industry. In private industry, if an employer refuses to bargain in good faith on wages and working conditions, you can go on strike. In government you can't.

In private industry, if you've got the support of a significant number of those in the work place and the agreement of the employer you can negotiate a union security clause in your contract. In government, even if 100% of the workers belong to the union, you can't negotiate union security and the next worker hired can take all the services and benefits of unionism without accepting the responsibility of helping to support the union.

In private industry, if you want to get actively involved in politics you can go out and work to elect representatives who support labor's programs. But when you work for Uncle Sam, forget it.

I am suggesting that government employees should have the right to strike in the same way that private employees do. And I do think the time has come to replace weak and inadequate executive orders with legislation guaranteeing federal employees the rights that workers in private industry enjoy under the National Labor Relations Act. And that includes the right to negotiate a union shop agreement—when that is what a significant majority of the employees want. I am suggesting that the Hatch Act should be repealed. No one wants to go back to the days when you could be told by your boss that if you wanted to keep your job or were looking for a promotion you had better kick across with a contribution to this candidate or that.

But I do think government employees have as much stake as anyone in electing candidates who support fair tax laws, full employment programs, national health security and other union legislative goals. I believe the Hatch Act should be repealed so as to increase the scope and effectiveness of the union's political action program. Too often business representatives serving government lodges feel their hands are tied because they cannot seek funds for the Machinists Non-Partisan Political League or endorse candidates who are favorable to the union cause.

These, then, are just a few of the kinds of issues and problems that these officers you have elected will have to deal with in the coming year.

If there is any lodge in the IAM that has

the kind of leadership capable of dealing with these problems, it is Lodge 1998. Over the years the people who work with the government membership have developed great pride in Lodge 1998. You have a spirit here—a spirit of real, honest-to-God unionism that has become much too rare in the labor movement. I predict, however, that as more people are forced to tighten their belt buckles there is going to be more of that spirit throughout the rest of the labor movement.

Though I have probably emphasized the negative here, and have perhaps sounded pessimistic, the fact is I really believe that this labor movement and this great country of ours will meet these challenges with the kind of courage and ingenuity that brought us through tough times in the past.

Once again I want to thank you for allowing me to be with you and to each and everyone I say, as I have said before, and hope to say again in the future—Aloha.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FUNDS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last week I began inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prime sponsors receiving funds for public service employment under title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

I am continuing today with allocations for the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation, Safety and Health which I chair intends to hold oversight hearings on the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act during this session of Congress. We will begin our oversight with hearings concerning the allocation of funds under CETA on February 20, 9:30 a.m., room 2175, Rayburn Building.

The list of allocations follows:

FINAL ALLOCATIONS	
Region V.....	\$153,480,170
Illinois.....	25,856,251
Chicago.....	11,165,540
Cook County.....	3,777,945
Arlington Hts.....	67,018
Berwyn.....	76,853
Cicero.....	126,408
Desplaines.....	80,291
Evanston.....	260,982
Oak Lawn.....	87,316
Oak Park.....	92,560
Skokie.....	101,718
Du Page County.....	597,012
Elmhurst.....	52,164
Kane County.....	555,243
Aurora.....	183,133
Elgin.....	201,041
Lake County.....	768,767
Waukegan.....	228,474
Macon County.....	178,672
Decatur.....	138,050
McHenry County.....	187,956
Rock Island County.....	231,874
Rock Island City.....	107,273
Tazewell County.....	125,605
La Salle County.....	137,925
Rockford Csr.....	533,870
Rockford.....	236,193

FINAL ALLOCATIONS—Continued

Bal Winnebago Cnty.....	127, 336	Washtenaw Csrst.....	1, 238, 594	Lucas Cnty.....	143, 294
Champaigne Csrst.....	207, 226	Washtenaw Cnty.....	1, 078, 866	Wood Cnty.....	136, 946
Champaign Cnty.....	52, 114	Ann Arbor.....	159, 729	Youngstown Csrst.....	1, 470, 533
Champaign Cnty.....	104, 905	Kent Cnty Csrst.....	2, 482, 833	Youngstown Cnty.....	356, 884
Will County Csrst.....	808, 754	Kent Cnty.....	749, 428	Mahoning Cnty.....	431, 676
Will Cnty.....	429, 369	Grand Rapids.....	882, 609	Trumbull Cnty.....	278, 223
Joliet.....	362, 649	Allegan Cnty.....	213, 129	Columbiana Co.....	140, 584
Sangamon Cnty. Csrst.....	194, 831	Wyoming Cnty.....	184, 505	Ashtabula Cnty.....	134, 111
Sangamon Cnty.....	73, 968	Muskegon Csrst.....	970, 327	Warren.....	129, 055
Springfield Cnty.....	114, 214	Muskegon Cnty.....	850, 552	Bal of Ohio.....	9, 298, 502
Madison Cnty. Csr.....	1, 726, 874	Genesee/Flint Csrst.....	3, 665, 450	Lima.....	302, 369
Madison Cnty.....	1, 695, 023	Genesee Cnty.....	1, 382, 375	Bal Allen Cnty.....	80, 316
St. Clair Csrst.....	1, 112, 526	Flint.....	1, 510, 739	Athens Cnty.....	91, 294
St. Clair Cnty.....	1, 101, 059	Lapeer Cnty.....	\$295, 082	Belmont Cnty.....	157, 999
Peoria Csrst.....	\$299, 290	Shiawasee Cnty.....	477, 165	Clermont County.....	362, 825
Peoria Cnty.....	238, 595	Ingham Csrst.....	1, 440, 381	Crawford Cnty.....	101, 829
Peoria County.....	60, 695	Ingham Cnty.....	613, 318	Erie Cnty.....	113, 411
East St Louis.....	795, 614	Lansing.....	619, 995	Fairfield County.....	129, 083
Shawnee Csrst.....	259, 564	Eaton Cnty.....	113, 269	Hancock Cnty.....	97, 829
Bal of Illinois.....	2, 191, 163	Jackson Csrst.....	1, 870, 453	Jefferson Cnty.....	278, 595
Adams Cnty.....	85, 008	Jackson Cnty.....	754, 524	Lawrence Cnty.....	309, 500
Dekalb Cnty.....	85, 861	Lenawee Cnty.....	882, 878	Marion County.....	94, 141
Henry Cnty.....	45, 389	Macomb Cnty.....	2, 330, 027	Miami Cnty.....	86, 513
Jackson Cnty.....	83, 427	Roseville Cnty.....	415, 097	Muskingum County.....	112, 081
Kankakee Cnty.....	130, 171	St Clair Shores Ct.....	305, 757	Mansfield Cnty.....	227, 356
Knox Cnty.....	62, 276	Sterling Heights C.....	261, 799	Bal Richland County.....	136, 239
McLean Cnty.....	105, 382	Warren City.....	681, 272	Ross County.....	128, 256
Vermilion County.....	139, 882	Bal of Michigan.....	10, 637, 303	Sandusky County.....	161, 130
Whitseite Cnty.....	107, 941	Livingston Cnty.....	305, 333	Scioto County.....	380, 237
Indiana.....	19, 241, 816	Marquette Cnty.....	277, 953	Seneca County.....	130, 505
Gary.....	735, 969	Midland Cnty.....	429, 074	Tuscarawa County.....	182, 034
Hammond.....	180, 608	Van Buren Cnty.....	287, 272	Warren County.....	285, 088
Lake Cnty.....	315, 885	Minnesota.....	8, 900, 238	Washington County.....	116, 411
Elkhart Cnty.....	344, 751	Duluth.....	462, 932	Wisconsin.....	12, 182, 377
South Bend.....	249, 459	Dakota Cnty.....	207, 301	Outagamie County.....	138, 602
St Joseph Cnty.....	168, 084	Urb. Minn. Consrt.....	3, 752, 847	Appleton City.....	64, 157
Tippecanoe Cnty.....	89, 374	Minneapolis.....	2, 191, 716	Rock County.....	400, 236
Madison Cnty.....	146, 330	Bal Hennepin Cnty.....	669, 399	Milwaukee Csrst.....	4, 252, 390
Anderson.....	79, 739	Anoka Co.....	475, 819	Milwaukee County.....	130, 021
Vigo Cnty.....	159, 537	Bloomington Cnty.....	114, 113	Milwaukee City.....	4, 027, 752
Terre Haute Cnty.....	104, 994	Washington Cnty.....	189, 917	Wauwatosa.....	26, 521
Indianapolis.....	2, 633, 002	St Paul City.....	1, 301, 809	West Allis City.....	68, 097
La Porte Cnty.....	107, 966	Ramsey Cnty.....	253, 493	Madison-Dane Csrst.....	405, 343
Ft Wayne Csrst.....	667, 065	Region III Csrst.....	530, 057	Madison City.....	247, 095
Allen Cnty.....	107, 289	St Louis Cnty.....	231, 279	Dane County.....	158, 248
Fort Wayne.....	339, 878	Rural Cep.....	705, 656	WOW Csrst.....	221, 352
Delaware Csrst.....	309, 812	Bal of Minnesota.....	1, 686, 143	Waukesha County.....	161, 334
Delaware Cnty.....	69, 627	Blue Earth County.....	77, 706	Ozaukee County.....	26, 245
Muncie Cnty.....	217, 854	Rochester County.....	53, 193	Washington County.....	33, 772
Evansville Csrst.....	570, 937	Stearns County.....	184, 092	Winne-Fond Csrst.....	388, 334
Evansville.....	330, 141	Bal Olstead County.....	35, 478	Winnebago County.....	103, 675
Bal Vanderbgh Cnty.....	18, 643	Ohio.....	30, 130, 137	Oshkosh City.....	136, 041
Bal of Indiana.....	12, 563, 037	Cincinnati.....	2, 820, 142	Fond Du Lac County.....	143, 617
Bartholomew Cnty.....	43, 608	Butler County.....	654, 579	Trico Cetac.....	577, 045
Clark Cnty.....	714, 585	Hamilton City.....	193, 071	Bal Kenosha County.....	44, 862
Floyd Cnty.....	629, 904	Clark County.....	379, 704	Racine County.....	89, 876
Grant Cnty.....	610, 815	Springfield City.....	291, 008	Racine City.....	225, 170
Hamilton Cnty.....	131, 453	Hamilton County.....	729, 741	Walworth County.....	92, 410
Henricks Cnty.....	127, 882	Licking/Del Csrst.....	261, 295	Kenosha City.....	124, 727
Henry Cnty.....	405, 832	Licking County.....	210, 335	Rural Cep.....	536, 308
Howard Cnty.....	798, 054	Lorain.....	490, 900	Bal of Wisconsin.....	5, 262, 767
Johnson Cnty.....	168, 589	Elyria.....	144, 252	Brown County.....	155, 149
Monroe Cnty.....	695, 191	Lorain City.....	159, 921	Dodge Cnty.....	105, 607
Porter Cnty.....	231, 168	Akron Csrst.....	1, 432, 004	Green Bay Cnty.....	338, 344
Wayne Cnty.....	671, 181	Akron City.....	608, 770	Eau Claire Cnty.....	138, 828
Michigan.....	57, 169, 351	Summit County.....	269, 752	Jefferson Cnty.....	97, 955
Wayne Cnty.....	4, 418, 075	Portage County.....	411, 424	LaCrosse City.....	133, 474
Dearborn Heights C.....	240, 783	Medina County.....	142, 058	Bal La Crosse Cnty.....	40, 697
Lincoln Park Cnty.....	257, 468	Canton Csrst.....	892, 360	Manitowoc Cnty.....	118, 404
Redford Township.....	322, 396	Canton.....	300, 772	Marathon County.....	325, 268
Taylor Cnty.....	471, 491	Stark County.....	477, 953	Sheboygan Cnty.....	136, 620
Westland Cnty.....	230, 246	Wayne County.....	113, 611	Wood County.....	247, 459
Detroit.....	15, 499, 517	Cleveland Csrst.....	7, 139, 141	Region VI.....	51, 330, 044
Dearborn.....	279, 101	Cleveland City.....	4, 854, 901	Arkansas.....	4, 498, 184
Livonia.....	150, 470	Parma City.....	131, 605	Little Rock Csrst.....	563, 933
Monroe Cnty.....	368, 887	Cuyahoga County.....	1, 269, 649	Pulaski Cnty.....	114, 766
Bay Cnty.....	557, 890	Lake County.....	384, 351	Little Rock.....	198, 895
Saginaw Cnty.....	866, 681	Cleveland Heights.....	108, 787	North Little Rock.....	80, 140
Saginaw Cnty.....	527, 478	Euclid.....	147, 265	Texarkana Csrst.....	287, 054
Oakland Cnty.....	5, 978, 156	Lakewood Cnty.....	147, 507	Texarkana City.....	108, 351
Pontiac Cnty.....	1, 523, 671	Geauga Cnty.....	95, 045	Bal Arkansas.....	3, 647, 197
Royal Oak Cnty.....	315, 068	Columbus Csrst.....	1, 549, 962	Benton Cnty.....	76, 753
Southfield Cnty.....	217, 217	Columbus Cnty.....	1, 230, 455	Craighead Cnty.....	176, 251
Waterford Twp.....	603, 433	Franklin Cnty.....	319, 507	Fort Smith Cnty.....	110, 676
St Clair Cnty.....	1, 133, 359	Dayton Csrst.....	1, 390, 147	Garland Cnty.....	129, 918
Calhoun Cnty.....	727, 994	Dayton Cnty.....	798, 406	Bal Jefferson Cnty.....	38, 183
Kalamazoo Cnty.....	586, 789	Montgomery Cnty.....	364, 543	Mississippi Cnty.....	99, 318
Kalamazoo Cnty.....	306, 493	Greene Cnty.....	133, 559	Pine Bluff Cnty.....	71, 057
Berrien Cnty.....	861, 469	Kettering Cnty.....	56, 505	Bal Sebastian Cnty.....	46, 122
Ottawa Cnty.....	424, 323	Toledo Csrst.....	1, 621, 127	Washington Cnty.....	177, 545
		Toledo Cnty.....	1, 340, 887	Louisiana.....	15, 055, 396

Rapides Parish	411, 999
Baton Rouge	607, 599
Lafayette Parish	166, 854
Lafayette Cty	116, 221
Cal/JDavis/Cam Crt	1, 176, 887
Bal Calcasieu	542, 350
Lake Charles Cty	572, 219
Quachita Parish	445, 072
Monroe City	184, 423
New Orleans Cty	4, 370, 842
Jefferson Parrish	979, 921
Shreveport	\$737, 158
Bal of Louisiana	6, 159, 064
Acadia Parish	59, 616
Bossier Parish	162, 272
Iberia Parish	60, 442
Lafourche Parish	85, 060
St Bernard Parish	288, 011
St Landry Parish	223, 396
St Mary Parish	54, 698
St Tammany Parish	419, 894
Tangipahoa Parish	388, 355
Terrebonne Parish	104, 291
Vernon Parish	36, 591
Bal Caddo Parish	280, 843
New Mexico	4, 495, 464
Albuquerque	1, 461, 680
Cty of Albuquerque	1, 100, 871
Bal Bernalillo Cnt	244, 224
Bal of New Mexico	3, 033, 784
Dona Ana Cnty	136, 394
San Juan Cnty	140, 208
Santa Fe Cnty	137, 222
Oklahoma	5, 195, 708
Comanche Cnty	106, 510
Lawton City	96, 800
Oklahoma Cnty	249, 629
Oklahoma Cty Csrt	1, 227, 479
Oklahoma Cty	864, 131
Norman City	176, 612
Bal Cleveland Coun	41, 249
Tulsa Csrt	654, 420
Tulsa Cty	467, 644
Bal Tulsa Cnty	79, 914
Bal of Oklahoma	2, 957, 670
Garfield Cnty	47, 146
Muskogee Cnty	165, 438
Payne County	64, 709
Texas	22, 085, 292
Amarillo Csrt	266, 008
Amarillo Cty	121, 866
Bal Randall Cnty	14, 904
Bal Potter Cnty	11, 838
Austin Csrt	490, 627
Austin Cty	301, 617
Bal Travis Cnty	33, 822
Beaumont Csrt	970, 912
Beaumont Cty	341, 686
Bal Jefferson Cnty	175, 658
Pt Arthur Cty	234, 890
Orange Cnty	151, 764
Cameron County	1, 043, 553
Brownsville Cty	422, 279
Corpus Christi Csr	770, 573
Corpus Christi Ct	485, 471
Bal Nueces Cnty	91, 726
Dallas City	957, 998
Dallas County	539, 353
Garland Cty	111, 855
Grand Prairie Cty	71, 183
Irving City	97, 528
Mesquite City	54, 673
Bal Dallas Cnty	204, 114
El Paso Cty/Cnty	898, 434
El Paso Cty	825, 331
Ft Worth Csrt	782, 961
Ft Worth Cty	559, 928
Arlington City	129, 293
Tarrant County	165, 717
Grand Prairie City	8, 899
Galveston Cnty	199, 472
Galveston City	87, 191
Houston	1, 880, 385
Harris County	921, 084
Pasadena City	185, 394
Bell Cnty Csrt	189, 260
Bell Cnty	115, 794
Hidalgo/Willacy Cs	1, 426, 493
Hidalgo Cnty	1, 364, 106
San Antonio Cst	2, 380, 955
San Antonio Cty	1, 996, 340

Bal Bexar Cnty	210, 008
McLennon Cnty Csrt	384, 938
Waco City	211, 385
Bal McLennan Cnty	71, 634
Wichita Cnty Csrt	192, 046
Wichita Falls Cty	79, 362
Bal Wichita Cnty	30, 310
Webb County	762, 726
Laredo City	732, 265
Texarkana Csrt	438, 263
Texarkana City	\$253, 1-
Bal Bowie Cnty	185, 074
Balance of Texas	6, 423, 534
Ablene City	65, 889
Bal Taylor Cnty	4, 466
Brazos Cnty	79, 086
Gregg Cnty	72, 462
Midland City	57, 734
Bal Midland Cnty	2, 333
Odessa City	90, 126
Bal Ector Cnty	10, 137
San Angelo Cty	63, 781
Bal Tom Green Cnty	2, 208
Tyler City	96, 424
Bal Smith Cnty	70, 500
Victoria Cnty	48, 526
Collin Cnty	83, 001
Denton Cnty	97, 277
Ft Bend Cnty	77, 104
Grayson Cnty	210, 990
Lubbock City	133, 283
Bal Lubbock Cnty	20, 524

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON
REPORT ENTITLED "THE CIA"

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Washington Report entitled "The CIA":

THE CIA

Most Americans have only the foggiest notion about what the Central Intelligence Agency does, but recently they have been disturbed to hear reports of the CIA conducting massive illegal domestic intelligence operations against dissident groups in the United States and covert actions to undermine foreign governments.

President Ford has acknowledged CIA complicity in the overthrow of the Chilean government and the use of subversion as an instrument of American foreign policy, and the Director of the CIA, William Colby, has now acknowledged that agents maintained thousands of files on American citizens and participated in break-ins, wiretaps, and surreptitious inspections of mail inside the United States.

The CIA, which grew out of the failure of American intelligence during World War II, was organized in the cold war days of 1947 and plunged into action against the worldwide enemy, Communism. Until recently it has drawn scant attention from Americans.

The basic function of the CIA as an independent intelligence gathering organization is not at issue. The charge now is that the CIA has violated the law by mounting intelligence operations against dissident groups in the United States and conducting covert political operations in Chile and other countries.

The President, the Secretary of State, and Congressional leaders have all declared themselves in support of covert operations, even though such a position runs counter to the common assumption that public officials should be both accountable and truthful.

CIA Director Colby acknowledges that whether the United States should abandon covert action and concentrate instead on in-

telligence gathering is a legitimate question. He admits that such abandonment would not have major impact on the security of the United States, but he argues that threats could arise which would require the United States to conduct covert operations.

Others believe the United States should never be engaged in covert, subversive activities in pursuit of American foreign policy objectives. Still others believe that there may be circumstances when the strategic interests of the United States require an alternative other than diplomacy or military action.

Concern about the CIA is also rising because of its size, cost, and the secretive way in which it is financed. The CIA employs about 16,500 people and spends about \$750 million a year. Most Members of Congress do not know how much money they are allocating for the CIA or what it will be used for. In fact, they do not even know when they are voting to allocate it. Small subcommittees of senior members, who rarely challenge the figures and the information supplied to them by the Agency, camouflage the CIA budget and spread it through a number of separate appropriation bills.

Not surprisingly, then, calls have arisen in the Congress for investigations, and there is certain to be much activity in the Congress in 1975 over the CIA.

A public discussion of the appropriate role for the CIA is long overdue. The CIA itself has the first responsibility for preventing further misuse of power, but tighter control over the CIA by the Congress is necessary. So far Congressional oversight has protected CIA interests but not the public interest. The Congress must pass a whole new set of directives and guidelines for the CIA. A central question of such an examination must be to what extent the United States should engage in covert operations. The Congress must also break up the concentration of decision-making power in the hands of a small group of anonymous officials with little or no accountability.

Obviously, the issues are difficult: what is the proper role of the CIA, and how do we achieve effective public oversight of secret operations in a democratic society? Inevitably tension will develop when an organization such as the CIA exists within a democracy. Congressional oversight of the CIA is part, but not all, of the answer. Good oversight can assure that operations are undertaken only in the most extreme cases and in the wisest possible way, but so long as the nation approves of secret activities, oversight alone will not resolve all the problems. There is no way for a democracy to manage secret activities, and no oversight, however effective, can ignore that fact.

I have come to the view that the United States should abandon covert operations designed to influence political results in foreign countries, except perhaps when the national security is clearly in jeopardy. I also believe the CIA should abandon illegal domestic intelligence operations against dissident groups. I am not persuaded that dirty tricks conducted by agents of the United States government serve the national interest. Covert intelligence gathering operations are needed in the modern world, but stringent criteria must be established by the Congress and enforced.

"WILL IT MAKE ME FAT?": THE
SENSITIVITIES OF TORTURERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, given the large number of authoritatively reported instances of torture occurring in junta-

ruled Chile, it no longer makes sense to speak and write of torture being "allegedly" used as an instrument of government there. It is a fact that the Pinochet government sanctions the use of torture.

Anthony Lewis' January 27 New York Times column recounts not only the inhuman treatment accorded Dr. Gustavo Molina and others by their Chilean captors, it makes clear the corrosive nature of torture. The pride one torturer takes in his "profession" illustrates this clearly.

But there is an encouraging aspect to Lewis' column. Dr. Molina is convinced that outside pressures—Americans expressing concern and outrage about torture and arbitrary arrests—do help those within Chile suffering under the arbitrary Pinochet rule. We must continue to protest even though we have ended military aid to Chile.

The article follows:

WILL IT MAKE ME FAT?

(By Anthony Lewis)

Dr. Gustavo Molina of Chile has been a leading figure in public health in Latin America for years; a book of his is a standard text. He was not in politics in Chile. But as an interne he had roomed with Dr. Salvador Allende, and he was a lifelong friend. At Allende's request he came out of retirement in 1970 to administer a region in Chile's long-established national health service.

Dr. Molina is a grandfatherly man whose voice remains gentle, his manner detached as he describes what he experienced after the military coup in Chile. "I'm 64, I'm a survivor," he says. "I don't care about me personally. I said that to the military men."

On Jan. 8, 1974, "three gentlemen from the Air Force," as he puts it, seized him without notice in Santiago. They threw him on the floor of a station wagon with two other doctors, Giorgio Solimano and Reynaldo Martinez. They were taken to a prison camp called Tejas Verde and kept together in a small room.

On Jan. 14 the three doctors were taken to another place, with hoods over their heads, for questioning. An officer told Dr. Molina that he was suspected of "permitting paramilitary instruction in your building." Dr. Molina realized that he was talking about concerts and social and other meetings in the health center's cafeteria. As he tried to explain, he heard another prisoner screaming in pain.

Dr. Molina was not tortured—he attributes that to his age. His two roommates were. They were strapped under gymnastic "horses," beaten and given electric shocks.

"Their lower limbs were paralyzed," Dr. Molina said. He added in a calm professional tone: "It must be a very low current, because the paralysis lasted only four or five days. I nursed them."

Dr. Solimano's torturer, when he finished, drank a glass of mineral water. "Giorgio," he asked the doctor, "will it make me fat?"

The three doctors had tried to prepare themselves to behave "with dignity." So Dr. Solimano, a nutritionist, gave a careful reply on the effects of mineral water.

"If you ever find me outside, Giorgio," the torturer asked, "what will you do to me?" Dr. Solimano said he would do nothing—he was a doctor, he helped people. The torturer responded: "Don't you see? This is a profession, just like yours."

Why have people behaved so savagely in Chile since the coup? The question puzzles Dr. Molina. It used to be such an orderly country, so law-abiding. And the change is not confined to the military.

"The present Director of Health was my student in 1951," Dr. Molina said—"my favorite student for years. He was a member of

the Socialist party then. Now he has become a wild beast, asking the Army to execute certain doctors.

"Why? Why in Germany? I think the same type of ferocity developed in France after the Revolution. It's like a cancer. Suppose tomorrow the left came to power in Chile. Would we be able to stop torture?"

Another important question is whether outside pressure helps the victims of torture and arbitrary arrest. Dr. Molina is convinced that it does, especially when it comes from the United States. He says that various expressions of U.S. concern were crucially helpful to him, notably a committee sent to Chile by Senator Edward Kennedy. He believes that Dr. Solimano was saved by the personal intervention of an American nutritionist, Dr. Nevin Scrimshaw of M.I.T.

No formal charges were ever made against Dr. Molina or the others. After months of confinement he and Drs. Solimano and Martinez were released. He found asylum in the Swedish, then the Colombian Embassy and got out to Colombia. He was interviewed during a visit to the United States, where he spent years of professional life and has many friends. He got his Public Health Degree at Johns Hopkins.

The Chilean junta makes a practice of denouncing as a criminal and conspirator anyone who reports the use of torture. It may be well, therefore, to say that I sought an estimate of Dr. Molina from a man who was in the cabinet of Allende's anti-Communist predecessor in Chile, Eduardo Frei. His estimate was: "a professional, a moderate man, a serious man, a respected physician, not involved in politics."

The junta maintains that it has issued orders against the use of torture. Everett G. Martin of The Wall Street Journal, in a thoughtful recent article from Santiago, wrote: "An honest investigation of its own jails by the junta could end torture quickly if its intentions were genuine."

Dr. Molina does not want to get involved in political attacks on the junta. Indeed, he was reluctant to talk about his own experience—except that he thought doing so might help some doctors who are still in prison in Chile. One is Professor Hugo Behm, an internationally-known demographer. Another is Dr. Natacha Carrion, whose husband was tortured and killed and who delivered her own baby in prison. Dr. Molina hopes that Americans who helped him will care about them as well.

THE 94TH CONGRESS SCOUTING SURVEY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during each of the current and past four Congresses, I have surveyed the Members of the House and Senate for the Boy Scouts of America to determine the participation of Members of Congress in Scouting, either as Scouts during their youth or as adult leaders.

The survey for the current Congress is now complete, with over 97 percent of the new Members of the House and Senate having responded to the survey form or followup phone inquiry. I thank them for their cooperation.

As I have done in the past, I am placing the results of the survey in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they will be available to other Members of Congress during the next 2 years for reference.

The results are also made available to the press, and through my office and the Boy Scouts of America, to others in Scouting or not associated with Scouting who can utilize the information.

A brief summary of the survey results, in the form of a news release, is also included:

THE 94TH CONGRESS SCOUTING SURVEY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The percentage of Members of the 94th Congress who have participated in Scouting, either as members of Scouting during their youth or as adult volunteers, dropped by 2.3 percent from the 93rd Congress, to 57.7 percent, according to a biennial survey by 7th Ohio District Congressman Clarence J. Brown.

Brown has surveyed Congress at the beginning of each of the current and past four Congresses for the Boy Scouts of America. He said the current survey shows that 309 of the 535 Members of the House and Senate have participated in Scouting, a drop from 321 during the previous Congress. The totals include 249 Members of the House, down from 262 two years ago, and 60 Members of the Senate, up one from 1973.

Brown also noted that the number of Members of the 94th Congress who attained the rank of Eagle as Scouts declined by three from the 93rd Congress, with the loss of seven former Eagle Scouts in the previous House membership, and the addition of four former Eagle Scouts among the current new Members. The Senate Eagle Scout representation remained the same, at five.

Brown's own Scouting activities began as a member of Troop 5 in Washington, D.C., where he served as a Senior Patrol Leader and earned the rank of Eagle. He was also Assistant Scoutmaster of Troop 47 in his hometown of Blanchester, Ohio, a counselor at Camp Hugh Taylor Birch at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and has served as a member of the Tecumseh Council, BSA, in southwestern Ohio.

The results of the Scouting survey were placed in the Congressional Record by Brown to be available for use by other Members of the House and Senate, and turned over to the BSA national headquarters for distribution within the organization and other organizations and individuals active in Scouting.

BREAKDOWN OF 94TH CONGRESS SCOUTING SURVEY

Scout (only):	
Representatives	153
Senators	37
Total	190
Scout and leader:	
Representatives	72
Senators	16
Total	88
Leader (only):	
Representatives	24
Senators	7
Total	31
Total:	
Representatives	249
Senators	60
Total	309

Total who were Leaders: 119.
Percentage of Members who participated in Scouting: 57.7%.

EAGLE SCOUTS

Senators—Frank Moss, Utah (D), Richard Schweiker, Penn. (R), Lloyd Bentsen, Tex. (D), John Culver, Iowa (D), and Sam Nunn, Ga. (D).

Representatives: Bill Alexander, Ark. (D), Burt Talcott, Calif. (R), Charles Bennett,

Fla. (D), Keith J. Sebelius, Kans. (R), Larry Winn, Jr. Kans. (R), Thad Cochran, Miss. (R), Barber E. Conable, N.Y. (R), Mark Andrews, N.D. (R), Clarence J. Brown, Ohio (R), J. William Stanton, Ohio (R), Tom Steed, Okla. (D), Daniel J. Flood, Penn. (D), Bill Archer, Tex. (R), J. J. (Jake) Pickle, Tex. (D), Henry S. Reuss, Wisc. (D), M. Caldwell Butler, Va. (R), Phillip R. Sharp, Ind. (D), John P. Murtha, Penn. (D), Richard T. Schulze, Penn. (R), Robert C. Krueger, Tex. (D).

SILVER BUFFALO

Senator John Glenn, Ohio (D).

SILVER BEAVER

Senator Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R).
Representatives: Del Clawson, Calif. (R), Larry Winn, Jr. Kans. (R), John McCollister, Neb. (R).

SILVER ANTELOPE

Senator Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R).

CUB SCOUT DEN MOTHER

Rep. Marjorie Holt, Md. (R).

RESULTS OF BOY SCOUT SURVEY, 94TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, CONDUCTED BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN OF OHIO

Scout denoted by "S"; Leader or Adult Volunteer denoted by "L"; Scout and Leader denoted by "S&L".

ALABAMA

Sen. John Sparkman (D) S&L, John Buchanan, Jr. (R) L, William Dickinson (R) S, Walter W. Flowers (D) S&L.

ALASKA

Sen. Mike Gravel (D) S, Sen. Theodore F. Stevens (R) S&L.

ARIZONA

Sen. Barry Goldwater (R) S, Sen. Paul Fannin (R) S, John J. Rhodes (R) S, Morris K. Udall (D) S&L.

ARKANSAS

Sen. Dale Bumpers (D) S&L, Bill Alexander (D) S, John Hammerschmidt (R) S, Wilbur Mills (D) S&L, Ray Thornton (D) S.

CALIFORNIA

Sen. Alan Cranston (D) S, Sen. John Tunney (D) L, Alphonzo Bell (R) S, Del Clawson (R) S&L, James Corman (D) S, George Danielson (D) S, Ronald Dellums (D) S, Don Edwards (D) S, Barry Goldwater, Jr. (R) S, Harold Johnson (D) L, Robert J. Lagomarsino (R) S, Robert Leggett (D) S&L, James F. Lloyd (D) S, Paul McCloskey (R) L, John McFall (D) L, George Miller (D) S, Norman Y. Mineta (D) S&L, John E. Moss (D) S, Carlos Moorhead (R) L, Jerry M. Patterson (D) S, John Roussetot (R) S, Edward Roybal (D) S, Burt Talcott (R) S&L, Lionel Van Deerlin (D) S, Bob Wilson (R) S.

COLORADO

Frank Evans (D) S&L, James Johnson (R) S, Patricia Schroeder (D) S, Timothy E. Wirth (D) S.

CONNECTICUT

Sen. Lowell Weicker (R) S, Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D) S, William Cotto (D) S, Robert Gialmo (D) S, Stewart McKinney (R) S, Anthony J. Moffett (D) S.

DELAWARE

Sen. Joseph Biden (D) S, Sen. William Roth, Jr. (R) L.

FLORIDA

Sen. Lawton Chiles (D) S&L, L. A. Bafalis (R) S, Charles Bennett (D) S, J. Herbert Burke (R) S, Dante B. Fascell (D) S, Louis Frey (R) S, Don Fuqua (D) S&L, Sam Gibbons (D) S, James Haley (D) S, Paul Rogers (D) S&L, Claude Pepper (D) S&L, Robert Sikes (D) S, C. W. Young (R) S&L.

GEORGIA

Sen. Sam Nunn (D) S, Jack Brinkley (D) L, John Flynt, Jr. (D) S&L, Bo Ginn (D)

S. Phil Landrum (D) S, Elliott Harris Levittas (D) S, Lawrence P. McDonald (D) S, Dawson Mathis (D) S&L, Robert Stephens, Jr. (D) S&L, W. S. (Bill) Stuckey (D) S&L.

HAWAII

Sen. Hiram Fong (R) S&L, Spark Matsunaga (D) S.

IDAHO

Sen. Frank Church (D) S, Sen. James McClure (R) S, George V. Hansen (R) S&L.

ILLINOIS

Sen. Charles Percy (R) S&L, Frank Annunzio (D) L, Phillip Crane (R) S, Edward Derwinski (R) S, John Erlenborn (R) S, Tim L. Hall (D) S, Henry J. Hyde (R) S, Robert McClory (D) S, Edward Madigan (R) S, Ralph Metcalf (D) S, Abner J. Mikva (D) S, Corgan Murphy (D) S, Dan Rostenkowski (D) S&L, Paul M. Simon (D) S, Sidney Yates (D) S.

INDIANA

John Brademas (D) S&L, Lee Hamilton (D) S, Elwood Hillis (R) S, Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (D) S, Phillip R. Sharp (D) S.

IOWA

Sen. Dick Clark (D) L, Sen. John C. Culver (D) S, Berkley Bedell (D) S&L, Michael T. Blouin (D) S, Neal Smith (D) L.

KANSAS

Sen. Bob Dole (D) S, Sen. James Pearson (R) S, Martha E. Keyes (D) S&L, Keith Sebelius (R) S, Garner Shriver (R) S&L, Joe Skubitz (R) L, Larry Winn, Jr., (R) S&L.

KENTUCKY

Wendell H. Ford (D) L, Sen. Walter Huddleston (D) S, John Breckinridge (D) S, William Natcher (D) S, Gene Snyder (R) S.

LOUISIANA

Otto E. Passman (D) S, David Treen (R) S, Joe D. Waggoner (D) S.

MAINE

Sen. William Hathaway (D) S, Sen. Edmund Muskie (D) S, William Cohen (R) S.

MARYLAND

Sen. Charles McCaskey (R) S, Sen. Glenn Beall (R) S, Goodloe Byron (D) S&L, Marjorie Holt (R) S&L, Gilbert Gude (R) S&L, Clarence Long (D) S, Paul Sarbanes (D) S, Gladys Spellman (D) S&L.

MASSACHUSETTS

Sen. Edward Brooke (R) S, Michael Harrington (D) S, Thomas O'Neill, Jr. (D) L, John Moakley (I) S, Paul E. Tsongas (D) S.

MICHIGAN

Sen. Robert Griffin (R) S&L, William Broomfield (R) S&L, Garry Brown (R) S, Elford Cederberg (R) S, John Dingell (D) S&L, Edward Hutchinson (R) S, Lucien N. Nedzi (D) L, Philip Ruppe (R) S, Richard F. Vander Veen (D) S&L.

MINNESOTA

Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D) S&L, Sen. Walter Mondale (D) S, Bob Bergland (D) S, Donald Fraser (D) S, Bill Frenzel (R) S, Joseph Karth (D) S&L.

MISSISSIPPI

David Bowen (D) S, Thad Cochran (R) S&L, G. V. Montgomery (D) S.

MISSOURI

Bill Burlison (D) S&L, William Clay (D) S, William L. Hungate (D) S, William J. Randall (D) S.

MONTANA

Sen. Lee Metcalf (D) S&L, Max S. Baucus (D) S.

NEBRASKA

John McCollister (R) S&L.

NEVADA

Sen. Howard Cannon (D) S, Sen. Paul Laxalt (R) S, James D. Santini (D) S.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sen. Thomas McIntyre (D) L, Norman E. D'Amours (D) S&L.

NEW JERSEY

Sen. Clifford Case (R) S, Sen. Harrison Williams, Jr. (D) L, James J. Florio (D) S, James J. Howard (D) S, William J. Hughes (D) S, Andrew Maguire (D) S, Helen S. Meyner (D) S.

NEW MEXICO

Manuel Lujan (R) S&L, Harold Runnels (D) S&L.

NEW YORK

Herman Badillo (D) S, Barber Conable, Jr. (R) S&L, Thomas J. Downey (D) S, Hamilton Fish (R) L, Benjamin Gilman (R) S, James F. Hastings (R) S, Frank Horton (R) S&L, Jack Kemp (R) S, Robert McEwen (R) S, Matthew F. McHugh (D) S, Donald Mitchell (R) S, Otis Pike (D) S&L, Frederick W. Richmond (D) S, Samuel S. Stratton (D) S&L, John Wyder (R) S.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sen. Jesse Helms (R) S, Ike Andrews (D) L, James Broyhill (R) S, L. H. Fountain (D) S, David Henderson (D) S, Walter Jones (D) S, James Martin (R) S, Stephen Lynbrook Neal (D) S, L. Richardson Preyer (D) S&L, Roy Taylor (D) S&L.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mark Andrews (R) S.

OHIO

Sen. John Glenn (D) L, Sen. Robert Taft, Jr. (R) S&L, John Ashbrook (R) L, Clarence J. Brown (R) S&L, Samuel Devine (R) S, Tennyson Guyer (R) S&L, William Harsha (R) S, Wayne Hays (D) S&L, Thomas N. Kindness (R) S&L, Delbert Latta (R) S, Clarence Miller (R) S, Charles Mosher (R) L, Ronald M. Mottl (D) S, J. William Stanton (R) S, Louis Stokes (D) S&L, Chalmers Wylie (R) S&L.

OKLAHOMA

Sen. Dewey Bartlett (R) S, Carl Albert (D) S&L, John Jarman (D) L, James Jones (D) S, Theodore M. Risenhoover (D) S, Tom Steed (D) S&L.

OREGON

Sen. Mark Hatfield (R) S&L, Sen. Robert Packwood (R) S, Walter Leslie AuCoin (D) S, Robert B. Duncan (D) S&L, Al Ullman (D) L.

PENNSYLVANIA

Sen. Richard Schweiker (R) S&L, Sen. Hugh Scott (R) S, Edward Blester (R) S, Lawrence Coughlin (R) S, Robert W. Edgar (D) S, Joshua Eilberg (D) S&L, Daniel Flood (D) S, William F. Goodling (R) S&L, Albert Johnson (R) L, Joseph McDade (R) S, Thomas Morgan (D) S, John P. Murtha (D) S&L, Gary A. Myers (R) S, Fred Rooney (D) S, Herman Schneebeli (R) S, Richard T. Schulze (R) S&L, E. G. Shuster (R) S, Gus Yatron (D) S.

RHODE ISLAND

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D) S.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sen. Ernest Hollings (D) S, Sen. Strom Thurmond (R) S&L, Mendel Davis (D) S, Kenneth Lamar Holland (D) S&L, Floyd Spence (R) S&L.

SOUTH DAKOTA

James Abdnor (R) S.

TENNESSEE

Sen. William Brock III (R) S, John Duncan (R) S&L, Harold E. Ford (D) S, Richard Fulton (D) S&L, Ed Jones (D) S, Dan Kuykendall (R) L, Marilyn L. Lloyd (D) S.

TEXAS

Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D) S&L, Bill Archer (R) S, Omar Burleson (D) S, Bob Casey (D) S&L, James Collins (R) S, Eligio de la Garza (D) S&L, Henry Gonzalez (D) S&L, Jack E.

Hightower (D) S&L, Abraham Kazen, Jr. (D) S, Robert C. Krueger (D) S, Dale Milford (D) S, Wright Patman (D) L, J. J. Pickle (D) S, W. R. Poage (D) L, Ray Roberts (D) S&L, Olin Teague (D) S, Richard White (D) S&L, Charles Wilson (D) S, James Wright, Jr. (D) S&L.

UTAH

Sen. Jake Garn (R) S&L, Sen. Frank Moss (D) S, Allen T. Howe (D) S&L, K. Gunn McKay (D) S&L.

VERMONT

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D) S&L, Sen. Robert T. Stafford (R) S, James M. Jeffords (R) S.

VIRGINIA

Sen. William Scott (R) L, M. Caldwell Butler (R) S, W. C. Daniel (D) L, Thomas Downing (D) S&L, Joseph Fisher (D) S, J. Kenneth Robinson (R) S&L, David Satterfield III (D) S, William Wampler (R) S.

WASHINGTON

Sen. Henry Jackson (D) S, Brock Adams (D) S, Don L. Bonker (D) S, Thomas Foley (D) S, Lloyd Meeds (D) S&L.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sen. Robert Byrd (D) S, Sen. Jennings Randolph (D) S, Ken Hechler (D) S, Robert Mollohan (D) S, John M. Slack, Jr. (D) S, Harley O. Staggers (D) L.

WISCONSIN

Sen. William Proxmire (D) S, Robert W. Kastenmeier (D) S, Henry S. Reuss (D) S&L, William A. Steiger (R) S.

WYOMING

Sen. Gale W. McGee (D) S.

DEDICATION OF L. B. J. BUST

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the 64th Texas Legislature in Austin, Tex. recently, there was a ceremony in honor of a new sculpture of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson. The beautiful bust, which is located in the State capitol building, was done by Ms. Jimilu Mason, of Alexandria, Va. Ms. Mason should be commended not only for her fine work of art, but for her ability in getting Mr. Johnson to stand still long enough to sculpt his likeness. Anyone who knew the President knows that keeping him in one place very long was no easy task.

Texas Lt. Gov. William P. Hobby, Jr., gave the dedicatory address on this recent occasion. Mr. Hobby comes from an illustrious political family in Texas. His late father was Governor of the State from 1917 to 1921. His mother, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, served as the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the Eisenhower administration.

I believe that Governor Hobby's words are worth sharing with you and I insert his speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS GIVEN AT THE DEDICATION OF LBJ BUST

(By Lt. Gov. Bill Hobby)

Governor and Mrs. Briscoe, Speaker and Mrs. Clayton, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Nugent, distinguished state officials, mem-

bers of the 64th Legislature, ladies and gentlemen.

Today we are gathered here in Joint Session to honor the memory of one of the greatest Texans of all times.

Some day, I believe, historians will say he was one of the greatest Americans of all times.

The Presidency of Lyndon Johnson was marked by the greatest outpouring of creative and innovative legislation this nation has ever seen . . . legislation that touched the lives of every man, woman and child in America . . . legislation for the people.

He understood the people because he was one of them. Though he rose to fame and fortune, he never, never forgot his humble beginnings. He never forgot those he left behind, because in a very real sense he didn't leave them behind. He brought them with him—every step of the way.

He was uniquely a product of his Texas environment.

The populism of the Texas frontier was as much a part of him as the air he breathed.

The plight of the small farmer and rancher, trying to eke out a living from the unyielding caliche soil, gave him a sense of compassion that remained with him to his dying day. He used to like to tell the story of the farmer in the hill country who once remarked that the great depression of the 30's wouldn't have been so bad if it hadn't come right in the middle of hard times.

Even the State Legislature, which honors him today, left its indelible mark on him and his philosophy.

Lyndon Johnson never served in the Texas Legislature, but his father, Sam Ealy Johnson, Jr., did—from 1905 to 1909, and from 1917 to 1923. And it was through his father's service here that Lyndon Johnson learned his first lessons of politics.

"I remember," he once remarked, "what my father said to me about public service when I was a little boy walking around, following him barefooted and standing there in the hot sand of Blanco County . . . He used to say to me 'Son, if you are to speak for people, you must know them, and if you are to represent people, you must love them.'"

Lyndon Johnson learned that lesson well. He did get to know the people and he did grow to love the people—and he represented them faithfully and well.

It was here, in this chamber, listening to such men as Wright Patman—his father's desk mate—that the fire of public service was kindled in him.

It was here, in this chamber, observing his father's unrelenting fight against the Ku Klux Klan, that he developed his first understanding of what the crippling legacy of bigotry could do to his fellow men.

"My father fought (the Klansmen) many long years ago in Texas," President Johnson once said, "and I have fought them all my life because I believe them to threaten the peace of every community where they exist. I shall continue to fight them because I know their loyalty is not to the United States of America but instead to a hooded society of bigots."

Later as a young school teacher in South Texas, he saw first-hand the results of such discrimination. The nation will never forget his remarks to a Joint Session of Congress in 1965:

"My first job after college was as a teacher in Cotulla, Texas, in a small Mexican-American school," he said. "Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see the scars on the hopeful face of a young child . . . I never thought then, in 1928, that I would be standing here in 1965. It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of those students and

to help people like them all over this country.

"But now I do have that chance—and I'll let you in on a secret: I mean to use it."

And he *did* use it.

He took office in the middle of the longest sustained period of prosperity this nation has ever known. A lesser man would have been content to preside over the status quo.

But Lyndon Johnson was not a status quo man. He ripped the glittering cellophane wrapper from around the nation and showed us what was really under it.

He showed us poverty, illness and hunger in the midst of affluence.

He showed us illiteracy and disease in city ghettos and rural hollows alike.

He showed us the plight of a full 20 million Americans who were treated as second-class citizens because of the color of their skins.

He showed us in graphic and sickening detail the ravages man had made on his environment: The filth in our air, the wastes in our lakes and rivers and the junk in our countryside.

And he did more than show us. He demanded that we face up to these problems and do something about them.

Because of Lyndon Johnson, black and brown Americans now walk proudly to the polling place, where once they faced intimidation, fear and rejection.

Because of Lyndon Johnson, every young American now has the opportunity for all the education his mind can take, regardless of the income of his parents.

Because of Lyndon Johnson, every American can now face the terrifying prospect of sickness in old age, at least with dignity and serenity, thanks to Medicare.

Because of Lyndon Johnson, the stark fact of American poverty is an inseparable part of our political dialogue. We may not have wiped poverty out, but we will never again be able to ignore it.

Because of Lyndon Johnson, American consumers are better protected than ever before from unwholesome meat and poultry, dangerous tops and products, and unscrupulous lenders.

Because of Lyndon Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson—who honors us with her presence today—America is a cleaner and more beautiful place to live.

Perhaps Lyndon Johnson's Presidency was best summed up by his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, at the late President's memorial service at the United States Capitol in January of 1973. Here is what he said:

"More than a thousand years ago, in a simpler and more robust age, perhaps we might have known him as Lyndon the Liberator, for he was determined to free our people in body, mind and spirit."

Well, his determination was translated into action . . . and action into programs. His legacy is written large in the laws of the land—and we are a better people because of it.

COSPONSORS OF KING STATUE BILL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert herewith the list of 156 Members who have joined with me in sponsoring legislation to authorize the commissioning of a statue or bust of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. for per-

manent placement in the U.S. Capitol. I sincerely hope that this overwhelming support leads to speedy passage of this fitting tribute to a truly great man.

The list of cosponsors follows:

COSPONSORS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. STATUE BILL

1. Abzug, Bella S. (D-NY).
2. Adams, Brock (D-Wash).
3. Addabbo, Joseph (D-NY).
4. Anderson, Glenn (D-Cal).
5. Anderson, John (R-Ill).
6. Ashley, Thomas (D-Ohio).
7. Aspin, Les (D-Wis).
8. Badillo, Herman (D-NY).
9. Barrett, William A. (D-Pa).
10. Bedell, Berkley (D-Iowa).
11. Bell, Alphonzo (R-Cal).
12. Benitez, Jaime (PR).
13. Bergland, Bob (D-Minn).
14. Blaggi, Mario (D-NY).
15. Biester, Edward G., Jr., (R-Pa).
16. Boggs, Lindy (D-La).
17. Boland, Edward P. (D-Mass).
18. Bolling, Richard (D-Mo).
19. Bonker, Don (D-Wash).
20. Brademas, John (D-Ind).
21. Brown, Clarence (R-Ohio).
22. Brown, Garry (R-Mich).
23. Brown, George E., Jr. (D-Cal).
24. Buchanan, John (R-Ala).
25. Burke, James A. (D-Mass).
26. Burke, Yvonne B. (D-Cal).
27. Burton, John L. (D-Cal).
28. Burton, Phillip (D-Cal).
29. Chisholm, Shirley (D-NY).
30. Clay, William (D-Mo).
31. Collins, Cardiss (D-Ill).
32. Conte, Silvio O. (R-Mass).
33. Conyers, John, Jr. (D-Mich).
34. Corman, James C. (D-Cal).
35. Cotter, William R. (D-Conn).
36. Coughlin, Lawrence (R-Pa).
37. Daniels, Dominick V. (D-NJ).
38. Danielson, George (D-Cal).
39. Dellums, Ronald (D-Cal).
40. de Lugo, Ron (VI).
41. Diggs, Charles C., Jr. (D-Mich).
42. Drinan, Robert F. (D-Mass).
43. Duncan, Robert (D-Oreg).
44. Eckhardt, Bob (D-Tex).
45. Edgar, Robert W. (D-Pa).
46. Edwards, Don (D-Cal).
47. Ellberg, Joshua (D-Pa).
48. Evans, Frank E. (D-Colo).
49. Fascell, Dante B. (D-Fla).
50. Fauntroy, Walter E. (DC).
51. Fenwick, Millicent (R-NJ).
52. Findley, Paul (R-Ill).
53. Fish, Hamilton, Jr. (R-NY).
54. Flood, Daniel (D-Pa).
55. Foley, Thomas S. (D-Wash).
56. Ford, Harold (D-Tenn).
57. Fraser, Donald M. (D-Minn).
58. Frenzel, Bill (R-Minn).
59. Giaimo, Robert N. (D-Conn).
60. Gibbons, Sam (D-Fla).
61. Green, William J. (D-Pa).
62. Harrington, Michael (D-Mass).
63. Hawkins, Augustus F. (D-Cal).
64. Hechler, Ken (D-WVa).
65. Helstoski, Henry (D-NJ).
66. Hicks, Floyd V. (D-Wash).
67. Holtzman, Elizabeth (D-NY).
68. Horton, Frank (R-NY).
69. Howard, James J. (D-NJ).
70. Hughes, William (D-NJ).
71. Hungate, William L. (D-Mo).
72. Johnson, James P. (R-Colo).
73. Jordan, Barbara (D-Tex).
74. Karth, Joseph E. (D-Minn).
75. Kastenmeier, Robert W. (D-Wis).
76. Keys, Martha (D-Kans).
77. Koch, Edward I. (D-NY).
78. Leggett, Robert L. (D-Cal).
79. Litton, Jerry (D-Mo).
80. Long, Clarence D. (D-Md).
81. Long, Gillis, W. (D-La).
82. McCloskey, Paul N., Jr. (R-Cal).
83. McHugh, Matthew F. (D-NY).
84. McKinney, Stewart B. (R-Conn).
85. Madden, Ray J. (D-Ind).
86. Matsunaga, Spark M. (D-Hawaii).
87. Mazzoli, Romano L. (D-Ky).
88. Meeds, Lloyd (D-Wash).
89. Melcher, John (D-Mont).
90. Metcalfe, Ralph H. (D-Ill).
91. Mezvinsky, Edward (D-Iowa).
92. Miller, George (D-Cal).
93. Mink, Patsy T. (D-Hawaii).
94. Mitchell, Donald J. (R-NY).
95. Mitchell, Parren J. (D-Md).
96. Moakley, Joe (D-Mass).
97. Moorhead, William S. (D-Pa).
98. Mosher, Charles A. (R-Ohio).
99. Moss, John E. (D-Cal).
100. Murphy, John M. (D-NY).
101. Murphy, Morgan F. (D-Ill).
102. Nix, Robert N.C. (D-Pa).
103. Nolan, Richard (D-Minn).
104. Nowak, Henry (D-NY).
105. Obey, David R. (D-Wis).
106. O'Brien, George M. (R-Ill).
107. O'Neill, Thomas P. (D-Mass).
108. Ottlinger, Richard (D-NY).
109. Patten, Edward J. (D-NJ).
110. Pattison, Edward (D-NY).
111. Pepper, Claude (D-Fla).
112. Price, Melvin (D-Ill).
113. Pritchard, Joe (R-Wash).
114. Rangel, Charles B. (D-NY).
115. Rees, Thomas M. (D-Cal).
116. Reuss, Henry S. (D-Wis).
117. Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (D-Mich).
118. Rodino, Peter W., Jr. (D-NJ).
119. Roe, Robert A. (D-NJ).
120. Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (D-NY).
121. Roush, J. Edward (D-Ind).
122. Roybal, Edward R. (D-Cal).
123. Ryan, Leo J. (D-Cal).
124. Sarbanes, Paul S. (D-Md).
125. Schroeder, Patricia (D-Colo).
126. Seiberling, John F. (D-Ohio).
127. Simon, Paul (D-Ill).
128. Sisk, B. F. (D-Cal).
129. Solarz, Stephen (D-NY).
130. Spellman, Gladys (D-Md).
131. Stanton, J. William (R-Ohio).
132. Stark, Fortney H. (D-Cal).
133. Steelman, Alan (R-Tex).
134. Stokes, Louis (D-Ohio).
135. Stratton, Samuel S. (D-NY).
136. Symington, James W. (D-Mo).
137. Thompson, Frank, Jr. (D-NJ).
138. Traxler, Bob (D-Mich).
139. Tsongas, Paul (D-Mass).
140. Udall, Morris K. (D-Ariz).
141. Van Deerlin, Lionel (D-Cal).
142. Vander Veen, Richard (D-Mich).
143. Vanik, Charles A. (D-Ohio).
144. Vigorito, Joseph P. (D-Pa).
145. Waxman, Henry A. (D-Cal).
146. Weaver, James (D-Oreg).
147. Whalen, Charles W., Jr. (R-Ohio).
148. Wilson, Charles (D-Tex).
149. Wilson, Charles H. (D-Cal).
150. Wolff, Lester L. (D-NY).
151. Won Pat, Antonio (Guam).
152. Wydler, John W. (R-NY).
153. Yates, Sidney R. (D-Ill).
154. Young, Andrew (D-Ga).
155. Zefferetti, Leo C. (D-NY).
156. Jacobs, Andrew (D-Ind).

WHAT GOES ON IN VIETNAM?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, last night's NBC news carried the startling announcement that several teams of uniformed Americans have been sent to

Vietnam to help reorganize a supply system for the South Vietnamese air force. UPI says the presence of these Americans violates the spirit if not the letter of the Paris Peace Agreement. The men are put to work 4 days at a time, then flown to the Philippines for an overnight stay. American officials in Saigon say this is technically not a violation of the agreement and is perfectly legal.

I believe it is a violation of that agreement and I am certain that it is a violation of the congressional prohibition against any new American involvement in Vietnam. This is where we came in—and unless we are vigilant, I fear that we will be right back in, with American troops and bombs and planes and ships and ammunition.

If another Presidential war is building, it is time for Congress to get the details and take immediate action to cut off any secret military intervention. I am glad to report that 30 Members of Congress now share this view. My resolution of inquiry, H. Res. 134, now has 30 cosponsors. I hope that many of my colleagues will join in this important search for information.

The names of the cosponsors and text of the resolution are attached:

NAMES OF COSPONSORS

- Representative Herman Badillo, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Edward Beard, Democrat of Rhode Island.
- Representative Michael T. Blouin, Democrat of Iowa.
- Representative George E. Brown, Democrat of California.
- Representative Bob Carr, Democrat of Michigan.
- Representative John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan.
- Representative Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat of California.
- Representative Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.
- Representative Thomas J. Downey, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Robert W. Edgar, Democrat of Pennsylvania.
- Representative Don Edwards, Democrat of California.
- Representative Harold E. Ford, Democrat of Tennessee.
- Representative Mark W. Hannaford, Democrat of California.
- Representative Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts.
- Representative Elizabeth Holtzman, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Martha Keys, Democrat of Kansas.
- Representative Andrew Maguire, Democrat of New Jersey.
- Representative Helen S. Meyner, Democrat of New Jersey.
- Representative George Miller, Democrat of California.
- Representative Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland.
- Representative Anthony Toby Moffett, Democrat of Connecticut.
- Representative Richard Nolan, Democrat of Minnesota.
- Representative Charles B. Rangel, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Frederick W. Richmond, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.
- Representative Edward R. Roybal, Democrat of California.

Representative Patricia Schroeder, Democrat of Colorado.

Representative Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of New York.

Representative Fortney H. Stark, Democrat of California.

Representative James Weaver, Democrat of Oregon.

H. RES. 129

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense be, and he hereby is, required to furnish to the House of Representatives, within ten days after the adoption of this Resolution, full and complete information on the following:

1. Since the Paris Peace Agreement of January 1973, has the United States carried out reconnaissance flights over North Vietnam or over areas of South Vietnam controlled by the Provisional Revolutionary Government? How many were for military reconnaissance and how many were for other purposes? Please specify what other purposes and dates.

2. Since January 27, 1973, has the United States supplied any reconnaissance information to the government of South Vietnam or otherwise assisted that government in its bombing raids over North Vietnam or over areas of South Vietnam controlled by the Provisional Revolutionary Government? If so, please supply the dates on which such information was supplied.

3. State the number and classification of American personnel now employed in the maintenance or repair of military aircraft and other military equipment in South Vietnam. State the number and classification of American personnel now employed in advising or assisting the government of South Vietnam, specifying the number of those serving in an advisory capacity to the military services of South Vietnam.

4. Are any American aircraft carriers now stationed within 12 miles off the shores of Southeast Asia or en route to that destination? If so, how many?

5. Furnish the following data regarding United States involvement in Cambodia:

(a) the text of Cambodia's request for air supply on Saturday, January 11, 1975;

(b) the number of flights made by C-130s or other American aircraft carrying military supplies to Cambodia between January 11 and the present;

(c) the description and quantity of such supplies and where they are flown from;

(d) the number of American military personnel involved;

(e) the number of American civilians involved;

(f) the cost of supplies, flights and personnel involved.

ALBERT WILLIAM HARTMAN, M.D.—
A GREAT HUMANITARIAN

HON. ROBERT (BOB) KRUEGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Antonio, Tex., has long been known for the richness of its historical and cultural heritage. We are proud of its place in the development of the Southwest and its traditions. However, the people of San Antonio are now developing another tradition which is a growing source of pride. This is the city's emerging role as a major center for medical research and treatment.

I would like to pay tribute today to Dr. Albert William Hartman, a man who has been instrumental in the development of our medical facilities. For over 25 years he has tirelessly given of his time and devotion toward this end. The results of his efforts can now be seen throughout our expanding medical community. Through his individual skills he has helped countless numbers of people in our area and become known as the dean of the San Antonio surgeons. Through his collective work with others toward improvements on a community-wide scale, he has had a far-reaching influence.

To show appreciation for his services, the city of San Antonio recently presented Dr. Hartman with the following citation:

In recognition of a great humanitarian who has labored unceasingly and contributed immeasurably to the expansion of better medical facilities and better health care for this community. His exceptional skill in applying surgery to human ills and his dedication to the serving of mankind assures that his work will be continued through the foundation which proudly bears his name.

Dr. Hartman's major contributions to San Antonio and south Texas resulted from his position as chief of surgery at the Robert B. Green Memorial Hospital from 1946 to 1966. His main preoccupation during these years was in securing improved medical care for those who were lacking adequate financial means. He was instrumental in developing a program for teaching and training hospital personnel, based on methods used in other teaching hospitals. To this end, he helped establish a program for post-graduate education for physicians serving the Robert B. Green Hospital, and greatly improved the ability of the hospital to recruit qualified physicians and supportive personnel.

Following this long and noteworthy service, Dr. Hartman founded the Albert W. Hartman-Edgar F. Frazell Foundation for Medical Research. This has provided for a continuation of Dr. Hartman's work toward improved medical care for our community. In 1968, Dr. Hartman published a paper on breast cancer, and is now involved in expanding this study. His foundation is also supporting a research project at the University of Texas Medical School at San Antonio.

In noting the many accomplishments of Dr. Hartman, it must be mentioned that he serves in various staff capacities in virtually every hospital in San Antonio. Besides the private and community hospitals, he also serves as consultant to surgery at Brooke Army General Hospital, Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital, and the Audie L. Murphy Memorial Veterans' Administration Hospital.

In addition to serving our community in a medical capacity, Dr. Hartman was appointed by the Governor to serve on the Texas Air Control Board, was president of the Bexar County Hospital District in 1971-72, and served as chairman of the board of governors of Southwest Foundation for Research and Education in 1961-64, and 1967-73. Dr. Hartman

has also been active in numerous professional associations.

A humanitarian is a person who, through his actions and philanthropy, shows his concern for human welfare and social reform. Dr. Hartman has certainly achieved such designation through his dedicated service to his fellow man. This concern for human welfare is the great strength of our Nation, and the people of San Antonio would like to share with you their profound appreciation for this man, and for those who will follow and be guided by him.

AQUACULTURE

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the world is confronted today with a food crisis of unprecedented character. The scarcity of food in the world and ever-increasing food prices have clearly highlighted the necessity of expanding our research and development efforts in areas which present viable alternatives for expanded food production.

One of the most attractive alternatives remains the development of aquaculture, the growing of aquatic organisms under controlled conditions. Aquaculture could make a significant contribution to nutrition in many parts of the world by virtue of its high productivity under selected conditions and also by the fact that aquatic crops are primarily protein crops rather than starchy staple foods. Although aquaculture has been developing in the United States for some time, it is still in its early stages and its potential is vast. It offers an excellent opportunity to cope with the problems involved in depletion of the U.S. coastal fish stocks, overfishing generally, and the destruction of natural fish habitats by environmental changes.

Aquaculture currently provides more than half of the Nation's catfish, 40 percent of the oysters, practically all of the trout, and over 10 percent of the salmon. In addition, appreciable amounts of shrimp, lobster, crayfish, clams, scallops, abalone, mussels, pompano, and other aquatic animals are produced annually through aquaculture. With the present state of aquaculture technology, it has been estimated that production by aquaculture could be increased between three and five times from current production levels and that a more concentrated development effort could result in a fifteen to twentyfold increase in production.

I have reintroduced today the National Aquaculture Development Act of 1975. This program will not only increase sources of marine protein for the consumer and the availability and quality level of consumer fishery products, but will also stimulate new business, industry, and employment. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, working in conjunction with other Federal agencies, to approve the construction of hatcher-

ies, assist public or private organizations with aquaculture, develop a central source of information on aquaculture development, inventory acreage and production, and initiate aquaculture pilot projects.

The potential areas for aquaculture development are unlimited: stock ponds, springs, creeks, bayous, rivers, lakes, wells, seas, and other pool and pond areas that can readily be adapted to useful aquaculture production. Aquaculture can coexist with agricultural pursuits and, in many cases, will provide complementary resources. For instance, water used in aquaculture is an excellent source of fertilizer, either when applied directly, or used for irrigation on various crops.

Aquaculture promises a dramatic increase in the supply of protein for the consumer in the form of fish and fishery products. Increased Federal involvement and coordination in this area is imperative if we are to meet the challenges of a worsening world food crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I have now introduced this bill with 32 cosponsors:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Benitez, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mrs. Boggs, Mr. Carter, Mr. Cleveland, Mrs. Collins, Mr. Davis of South Carolina, Mr. deLugo, Mr. Downing, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Hinshaw, Mr. Holland, Mr. Jenrette, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Mathis, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Patman, Mr. Pattison of New York, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Rees, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Roe, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Schulze, Mr. Seiberling, Mr. Solarz, and Mr. Zeferetli.

I urge my colleagues to consider the importance of this legislation in light of the world food crisis and I urge the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to hold early hearings on this legislation.

THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA—AMERICA'S YOUTH IN AGRICULTURE

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I like the Future Farmers of America. I know many of them personally and although I must admit that at times I have a little trouble keeping track, I take pride in their many activities. I like the things they do, the ideals they represent, and I am glad that I have this opportunity to salute my young friends, the Future Farmers, during National FFA Week.

This year their annual nationwide celebration will be observed from February 15 through February 22. It is FFA tradition that their national week include the birthday of George Washington who is revered by members of the Future Farmers not only as the first President of these United States but as our country's first farmer.

"FFA—A Chance For Growth," the 1975 theme for the Future Farmers of America, exemplifies to me the FFA pro-

gram. It expresses so well its purpose for if ever a program offered its members the opportunity to grow—to explore—and to develop, it is the FFA program.

Founded in 1928, the FFA program has from the start stressed leadership, cooperation, and citizenship. It is an organization run by its student members under adult guidance and serves as a splendid example of American youth in action.

FFA members are vocational agriculture students in 8,000 of our Nation's high schools. The members—and there are 450,000 of them—are young, and it is not as easy to be young today as it has been in the past. We expect more of our young people today. They face more challenging circumstances and decisions.

The FFA program recognizes that its primary goal is to prepare our young men and young women for the future. Its activities are specifically designed as a part of the instructional program in vocational agriculture. Members learn through active participation to assume leadership roles in their schools and communities.

For American youth, choosing a career is just about the most important and, more often than not, the most difficult decision they will have. For FFA members this decision is made easier. Every member of the Future Farmers will not of course become a farmer in the future. But every member will be equipped to handle a job related to the broad field of agriculture. This year alone some 110,000 FFA members will graduate from agricultural education courses in our high schools. There will be one-half million jobs waiting to be filled and these graduates will have the specialized training needed to fill these positions.

Our American youth in agriculture are one of our Nation's most valued resources. It is to them we will look for new concepts in farming, new ideas, and new methods of feeding our people. Certainly recent food shortages attest to the need for a continuing strong program of vocational agriculture and the FFA program. It is a big responsibility they face, but one I am sure they will meet and master.

I congratulate the young men and young women of the Future Farmers of America as they make ready their plans for FFA Week—1975, and wish them every success in their every endeavor.

CONGRESS EMPY—LET
CONGRESS BEWARE

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial that appeared in the Towner County Record-Herald of North Dakota. Because my State has so many fine weekly newspapers I always pay close attention to what they say.

It concerns the opinions of Blanche

Denison who makes some pretty good comments about congressional inaction. Sometimes we in Congress are accused of not seeing the forest for the trees. In the case of Blanche Denison, I think that she can see more clearly, some of the foibles of a Congress that talks much of action in solving the problems of inflation, recession, and unemployment but is not willing to put in some extra hours to help solve some of these problems.

There is a lot of hope that this Congress is going to take some bold steps and get some solid legislation out and signed without a lot of unnecessary delay. Unless Congress does take some positive steps this session, more people like Blanche Denison will react next election and vote out those responsible for the inaction. The editorial follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS SHAKING UP

(By Blanche Denison)

President Ford on Wednesday presented a national and anti-recession program to Congress pleading that it be enacted in "all due haste." Critics say it should have been enacted "yesterday." The Democrats say they have a program just as urgent and much better. Every day of production stoppage, unemployment costs and slowdowns can never be captured again and are estimated to cost 200 million dollars a day in gross national product (to say nothing of tax income). The areas of agreement are large and no time remains for dilly-dallying.

Interviews with Congressional leaders promise they will hurry as fast as they can. Rep. Carl Albert says they even hope to have a bill out of the House Committee ready for floor debate by late March. That is 68 DAYS. What is the matter with burning a little midnight oil, working a few Saturdays, having committee sessions begin early and end late. When they wanted to pass a football telecast bill it went through the House and the Senate and was signed by the President all in three hours.

The entire government took a three-week holiday at Christmas and now have scheduled among their other recesses a vacation from February 6 to February 17 to celebrate Lincoln's birthday. We doubt that Mr. Lincoln would have approved of this, if the country is in the peril some say it is. Not counting Saturdays and Sundays the House has scheduled 63 days of recesses and the Senate 67 days. For Easter observance they need from March 21 to April; for Memorial Day from May 23 to June 2 and for July 4 observance from June 27 to July 7. The summer recess which we agree they need is from August 1 until September 3 but the House barely gets back until they must take five days from September 12-17 to celebrate Yom Kippur. Then there is the October Vacation from October 10-20 and for Thanksgiving dinner they need from November 21 to December 1. Then comes Christmas again.

People are going to find it hard to take seriously their commitments if elected leaders are not willing to change their schedule for extra effort. In our opinion the one thing that will enrage people now is intra-party squabbling about who gets credit and who gets blame until nothing happens. These are grown men and women acting like children and we deplore it. The one thing that seems to have top priority this first week is committees being named upon committees to investigate and play amateur detective and hearings. Some of this may be necessary, but some of the things being investigated we have lived with for 30 years and they are hardly that urgent. The disgrace of wasted time and money in three months of hearings on Nelson Rockefeller's nomination should be enough to last a long time.

President Ford pointed out in his message

that in 1942 Congress enacted the needed legislation to swing the country into the war effort in less than half the time expected. Shaking up the leadership of some committees might help, and there are freshmen legislators determined to do this. They had better act fast before they catch the disease of believing they are in a class by themselves. Somehow it is comforting to find we have a new woman Representative who smokes a pipe and a man who brought his camper to Washington to live in because he refused to pay the cut-throat prices and plans to ride a bus from the campground to the Capitol each day.

At the same time the dust is shaken from the rafters of committee rooms we would like to see Senator Proxmire's bill passed which would strip government officials of their sleek black official limousines. He sets an example by jogging two miles to work each day. His bill would reduce the number of "prestige cars" from 800 to 25 and save 13 million dollars in chauffeurs' salaries alone. The Postal Service would lose six green Mercurys for their executives that they vow is necessary to "attract top people to \$60,000 jobs." Such utter foolishness . . . Officials like the House doorkeeper and the Secretary for the Senate are said to need chauffeurs so they have time to think and read enroute to their jobs. Other car losers would be under-secretaries and assistant secretaries of Cabinet members, 20 non-cabinet level White House advisors and heads of regulatory commissions. Cabinet member Simon, former Energy chief, will still be chauffeured one block from his office to the White House. If these government officials are worth their salaries they should be smart enough to get themselves to work and home without gouging the taxpayer.

From elected officials to the lowliest subcommittee workers something seems to happen to the common sense of some of the normally good people when they get to Washington. If it is the aroma of royalty—let's fumigate the halls and remind them there is only one reason they are there, and that is the welfare of the United States. If keeping political fences mended and playing politics with national issues is the prime concern, this nation will soon join the ranks of other nations in history—none of which survived 200 years.

We are close to the 200 year mark. It would be nice to make it. Most of our Midwest officials are farmers. Let's ask them to feel the urgency of "a crop on the ground with hail clouds coming up in the West", and really put in some long hours.

B. IRVIN CHENEY RETIRES

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a magnificent record of public service. B. Irvin Cheney, clerk of the County Commissioners of Wilkes County, Ga., has performed for 55 years. His home is Washington, Ga., the first incorporated town in the United States, named in 1780 for Gen. George Washington long before he became the first President of the United States.

The following article by Mildred R. Sisson is recognition of Mr. Cheney's service record appeared on January 16, 1975, in the News-Reporter of Washing-

ton, Ga., whose editor is Mr. Smythe Newson:

CHENEY RETIRES (By Mildred R. Sisson)

He's retired now. Retired? Does that mean "tired" and "tired" again? He's not really tired in that way—a little weary perhaps, and rightfully so. After more than 55 years of service to one's county it's time to be a little bit "tired"—but he's not.

If his eyes were as keen as they once were Irvin Cheney could go on indefinitely. Cataract surgery on one and upcoming surgery on the other eye makes seeing somewhat of a problem these days.

We all know by now that B. I. Cheney, clerk and fiscal officer of the Wilkes County Board of Commissioners for the past 55-plus years, retired Dec. 31, 1974, and was honored, along with C. B. Wright (board member for four terms) by their co-workers with a testimonial dinner last Friday night, Jan. 3.

Irvin Cheney came very near to being born in Wilkes County. His mother could just have easily have been at their place in Wilkes as in Bairdstown, just over the Oglethorpe County line.

His father, Patrick Mell Cheney, an Oglethorpe man, married Lula Belle Walton, a Wilkes County girl. They became parents of nine children. Next to the youngest was Benjamin Irvin, born August 31, 1899, there in Bairdstown. Patrick Mell Cheney was principal of Mercer Institute for a dozen years.

Young Irvin finished high school in Valdosta. After completing Southern Shorthand and Business University in Atlanta he went to the University of Georgia. After receiving his very thorough education in business he went to work in Albany at a bank where his brother was president.

He was there in 1919 when contact with his father's dear friend, Jim Griffin, a merchant who his father thought was a "diamond in the rough," led to his coming to Wilkes County in 1919. He admits that his father's high regard for Mr. Griffin had much to do with his acceptance of the job as clerk of the Wilkes County Board of Commissioners on Sept. 1, 1919.

Members of the board then were Jim Griffin, Ed Barnett, Sam McLendon, T. J. Jackson and J. W. Fanning, with Mr. McLendon as chairman.

From that time on this work has "been his life through thick and thin," according to his wife, the former Mildred Mays Sims—his Millie, daughter of William Mays Sims and Bettie DuBose Sims.

They were married on June 8, 1922, and have five children and 14 grandchildren.

Children first—and they are Lella Sims, Irvin Jr., Mildred DuBose (Mimi), Marlon Pope, and Patricia Stephens (named after their neighbor and friend, the late Dr. R. G. Stephens).

Mrs. Cheney wanted this to be entirely about Mr. Cheney, but she worked many, many years with the county health department, and also did secretarial work for her husband—working late in the night many nights, until Mrs. Ed Markwalter came to fill that position.

And I do have to tell you a little about those dear children.

Lella married Ben A. Freeman, an attorney in Greenville where they live. She's a talented artist and musician and has taught in both fields. She is currently president of the historical society of Meriweather County. Their children are Nan, Ben, Beth and Patricia.

Irvin Jr. is assistant director of VISTA for the Southeastern States. He lives in Atlanta. His children are Jeanne and the identical twins, June and Joy.

Mimi's husband, Porter B. Cohen, is head

of the ASC office in Louisville. She teaches at Burke Academy. Their children are Mildred, Mary, Jim and Katherine.

Patricia married Walter C. Britt, a student at the University of Texas who is working on his doctorate. They live in Austin where she manages a large apartment complex. Brian, Susan and Alice are their children.

And they all add up to a house full which Mother Cheney enjoys very much. She really enjoyed having them all home for Christmas—all except Beth who was in Europe and June and Joy who were in Louisiana.

She starts planning about three weeks ahead of time in order to have time to really enjoy her children. She freezes a lot. That's the way she managed the 4,000 sausage balls she made for the wedding of one of her granddaughters. She really does make delicious ones. She's a good cook anyway, according to her husband.

I'd better get back to telling you about her favorite subject—her husband.

They're members of the First Baptist Church. He became a member there April 26, 1920. He helped organize the first Baptist Training Union which succeeded the old BYPU. He served as clerk of the church for seven years; taught Sunday School for over 20 years; and was an active deacon for several years.

He was a charter member of the 214th Coast Artillery Unit of the Georgia National Guard, which later became an anti-aircraft unit.

He's been a member of the Kiwanis Club. He considers it an honor to have served on the Mary Willis Library Board with the late Dr. R. A. Simpson and Col. Frank H. Colley.

He's a Mason—member of LaFayette Lodge No. 23 AP&AM.

Mr. Cheney remembers that that ole black bug had wrecked the economy and the county and city governments were having quite a time trying to operate when he went into office, but he did the very best he could, and according to Mr. Cheney and the record, 1934 was the year Wilkes County borrowed its last money and it paid its last interest on borrowed money that same year. Since that time the county has received a good bit of interest on invested reserve funds.

During this period many of the counties in this area were issuing refunding certificates or negotiating loans for operational purposes. According to various board members Mr. Cheney's ideas and suggestions have proven most beneficial to the county. Over the state and in the state offices in Atlanta he has always been held in high esteem and this relationship has proven most beneficial in getting things done. They say he has accomplished much without any publicity of fanfare.

A few years back when Mr. Cheney was thinking of retirement, the chairman of the board, DeLeon H. Reynolds Jr., died and Henry Harris, board member, was appointed as chairman for the unexpired term. Mr. Harris was reelected to that position last year.

Mr. Cheney has always been opposed to deficit spending. Over the years the county government has remained solvent, and yet has cooperated in every effort made to further the progress of Wilkes County while operating on one of the cheapest tax rates in the state.

He served under six administrations. In addition to his duties as clerk of the commissioners, appointed fiscal officer, he also performed the duties formerly done by the treasurer of Wilkes County before that office was abolished.

Records show that Wilkes County has not had to borrow any funds for operations of county purposes since the year 1934 and not a cent of interest has been paid for such purpose since then.

During the recession of the 1960s—or de-

press—when quite a number of counties could not borrow money and had outstanding time-warrants due, but unpaid because of no credit, Wilkes County was drawing interest on a reserve account and taking a cash discount on all purchases.

In speaking of his years in office he lists some things which have been met from the Savings Reserves, such as the following: "Wilkes County organized the second forestry fire control unit in the tenth district; had the second health office in the district; has one of the best rescue units in the state; assists in volunteer fire departments over the county; has instituted solid waste (garbage disposal) program; has nursing home (\$18,000); hospital (\$30,000); and emergency ambulance service (\$18,000 per year)—all within the lower 10 per cent of tax rates."

Two years ago they moved into their new home on Sims Street. During the Christmas holidays their sons fashioned a handsome mantel of old lumber from her grandmother's place. This adds to the charm of their lovely living room.

His many friends wish Mr. Cheney—and his Millie—many years of happy retirement, content in the knowledge of a "job well-done."

USELESS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, in the rush to write laws to deal with the increasing public awareness of environmental problems a few years ago, the Congress made some silly mistakes.

Certainly one of the worst was the requirement for environmental impact statements on everything under the Sun. It is my general opinion that the vast quantities of paper needed to produce these incredibly complex statements is a greater environmental hazard than the problems they are supposed to clear up.

More importantly, the legal battles over these statements have resulted in a disservice to the citizenry, because they have needlessly delayed a great many worthwhile projects.

One such project, needlessly delayed by environmental regulations, is an Interstate Highway project known as the Peoria bypass. This project is of great importance in my district, and in my hometown of Peoria.

An article in last Sunday's Peoria Journal-Star by Bill Prater did an excellent job of showing just how useless and silly the environmental impact statement problem can get. So that my colleagues can better understand this problem, I am including this article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star,
Feb. 2, 1975]

USELESS IMPACT STUDY MRES I-474 JOB
(By Bill Prater)

An apparently useless environmental impact statement on the Interstate 474 Peoria bypass has inflated the cost of the project as much as \$25 million and delayed its completion a year and a half.

The final contracts could be let this August or September, state Department of Transportation officials say, making it doubtful much work will be done this year.

The next tentative completion date: late 1977 on a project originally scheduled for completion in 1972.

The long-awaited highway was the victim of a 1973 out-of-court settlement between environmentalists and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The order, abruptly handed down in September, 1973, was clear: impact statements are required on all major federal highway projects not already under contract.

And I-474 was being built as a series of interrelated projects. About half were under contract.

Massive projects worth \$41.9 million—the five interchanges and all but four overpasses—were under construction or awarded before the sudden cutoff.

They stand now, islands of concrete and steel, some completed months ago, others nearly complete, all awaiting pavement that will join them.

That's what awaits approval of the impact statement: about 13 miles of paving and earthmoving work, along with the difficult and costly relocation of a railroad overpass near the Adam Street interchange in Bartonville.

The estimated cost of the project in September, 1973, was about \$75 million.

The latest estimates are between \$90 million and \$100 million, with the cost of unstarted work rising from about \$33 million to between \$48 and \$58 million.

Inflation alone has added 30 to 35 per cent to the increased costs, said William T. Mills, planner for the local DOT office. Interest rates also have soared.

But much of the added cost attributed to inflation may be misleading, said Ronald Houska, bureau chief of programming for the department.

It can be negated, he said, by the transfer of funds to other federal highway projects. All federal highway money allocated to Illinois in 1973 and '74 was spent, he said.

"We have a responsibility to insure that what we are doing does not adversely affect the environment," Houska said. In the case of projects already underway, "if we do find something adverse we can go back and correct it," he added.

"I don't like paper work either. This is just a matter of going back and showing people that what we've done is proper."

Proper or not, what's been done on I-474 would be extremely difficult to change, according to DOT project engineer A. F. Burnham.

The path of the interstate is dictated by work already completed, he said.

"It's the same route at the same locations at the same heights," he said. "There have been no complaints either, really. Everyone wants it."

Wanted or not, the I-474 is not yet out of the bureaucratic woods.

The environmental impact statement, a year in the preparation, is still not approved. The 231-page document was sent to 41 federal, state, local and private agencies for comment, and any conflicts between their recommendations and the DOT's plans must be settled by the FHWA. Burnham said approval of the impact statement could be given in May or June, clearing the way for contract letting about six weeks later.

Mills laughingly said Burnham is "always the optimist," and that it would probably be July at the earliest. Work could begin two months later.

The impact statement was drawn up by Charles Landis, environmentalist for the district office. It was the first of several he has prepared on area road projects.

The document contains the same types of information found in the others: possible adverse effects on wildlife habitat, mineral resources, sites of archaeological or historical interest and other areas.

In at least one way, however, the I-474

study was Landis's most unusual: all the "possible" adversities had already been inflicted.

Future generations may find something dreadful about the bypass, something a more exacting preliminary study would have eliminated.

"But," planner Mills maintained, "if there are going to be any adverse effects on the environment from this road, we've already done it."

"If we've made mistakes—and I don't think we've made too many—we did it before we had to draw up this thing (the impact statement) and we're committed to them."

The bypass as a whole can be compared with one of its individual embankments, Mills said. "We've already scarred up the earth and done the damage, only now we can't cover it back over."

The specific cause of I-474's woes is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

An obscure section of the act, disregarded until it became the basis for precedent-setting lawsuits required every federal agency to publish detailed statements on the environmental impact of every project under its jurisdiction—along with reasonable alternatives.

Of the lawsuits stemming from this section, one halting the controversial Alaskan Pipeline is famous. It forced the federal government into an exhaustive study of the delicate Alaska tundra and resulted in major engineering changes.

The provision also has been used for suits against the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Forestry Service and other agencies.

The FHWA did not change its policies until 1973, after a suit was filed by the National Wildlife Federation.

Landis said, "Until we got that notice, we just followed our normal procedure—public hearings, studies, that sort of thing." When the full implications of the order became known and the I-474 timetable was thrown into shambles, "It was a shock, I'll tell you," Landis said.

The preliminary environmental impact statement makes only passing reference to the unusual events surrounding the Peoria bypass.

"The submittal of this statement is not in the normal, chronological sequences of events," the statement reads. "Currently, environmental considerations are a part of the pre-planning process. This statement is a result of a suit . . . requiring in-depth environmental considerations for major federally funded projects previously determined exempt."

Though prepared by the Peoria district, the impact statement is officially the product of the FHWA and it must give final approval.

The state "Action Plan" for conducting such studies was not published until April, 1974.

In compliance with FHWA requirements, all states must have such a plan, describing how they will:

Identify social, economic and environmental effects;

Use an interdisciplinary approach in planning and decision making.

Involve the public and other state agencies;

Develop alternative solutions to transportation needs.

The I-474 impact statement dutifully lists alternatives: abandoning work already done in favor of either doing nothing about highway improvements, or upgrading existing roads.

Neither is particularly desirable, the study concludes, adding, "It must also be of great concern that a 'no-build' (or non-completion) alternate at this stage would negate a \$50 million public investment."

The study did not say what could be done with those \$50 million worth of islands of

steel and concrete, but DOT workers jokingly pointed out that proposals could be added later—subject, apparently, to further review.

Other environmental impact statements forced by the 1973 agreement have not been as meaningless as I-474's, but have been just as time-consuming.

A study of a proposed freeway between East St. Louis and Carlyle uncovered possible damage to a swamp valued as a breeding ground for ducks. Approval of the impact statement on that highway is being withheld until the controversy is resolved.

Only a minor portion of that \$85 million project—about \$9 million worth of bridge abutments—has been spent.

Work also is being delayed on two freeway projects in the Chicago area.

"THE TRIAL OF MARTIN LUTHER KING": CIVIL LIBERTIES AND THE RULE OF LAW

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a new book entitled "The Trial of Martin Luther King," by Alan F. Westin and Barry Mahoney, recounts the court case which arose when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was arrested for leading a civil rights march in Birmingham on Good Friday, April 1963. Dr. King was convicted for violation of a State court injunction against the march, and 4 years later the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the conviction, 5 to 4. Dr. King then returned to Birmingham and went to jail for the last time in his life, in October 1967.

A reexamination of this case is important because, in the words of Dr. Westin:

It is a matter that goes to the heart of civil liberties under the rule of law, and protection of the process of social change from strangulation by the local status quo.

He concludes that:

We should be aware how our legal system failed one of the most devoted believers in the American Constitution at a critical moment for him, for the cause of nonviolence, and for the democratic system.

I submit for the RECORD an article drawn from the new book by Dr. Westin, who is professor of public law and government at Columbia University. His coauthor, Mr. Mahoney, practices law in Denver and teaches and does research in the field of criminal justice. The article was published January 19 by the Los Angeles Times.

The article follows:

RULING IN KING CASE INFRINGES LIBERTIES
(By Alan F. Westin)

Martin Luther King Jr. would have been 46 last week if he had not been assassinated in Memphis in 1968. The King anniversary—coming two weeks after the conviction of the major Watergate conspirators—should cause us to raise some hard questions about how our legal system really works.

At first glance, linking King's civil rights troubles with the lawlessness of Richard Nixon and company may seem a forced comparison. Yet there are direct and revealing connections between King's most famous political trial in 1963 and the unfolding of the Watergate affair in the nation's courts.

It was April 12, 1963, when King led his now-famous Good Friday march against segregation practices in Birmingham, Ala. He did so despite a state court injunction, obtained by city officials two days earlier, forbidding all demonstrations, parades and marches in the city by King or his associates. He was arrested, tried by an Alabama court, and found guilty of contempt. Four years later, when his appeal reached the U.S. Supreme Court, a 5-4 majority upheld the conviction.

According to the Supreme Court's majority, King should have called off his demonstration and sued in the Alabama courts to dissolve the injunction. Lecturing King for his "impatience," Justice Potter Stewart declared: "In the fair administration of justice, no man can be judge in his own case, however exalted his station, however righteous his motives, and irrespective of his race, color, politics, or religion."

"Respect for judicial process," Justice Stewart concluded, "is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of the law. . ."

The decision was warmly applauded at the time by most commentators as a necessary affirmation of the "rule-of-law" principle.

Then, four years after King's death, the Watergate scandal began to unfold. Richard Nixon asserted that he did not have to obey court orders to disclose relevant presidential documents if he felt that it would violate executive privacy to reveal them. In October of 1973, Nixon announced that he would not comply with a final federal court order to give nine presidential tapes to Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox.

At that critical moment, Justice Stewart's language in the King case seemed exactly apt: "In the fair administration of justice, no man can be judge in his own case, however exalted his station. . ."

The American public shared that view. Faced by a fire storm of public protest over his defiance of the court order, and his firing of Cox, Nixon retreated and said he would furnish the tapes. Later, in 1974, a unanimous Supreme Court ordered Nixon to furnish more tapes, for use in the Watergate conspiracy trial. What was revealed in those conversations ultimately forced the President's resignation.

For many observers, the performance of the court in the King and Nixon cases supplied heartening proof that the "rule of law" is alive and well in this country. There is much to support that judgment in the Nixon case, where executive-privilege claims were being invoked by the President to shield his criminal deceptions.

But the same warm approval should not be given to the King decision. It was a bad wound then, and still has harmful effects on civil liberties today.

To understand why the King decision was wrong, consider the moral, political, legal, and practical realities of King's situation in 1963. Black Americans in the South were still being refused service in public-accommodation facilities, denied voting rights, refused equal job opportunities, kept in segregated schools, and subjected to harsh police mistreatment—almost 10 years after the U.S. Supreme Court desegregation ruling of 1954. The moral case against such official, lawless conduct in Birmingham was undeniable.

Politically, the liberally-oriented Kennedy Administration in 1963 was so cowed by Southern and conservative forces in Congress that it had abandoned efforts to press for federal civil rights bills. Unless King could find a way to dramatize the absence of any real progress toward integration in the South, a corroding tokenism would be all that American Negroes would be getting in the mid-1960s.

Legally, King knew that he had a firm constitutional right to lead peaceful picketing,

prayer meetings, and orderly protest demonstrations. The U.S. Supreme Court had indicated that local ordinances which left city officials free to deny parade permits at their whim, without objective and careful standards, were unconstitutional. Twice in April, Police Commissioner Bull Connor had refused to issue a permit for picketing or marches. "No," Connor had replied, "I will picket you over to the city jail."

For practical reasons as well, King could not afford to let the Birmingham direct-action campaign become a slow, courtroom test case. More than a year had been spent in planning, raising ball money, and mobilizing national support. If he abandoned the march, he would be trapped on the flypaper of the Alabama judicial system for years—just where Bull Connor wanted him to be.

Several of King's key civil rights campaigns, especially in Albany, Ga., in 1962, had been defeated by such tactics. "The injunction method has now become the leading instrument of the South" to block civil rights efforts, King noted, "a maliciously effective, pseudo-legal way of breaking the back of legitimate moral protests." The whole future of civil rights progress in the 1960s was at stake.

So King marched, and was convicted for contempt of court.

Ironically, if that conviction had reached the U.S. Supreme Court later in 1963, or even by 1965, the odds are it would have been overturned. The Birmingham demonstrations—with pictures of police dogs and fire hoses being used by the police—had triggered protests around the nation, and the world. The political climate was dramatically altered. President Kennedy sponsored legislation requiring equal service in public accommodation facilities, after Kennedy's assassination. President Johnson won passage of that bill as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In that context, a Warren Court majority would almost certainly have reversed King's conviction.

But the Alabama Supreme Court, notorious for its delays in handling appeals, did not affirm King's conviction until December of 1965. The Supreme Court did not decide the case until June of 1967. By then, black power advocates had arrived; urban riots had broken out in Watts, Newark, and Detroit; anti-war protests were rising; and King was struggling to keep the nonviolent civil rights movement a meaningful force.

In this troubled setting, the Supreme Court put its thumb down not on the side of free expression but on law-and-order. King was sent to jail briefly with the blessing of the nation's highest court.

This did not have to be the outcome, even if we agree that complying with court orders is a fundamental tenet of our legal system. The court should have held that issuing an injunction without giving King a chance to appear and contest it violated basic due process. More broadly, the court should have said that where there are no speedy appeals procedures and where enjoined demonstrations have a critical time factor (the Good Friday holiday), persons cannot be punished for contempt if a later review of their First Amendment claim and the injunction ruling shows that the ban was unjustified.

Since the Supreme Court was later to rule, in 1969, that Birmingham's permit procedures were unconstitutional, this would have meant that enjoining King from marching without such a permit was also illegal.

This may sound somewhat technical to non-lawyers. But it is a matter that goes to the heart of civil liberties under the rule of law, and protection of the processes of social change from strangulation by the local status quo. The King precedent has been used since 1967 to deny vital free-expression rights to farm workers, students, women's rights groups, teachers, public workers, and many others trying to get claims for social justice

heard by the American people. The press and TV have also been gaged by local court orders having to withhold vital news stories for months or longer even though the injunctions are later found to violate free-press guarantees.

In marking the anniversary of King's birth, therefore, we should be aware how our legal system failed one of the most devoted believers in the American Constitution at a critical moment for him, for the cause of nonviolence, and for the democratic system.

ADVICE FOR A SOUND ECONOMY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the President and Congress are headed toward a stalemate on economic policy. Unfortunately, this stalemate will be over two variations of how the Government should interfere and attempt to "manage" the economy, but not over the fundamental changes that are necessary to permanently solve our economic problems.

Therefore I wish to call the following letter to the attention of my colleagues. The letter, to President Ford from four professors of economics at Grove City College, appeared in the middle October issue of the International Harry Schultz Letter.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 1, 1974.

President GERALD R. FORD,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With all the economic advice you received at the Summit Conference you may not mind hearing from the Economics Department of Grove City College which, as you may recall, conferred the degree of Doctor of Laws on you at our commencement of June 8, 1968. We feel especially moved to proffer our advice as the gold school we represent was conspicuously absent at the Summit Conference.

To end inflation and to stabilize the US dollar the following steps need to be taken immediately:

1. The Federal budget must be balanced now, next year, and every year thereafter.
2. Your engine of inflation, the Federal Reserve System, must be inactivated, or better yet, abolished.
3. The Federal Reserve money now in circulation must stay in circulation and be made fully redeemable in gold.
4. With these steps you will have achieved monetary stability. But you will face a recession which past deficit spending and credit expansion have made unavoidable. Without an engine of inflation to accommodate new deficit spending and credit expansion, you will need to cut federal spending even further as federal revenue declines. And to facilitate speedy recovery from the recession business taxes should be cut. We are confident that in a year or two the American economy will resume full speed again, with stable prices and a sound monetary system.

We realize that our advice may not be popular with the economics fraternity, which since the 1930's has preferred the "new economics" of easy money and deficit spending. We are proud to represent the great tradition of classical economics and the gold standard that gave the world natural money rather than depreciating political paper.

Mr. President, the choice is yours. Proceeding on the present road you will preside over an accelerating depreciation of the dollar and all the economic and social evils thereof. Or, you may embark upon the road to gold money which is hard money. There are no alternatives.

Yours respectfully,

William H. Burdick, Charles J.

Guller, Paul J. Fair, Hans F.

Sennholz,

Professors of Economics, Grove City College.

Mr. Speaker, it is still not too late to take this advice. However radical some of these changes may appear to many of my colleagues, we must keep in mind that the very survival of our free economic and political institutions is at stake.

ENERGY EXPERTISE

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, every now and then a letter comes to our attention from a constituent who knows the ins and outs of problems with which we are dealing.

Such a letter has come to me from an energy expert in Dallas, A. G. Galt who is with Pan American Engineering Co.

Because of the information included, and its accuracy, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that I may share it with my colleagues. I believe with information such as this, we can all make better-informed decisions as we grapple with the energy problems affecting our Nation today.

The letter follows:

PAN-AMERICAN ENGINEERING Co.,
Dallas, Tex., January 30, 1975.

HON. DALE MILFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: From where you sit today in your profession you are aware that our energy problems perhaps transcend almost any other problem our nation now faces. Without energy there is absolutely no way for industry to expand and provide jobs, and certainly without energy we could have a very real problem in connection with national defense. Unless people have jobs and can work and have income they can't pay taxes, and the federal establishment could not be supported in the manner in which it is now accustomed. If the industrial base of the country cannot expand and provide products and services and the jobs necessary to take care of an ever increasing labor force, our problems today will seem minimal to what they will be in the future. Unless there is sufficient ongoing forward movement of the industrial establishment, the national debt is bound to get in worse shape than it is and our balance of payments overseas will become monstrous. Unless the energy problem is really solved, everything else we talk and argue about might as well be thrown into the ash can.

I know you must be involved at this time with a desire to obtain actual facts about this problem and not voluminous rhetoric from people with particular axes to grind and who are in the main extremely ignorant of the problem. Let me say that I have no connection with, nor do I own stock in, any major oil company, but I do have considerable ex-

perience in connection with energy generally and the following basic bit of data may have some interest for you.

In all of the hassle concerning oil pricing from a domestic point of view, little has been said about the cost in finding and producing crude oil and gas in this country during the past thirty years. There are two leases south of Corpus Christi, Texas, one known as the Flinn and the other the Taylor, which have been producing in an old field since approximately 1938. Both leases have been subject to various workover programs from time to time, depending upon geological data and the economic incentive to look for more hydrocarbons. One of the prime tools the oil operator uses to keep oil production on the line is what is known in the trade as a workover rig. This is a machine which does all of the maintenance on an oil well, pulls the tubing and is used to solve certain production problems; it is the most important maintenance tool the oil operator uses after the well is drilled and placed on production. The use of the workover rig is more or less a continuous process from time to time over the life of the well. The cost of this particular piece of equipment is an excellent yardstick as to the cost the oil operator encounters, this because the rig itself is a piece of machinery with a basic cost and the operation of it includes labor, supervision, taxes, fuel, depreciation and maintenance and all other costs involved with a service operation.

I hand you herewith copy of a workover bill dated January 31, 1945 which shows that the workover rig cost at that time was \$10.50 per hour. Let me underline that this hourly cost included supervision and fuel and all other costs. On October 30, 1956, almost eleven years later, the cost of a similar service rig had been raised to \$16.50 per hour. A copy of that particular invoice is attached. On September 9, 1974, the use of a similar rig on the Flinn Lease had risen to \$50 per hour including the use of a supervisor. In these days of high costs, the companies are trying to break their cost down as to rig time, fuel cost and supervisor's time. In any case, what cost an oil operator \$10.50 per hour in 1945 cost him in September, 1974 \$50 per hour, or practically five times as much, and on January 1, 1975 the cost of a workover rig has now risen to \$55 per hour.

All operators domestically have not made a great deal of money over the past thirty years, and for many, many years it was a question of just trying to stay in business. In 1945 the operator was getting \$2.52 per barrel on the average for the grade of crude produced in the area I use as an example. In 1956 the same oil was selling for approximately \$2.90 per barrel, and in March of 1973 the price was still only \$3.28 and the costs of operation were skyrocketing, and the operator's basic cost for the major items increased all the way from three to five times. Used oil well tubing which in 1956 we bought for \$0.35 per foot now sells for \$2.00 per foot, and I can provide invoices to support this statement. I submit there is no way you can communicate the price of domestic crude for a long period of time from the world price, and certainly there is no reason why the country as a whole should make an example of the oil producer and force him to provide a service and product at a very unfair price when the price of shoes, needles or any other product are allowed to find their price level on the open market.

Every action that is taken in the energy field should be based at this time on whether or not such action will result in more energy. Governmental irresponsibility, political demagoguery and the like will not result in one additional barrel of oil or cubic foot of gas or ton of coal.

The campaign to gut the major oil companies can only have in the long run disastrous results for all American citizens. The major oil companies with their tremendous

expertise have explored for oil and gas around the world with the greatest efficiency that has ever been involved with a major industry. They have been able to handle the local political problems, they have expended billions of dollars in risk money, they have expanded production, they have provided the technical know-how and engineering, and they have made available to citizens of the world vast amounts of energy. However, as they have made these large investments in the various foreign countries and made those particular local industries very profitable, all of the host countries without exception have become greedy. There has been absolutely no protection afforded American oil companies operating overseas against the unilateral abrogation of contracts, even though such contracts had termination dates far into the future. The American government for the past thirty years has fostered the idea that any contract between an American company and a host producing country could be abrogated if that country went through the face saving gesture of saying they were going to provide adequate compensation for what they were stealing. They have never provided adequate compensation wherever expropriation has taken place whether it was oil, copper or any other resource industry. Recently, Venezuela has taken over the iron ore industry which was brought to bear fruit by U.S. Steel and Bethlehem. The countries producing bauxite are now holding a loaded gun to the head of the aluminum companies and are blackmailing them.

If the American government had a long time ago taken the position that a contract is a contract, that it can be revised in equity to suit new conditions but still must remain a viable instrument under which people can operate, oil, copper, iron ore, bauxite and other companies would have had a much easier time and the United States today would not be cut off, nor would they be under the strictures of price which now prevail worldwide for these commodities. As long as you have people like Senator Frank Church in the Senate fighting all efforts to support American interests abroad, all host countries will feel they can spit on the American flag anytime they desire to do so. The time is long past when the American government can do anything to support its representatives around the world. They could have done it but they didn't.

The main thing we need to do is make ourselves as self-sufficient as possible insofar as concerned, and we can do this through coal, oil shale and additional drilling and exploration for oil and gas. You cannot construct refineries unless people will give you a building site for the refinery. Look at what has been happening in the northeastern part of the United States during the past several years. It is still impossible to get a building site for a refinery in that area. Insofar as exploration for oil and gas is concerned, there have been many people in the Congress and around the country who have always said let the domestic oil and gas industry go to hell because we can always go to the Middle East and buy oil at a buck a barrel. You know where you can stick that idea now.

Most people should get down on their knees and thank God that we have been able to keep our domestic oil and gas industry operating because while we do have energy problems, these problems are nothing like they would be if we did not have an active oil and gas producing industry. The depletion allowance has by media propaganda and political demagoguery turned into a dirty word, but these same people would want depreciation on other types of assets continued. As an example, I am sure the Columbia Broadcasting System takes depreciation on all of the equipment they own, electronic and otherwise, which they use to disseminate the news. If they own a build-

ing in New York, I'm sure they take depreciation on that. They consider these assets as a wasting asset in need of depreciation. Oil and gas is a wasting asset and should be depreciable or depletable, whichever word you wish to use.

Perhaps one of the most terrible results of the ignorance relative to energy which has permeated the country is the delay in the building of the Alaska pipeline. If the oil companies had been allowed to proceed originally with the building of that pipeline, we would today be moving through that line two-thirds of the oil necessary to meet the short fall from the Middle East if another embargo takes place. The original cost of the pipeline was \$900 million. The latest figure is \$6.5 billion. There is only one group of people who will pay the additional cost and that is you, me and all other citizens like us. The zealots who went into court and stopped the building of the line are responsible to no one. Not only have they cost the American public billions of dollars in inflated cost of the line but the oil which must be imported to take the place of oil that would have been coming through that line will probably cost the American public another \$25 billion before the line is now operable. The fact that the American government and its people would stand for this type of manipulation by small numbers of hard-headed and unreasonable zealots is sickening.

This country has plenty of energy and the expertise necessary to produce it. We need to make it economically profitable to do all of the things necessary to produce coal, oil from shale, oil and gas exploration, and anything else necessary to reduce the dependence of this country on outside energy sources. The time has come for America to stop listening to demagogic candidates for president, or any other person or group whose actions or ideas set up roadblocks toward making this country self-sufficient in energy. Free enterprise is the only way to get the job done properly and the free marketplace with its competition is the place to take care of the pricing.

Our neighbor to the south, Mexico, is self-sufficient in energy and all energy has been government controlled since the Mexican government ran out of the country in the 1930's those concerns who originally found the oil. The Mexican oil industry has stumbled along only because of the expertise provided by American technology and American equipment. But they are self-sufficient and have become an oil exporter. Today the price of gasoline is 80¢ a gallon in Mexico. I can buy gasoline two blocks from my office at 47¢ per gallon for premium gasoline. Mexicans across the border from Laredo, Texas, cross the bridge to the American side to buy American gasoline because of the cheaper price. When you consider the difference in the economies of the two countries, an 80¢ per gallon price for gasoline in Mexico is about the same as charging the American motorist \$1.75 per gallon. Enough said.

Yours very truly,

A. G. GALT.

TIME TO CLEAN UP OUR OWN HOUSE

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for years now, especially since the economic crisis has come to a head, the Halls of the House and Senate have rung with ora-

torical promises to slash Federal spending to the bone.

Probably every department and agency of the Government has been accused of spending beyond their real needs.

However, it seems to me that the finger of guilt has not been pointed very often at the Congress, one of the worst offenders in the area of excessive spending.

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent editorial, entitled "Expensive Congress," which appeared in the January 12, 1975, edition of the Syracuse Herald-American:

Almost daily we endure the words of noble intent from Congress.

It is going to cut the cost of Federal government.

It is going to investigate the excessive spending of the Administration.

It is going to attack Federal bureaucracy.

But never a word about one of the worst offenders of excessive spending in Washington—*itself*.

Remember the parting words of George Aiken of Vermont after 34 years in the Senate? He called Congress an "unholy expansion of committees, subcommittees and staff personnel" that has "mushroomed to an unconscionable extent" over the past 10 years.

In 1954 the House and Senate had a combined staff of 4,500 persons and an annual budget of \$42-million.

Today, Congress' budget has grown to \$328-million to run a staff of 16,000 employees.

If this growth rate continues, Congress will cost a billion dollars a year to run by 1984, according to reliable estimates.

A Washington newsman, Donald Lambro of UPI, checking on the climbing cost of Congress, discovered that the number of bills enacted in 1974 totalled 285, which, he wrote, was little more than the number passed 10 years ago. And a decade ago, Congress' budget and staff were less than one third their present size.

If Congress isn't doing much more work than it did 10 years ago with a third the cost, then are the enormous budget and staff needed now?

Why must the Senate have 17 major committees and 147 Subcommittees? Why must the House have 21 major committees and 133 subcommittees? Why must joint committees of Congress have 17 subcommittees?

All these committees and subcommittees require staff members. The office space for these staffs fills five major buildings and is overlapping into adjacent Capitol Hill complexes.

A sixth office structure is being planned at a cost of \$84-million, and Congress still is looking for more land for future office buildings.

Congress now is spending some \$50 million a year solely to operate its committees.

Yet Aiken and other congressional veterans complain that many of these expensive subcommittees haven't met in years, least of all held hearings. Others duplicate and overlap the work of dozens of other panels.

Lambro wondered in his report what the special subcommittee on the freight car shortage, the subcommittee on small business problems in smaller towns and urban areas and the select committee on parking were doing?

Congress pays the 25th largest police force in the nation, employs a staff of photographers, and grants the most generous pension program in the world.

It provides fresh cut flowers and tropical plants, free picture-framing, cut-rate haircuts and meals, a private airline reservation service, banking facilities, fully-equipped

gymnasiums and medical services for its members.

This is ridiculous.

Money is too precious to most Americans to have to support such lavish behavior. Congress is not the court of the French kings. It is not Versailles. It is Washington, D.C. supposedly the seat of a democratic nation in which royalty is not supported by its tax-paying population.

Congress, heal yourself.

THE DEMISE OF THE HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1975, the House of Representatives voted to transfer the jurisdiction of the Internal Security Committee to the Judiciary Committee. This was indeed an historic occasion, ending the tenure of a body which has haunted the Congress and the Nation as a whole for well over 30 years.

For the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time a number of newspaper and editorial comments which were printed at the time of HISC's demise:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1975]

AN UN-AMERICAN BODY

The new winds blowing through the House have finally swept away that alling relic of an ugly past, the House Internal Security Committee. Established in 1930 as the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Propaganda, it reached its heyday in the forties and fifties as the House Un-American Affairs Committee, serving as a platform for such proponents of an American orthodoxy as Martin Dies, Richard M. Nixon, and J. Parnell Thomas. Between 1945 and 1969 it received more than \$6.5 million in funds and managed to produce only one major piece of legislation.

But the committee should not be judged on its legislative accomplishments, for it specialized in conducting investigations and destroying careers. It conducted vindictive investigations of the movie industry, the labor movement and of Federal employes and college staffs.

Last month, the Democratic Caucus refused to assign any members to it, other than the chairman, and this week the House buried it. Its epitaph was written years ago by Harry Truman when he called it "the most un-American thing in America."

[From the Nation, Feb. 1, 1975]

HUAC SHELVED

Almost thirty years to the day after it had been established as a standing committee on motion of Rep. John Rankin, the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), known of recent years as the House Internal Security Committee (HISC), has been consigned to limbo, if not actually abolished. HISC's jurisdiction has been transferred to the House Judiciary Committee. Of a staff of thirty or forty, a few will be kept on for the time being—those designated by HISC's chairman Rep. Richard Ichord (D., Mo.)—but there is no implied obligation to retain them. The committee's records, including some 750,000 individual files, will be transferred to Judiciary's custody. This ac-

tion on the part of the new Congress calls for three cheers—almost.

Almost, because the Senate Judiciary Committee has its own Subcommittee on Internal Security, with staff and files and jurisdiction to inquire, and no move is underway to abolish it, since the foxy chairman, James Eastland, voluntarily cut the subcommittee's budget in half last year. The house debate does not indicate any likelihood that HISC will be set up as a subcommittee. Still, the files remain ticking away, and it is uncertain what will happen to them. Rep. Robert Drinan (D., Mass.), who played a key role in putting HISC to rest, suggests that they should be turned over to Archives and sealed for fifty years. As property of the House they would not be subject to court action under the Freedom of Information Act, but members could request access to a file which some constituent might want to examine. That remains a cranny through which organizations might gain access to a file for the purpose of harassing an individual of whose politics they did not approve.

Defanging HISC was an artful political maneuver for which major credit goes to Reps. Phillip Burton, Don Edwards and Robert Drinan. Edwards and Drinan had sponsored a resolution calling for the transfer and containing an amendment which would limit inquiries to "sabotage and other overt acts affecting internal security"—essentially harmless language, since the House Judiciary Committee probably has such jurisdiction in any case. But Ichord, reading the signs of doom correctly, offered his own resolution calling for transfer, but limiting inquiries to "Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States." As a face-saving device, it was decided to let the chairman abolish his own committee. So his resolution was adopted by voice vote in the caucus and on the floor of the House. We are left with a practical victory of major proportions, but one that is clouded by some uncertainty.

HISC's dismantling did not just happen, nor can it be attributed solely to the post-Watergate environment or to the new members elected to the 94th Congress. It represents fifteen years of hard work by the National Committee to Abolish HUAC (after 1969, the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation), directed by Frank Wilkinson, with headquarters in Los Angeles. Wilkinson, a tireless and eloquent opponent of HUAC, had been one of its early victims. The committee was set up largely on the initiative of Aubrey Williams, Alexander Melkejohn and James Embree. Harvey O'Connor serves as chairman and the committee has been brilliantly advised on constitutional issues by Thomas J. Emerson of the Yale Law School. Robert Walker Kenny, who has just retired as judge of the Superior Court, Los Angeles County, after years of splendid service, was of great help to the committee as treasurer before his appointment to the bench. Kenny, one of counsel to the Hollywood Ten, had acquired special and invaluable insights about the way HUAC functioned. His former associate, Robert Morris, succeeded him as treasurer. To these individuals, and to other members and supporters of the committee, special thanks are due. HISC's guns have been spiked largely by their efforts.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 18, 1975]

RED-BAITED PANEL DIES AT LAST

A panel snooping on Americans by any other name is still a panel snooping on Americans—and that's why the notorious Committee on Un-American Activities, renamed the House Internal Security Committee, has been scrapped.

The committee never had and never would have justification for being. During the irrational Communist witchhunting days of

the 1950s, it became a power body that found a Communist under every rug. It fed on fears and ruined reputations, all in the name of preserving national security.

It survived, partly because residual fears of a Communist or left-wing takeover in this country kept it alive, and partly because it's easy to create a bureaucracy, but tough to kill one. Previous congressional efforts to do so have failed.

But now the House has voted for abolishment, with the concurrence of the chairman of the ISC, Rep. Richard Ichord (D-Mo.). Jurisdiction will go to the Judiciary Committee.

When the head of a committee as unneeded as this one wanted it axed, the message was clear: it was time to bury one of the country's major contradictions of the democratic process.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Jan. 17, 1975]

HUAC WENT OUT OF STYLE

The House Internal Security Committee—successor to the Un-American Activities Committee—is going out of business after 45 years. A lot of old ghosts will be exorcised at the same time.

What happened was that the House Democratic Caucus voted to abolish the committee and turn what was left of its staff, files and functions over to the House Judiciary Committee. Time had simply made the old committee obsolete.

The old Un-American Activities Committee served as a utensil and a springboard for many an ambitious congressman eager to crusade his way to fame and power. Martin Dies, J. Parnell Thomas and Richard Nixon were among those who turned it to their service.

Undoubtedly, in the course of a career in which it amassed data on 750,000 Americans suspected of subversive dirty work the committee caught some authentic bad ones. But just as surely, the evil came to outweigh the good as successive chairmen indulged in the indiscriminate hunting of witches and smearing of the innocent.

As recently as last year, House liberals failed by a vote of 246 to 164 to kill off the committee and its \$725,000 budget. It remained for this year's new crop of freshmen to turn the tide, which they did in the caucus on Monday.

Father Robert F. Drinan, the congressman and Jesuit priest who led the recent drive to abolish the committee, declared that the execution marked "a moment in history," and so it did. But the kind of job that became the committee's trademark—the reckless harassment of citizens and assassination of character—has been carried on by other agencies, as the Watergate disclosures have witnessed. At least the new Congress is serving notice that it holds the rights and dignity of individual citizens in greater respect than have some of its predecessors, and that's encouraging.

[From the New Yorker, Jan. 27, 1975]

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A colleague of ours had a talk the other day with Father Robert Drinan, the Jesuit priest who serves Massachusetts' Fourth Congressional District in the House of Representatives. Father Drinan, a Democrat, was in an uncommonly buoyant mood, because his party's caucus had just voted to put an end to the House Internal Security Committee (H.I.S.C.), the infamous successor to the even more infamous House Un-American Activities Committee (H.U.A.C.). When Father Drinan was first elected in 1970, the leadership judged it fitting to seat him on the Judiciary Committee and on H.I.S.C. He is, after all, a distinguished member of the bar and a former dean of the Boston

College Law School. From the day of his election, he dedicated himself to the goal of abolishing the H.I.S.C. He said he had not expected so early or complex a success. The caucus vote was by voice, and if there were any dissenting voices they were not very audible. He had expected the official vote in the House to follow the caucus vote by a few days; actually, it followed by only one day. While Father Drinan was getting ready for the last battle, the battle was won: on the opening day of the Ninety-fourth Congress the House killed H.I.S.C. and transferred its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee. The interment, Father Drinan said, half-seriously, came before he had finished writing his eulogy or recovered his vestments from the dry cleaner's. About that, he has no real regrets. He does, however, lament the fact that the abolition of the H.I.S.C. was only one provision in the proposed House rules on which the members were voting, since it means that no one will ever know for a certainty who was for—and, more important, against—the legislative demise. Some representatives, of course, have already said; others unquestionably will say; but in all likelihood many will stand mute. Father Drinan pointed out that the President should honor him for his contribution to Whipping Inflation Now. In the last Congress, the H.I.S.C. budget was seven hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars. It had a full-time staff of about forty, and dossiers on hundreds of thousands of people. The files will be in the custody of the Judiciary Committee. Their future is uncertain. "We could deep-six them or recycle them," Father Drinan said. "But under proper supervision they should prove invaluable to historians. We might break the seal in 1984. And I can always boast that I served on the most useless committee in Congress."

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 16, 1975]

A LENGTHY WITCHHUNT ENDS

The U.S. House, post-Watergate soul-searching coursing through its veins, Tuesday inaugurated its 1975 session on an appropriate note. It consigned to infamy the House Internal Security Committee, a catalyst in the late 1940s and early 1950s for a politically ambitious and conspiratorially minded young congressman named Richard M. Nixon.

A precursor of Watergate, the committee for three decades ran roughshod over civil liberties in the name of national security. Mr. Nixon, as a member, beat a demagogic drum in his anticommunist crusade. Although a conspicuous example, the former President was by no means the only offender.

The committee—known until six years ago as the House Un-American Activities Committee—issued 174 contempt citations, 10 times as many as the other House committees combined, but mostly to no avail. The courts found most of the citations unwarranted, and few of the defendants ever went to jail.

Yet only six of the bills originating in the committee since 1945 ever became law. The committee accosted investigations, invading the privacy of countless individuals for dubious legislative advantage. In a 1971 suit, three persons subpoenaed to testify before the committee challenged its authority, charging with some justification that it merely sought the "exposure of witnesses . . . to public scorn, obloquy and harassment and intimidation . . . without any legislative purpose."

In recent years, the power of the committee has withered, as anticommunist hysteria has subsided. Its \$725,000 budget of a few years ago has been shaved by more than \$100,000 and its staff of 39 persons diminished by 15. It has tended to avoid the raucous confrontations, a staple of the committee in the past, between members and witnesses.

Indeed, the committee had become a shadow of its former self. Many of its members had resigned. No freshmen in the House sought membership this year.

The House thus recognized the inevitable in abolishing the committee. It has assigned its functions to the House Judiciary Committee, steered from Watergate and equipped to inquire into internal subversion, where necessary. Ironically, it was the Judiciary Committee which had this jurisdiction before the advent of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The demise of the committee represents a personal victory for Rep. Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts, who joined it four years ago to challenge it from within. In one of his trenchant critiques of the committee, Drinan said in 1971: "Men and women old enough to recall the use of the U.S. Congress as a vehicle for systematically wrecking the careers and reputations of individuals whose associations did not meet with the approval of their accusers will always look back upon the episode with embarrassment and discomfort." The words stand as a fitting epitaph for the Internal Security Committee.

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 19, 1975]

DAGGERS FOR HISC

(By Mary McGrory)

The death of the House Internal Security Committee, formerly the House Un-American Activities Committee, was accomplished in the end by a cloak-and-dagger operation, which was probably the only way it could have been done.

The cloak was the manner of the voting. On Monday, in the blessed anonymity of a voice vote, the Democratic Caucus shouted acceptance of HISC Chairman Richard Ichord's extorted proposal that HISC's functions, files and some of its staff members be turned over to the House Judiciary Committee.

Tuesday, the entire membership, under the cover of voting on a package of rules changes in which the elimination of HISC was included, gave the coup de grace to the panel which has haunted the House for more than 30 years and brought on it much shame and ridicule.

Chairman Ichord spoke with more than formal regret at its passing, as did ranking Republican member John Ashbrook of Ohio.

Many members who had lived for the funeral admitted that had HISC been extricated from the bundle, the vote might have been close. The fear that a vote against HISC can be translated into a "soft-on-communism" charge from one's next campaign opponent dies hard in a chamber where détente is still a cold abstraction.

The two daggers were a pair of determined congressmen, Rep. Robert Drinan, D-Mass., the Jesuit who joined HISC in 1971 to destroy it from within, and Rep. Philip Burton, D-Calif., the fire-breathing new chairman of the Democratic Caucus, who has hated HUAC and HISC with a genuine passion since 1949, when he undertook the defense of several of its targets.

Drinan contended that HISC, with its semblance of legality and respectability, was just as dangerous as HUAC, which, under a succession of wild-man chairmen, never pretended to follow the rules.

He conducted ranking cross-examinations of such "friendly" witnesses as former Asst. Atty. Gen. Robert C. Mardian, who has since been convicted of conspiracy himself. On the other hand, when the committee was offering "sensational" fare, Drinan would announce a boycott and grab the headlines.

But the old terror lurked in congressional hearts. Last October, after three reform committees had recommended HISC's abolition, Ichord won a stay of execution by 70 votes. But November brought 75 new members, who,

as a group, could be seen at a glance to be more concerned with reform and economy than with Communists under the bed, and Drinan and Burton went back into the trenches.

Drinan wrote letters to the new members recounting the sorry past and dubious future of HISC and hinting that a new member who sought assignment to it would be buying a ticket to oblivion.

Burton began a series of delicate parliamentary maneuvers. His object was to pick off Democratic members of HISC, enticing them from its ranks with promise of plum assignments not available to members of an "exclusive" committee such as HISC. Several slots on the far more desirable Government Operations Committee opened up, and by a skillful evocation of old House practice and new House rules, Burton was able to move them at a rate that left Ichord standing alone.

Many members and citizens are sleeping better of nights knowing that the 745,000 names gathered by HISC are in the hands of Chairman Peter Rodino of the House Judiciary Committee, which is a hotbed of civil libertarians.

The point has been taken by the House as a whole that the most un-American activities in the history of the Republic were conducted by HUAC's most famous alumnus, Richard M. Nixon, and that the internal security was never more threatened than by the men who were running the country.

The Founding Fathers never troubled to define "Americanism," which to them meant being in trouble with the authorities. So of course they never defined what HUAC and HISC breathlessly pursued over the teeth-gnashing years, "Un-Americanism." Now that the official body of definition has been eliminated, perhaps we can all start even again.

CONYERS INTRODUCES GRAND JURY REFORM ACT OF 1975

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, for myself and 20 colleagues, the Grand Jury Reform Act of 1975, a strengthened version of legislation I introduced in the 93d Congress to restore the grand jury's traditional role as a guardian of American liberties.

Last year, the Congress enacted the Speedy Trial Act of 1974, a long overdue measure to revitalize the eroded constitutional right to a speedy trial. The bill I am introducing today will revitalize another long eroded and neglected constitutional right in our criminal justice system—the right of a citizen to the protective shield of the grand jury.

Historically, grand juries have had two distinct functions:

First. They have evaluated the evidence gathered by a prosecutor to determine whether the State was justified in bringing a person to trial, with the humiliation and expense that entails.

Second. They have conducted independent investigations of offenses allegedly committed or aided by public officeholders. If the State would not investigate itself, a body of citizens would discover and prosecute criminal activity.

As might be expected of an institution 800 years old, the grand jury has had a

mixed history. At times, grand juries have acted as "people's panels," shielding the innocent from unjust prosecution, or investigating government authorities who misused their positions for private gain or public harm. In pre-Revolutionary America, for example, grand juries sometimes refused to indict colonists accused of violating British laws, such as the Stamp Act or seditious libel laws, which the jurors believed to be unjust.

But, in more recent times, the grand jury has often been a compliant instrument of the prosecutor. In the words of former Senator Charles Goodell, writing in the May 1973, issue of Harper's:

Over the years, the complexion of grand juries has changed, their anti-authoritarian tradition has been diluted, and they have become subservient to the interests of the prosecuting authority over which they are assigned to watch.

By 1791, when the Bill of Rights was adopted, the grand jury was established as a major barrier to unchecked prosecutorial authority. The fifth amendment provides that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime" unless a grand jury votes in favor of bringing the charge. This provision has been interpreted by the courts to mean that no person may be prosecuted in the Federal courts on a felony charge without a grand jury indictment. Every Federal prosecution—whether for violation of Selective Service or antitrust laws, or for counterfeiting, smuggling, bank robbery, tax fraud, or a variety of other crimes—begins with a grand jury indictment.

In the Federal system, the grand jury usually functions with little conflict and attracts little attention. At least one grand jury is in operation in every busy Federal district at all times, normally meeting once a week or less for several hours at each meeting. The 23 members of the jury normally are chosen at random from the voter registration lists of the counties within the district. At each session, the grand jury considers the evidence gathered by Government investigative agencies, under the direction of one or more assistant U.S. attorneys. Typically, a U.S. attorney calls witnesses into the grand jury room one at a time—an agent of the FBI, the Customs Service, the Internal Revenue Service, or any one of a number of other Federal or local investigative agencies. Sometimes the victim of a crime may also be called as a witness.

In response to the questions asked by the U.S. attorney, the witness, if an investigative agent, will describe the findings of his agency in the case. In addition, either the U.S. attorney or the witness may introduce documentary evidence. After all witnesses have been questioned, the grand jury, with no one else present, votes on whether to indict anybody for committing the possible crime or crimes involved. The grand jury, which until that point has played no role in questioning the witnesses or in shaping the investigation, almost always votes in favor of indictment.

The American Bar Association's "Standards Relating to the Prosecution

Function," approved draft 1971, caution that—

Where the prosecutor is authorized to act as legal advisor to the grand jury he may appropriately explain the law and express his opinion on the legal significance of the evidence but he should give due deference to its status as an independent legal body; The prosecutor should not make statements or arguments in an effort to influence grand jury action in a manner which would be impermissible at trial before a petit jury. (Approved Draft, 1971, p. 87).

Nevertheless, as Judge William Campbell of the Federal bench in Chicago has written:

Any experienced prosecutor will admit that he can indict anybody at any time for almost anything before any grand jury.

For several years, beginning in 1970, the Justice Department, and particularly its Internal Security Division, convened a series of special grand juries and used them in a way rarely seen before. Instead of calling Government investigators or victims as witnesses, the Government subpoenaed a wide variety of citizens who were neither victims nor Government employees. Many of them were associated with the antiwar movement, although some had only incidental ties with antiwar activists. Scores of witnesses were forced to choose between testifying about their friends, relatives, and political associates, or going to jail for contempt of court if they refused to answer the prosecutor's questions in the grand jury room.

In addition, the questions asked of witnesses were often impossible to answer. For example:

I want you to tell the grand jury what period of time during the years 1969 and 1970 you resided at 2201 Ocean Front Walk, Venice (Los Angeles), who resided there at the time you lived there, identifying all persons you have seen in or about the premises at that address, and tell the grand jury all of the conversations that were held by you or others in your presence during the time that you were at that address. (Question asked by Guy Goodwin of the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department of a witness subpoenaed to appear before a federal grand jury in Tucson, Arizona, Fall, 1970.)

Witnesses were jailed for their refusal to answer this question and others that were equally sweeping. Dozens of people were jailed for refusing to testify. Others, unwilling to be jailed for a principle when they knew nothing to incriminate anybody, were forced to disclose the private lives of their friends and relatives.

Probably because the grand jury has a long history as an institution independent of the prosecutor and other arms of the Government, Federal law says almost nothing about its procedures. In the absence of legal restraints, prosecutors have taken control of making decisions that properly belong to the grand jury itself. The prosecutor decides whom to subpoena, what questions to ask, the general nature of the investigation, and the question of grants of immunity. One result is that, particularly in recent years, prosecutors have exploited this freedom of action in ways that constitute serious abuses of the power of the grand jury. For example, as illustrated by the ques-

tion quoted above, prosecutors have been able to force witnesses to answer questions before a grand jury which they would not have to answer if asked in the prosecutor's office or in a police station.

Moreover, the Department of Justice now seeks to remove whatever constraints still remain. In a September 10, 1974, letter to the Honorable PETER ROBINO, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Department advocated a constitutional amendment that would give attorneys for the Government the sole power to determine when the grand jury indictment process should be used, and when it should be bypassed in favor of a prosecutorial information—a procedure which eliminates the role of the people in this critical stage of the criminal justice process. This proposal would further erode grand jury safeguards which were already weakened recently by the 1974 Supreme Court Calandra decision which ruled that illegally obtained evidence is admissible in grand jury proceedings.

The legislation I am introducing is based on the belief that it is better to strengthen the grand jury as an institution than to restrict or abandon it. First, the place of the grand jury in the federal system is defined unequivocally by the fifth amendment; eliminating or curtailing its role, therefore, would require a constitutional amendment. Such an amendment is practically unrealistic and potentially dangerous to propose changes in the Bill of Rights. Second, grand and petit juries are the only two institutions in our judicial system in which decisionmaking authority is given to the people independent of the Government. I believe that it would be a mistake to eliminate the grand jury, or to minimize its role, at a time when popular participation in our political and legal institutions needs to be encouraged, not discouraged.

The Grand Jury Reform Act of 1975 is designed to end the pattern of grand jury abuse of recent years. The tool which has been crucial to prosecutors' misuse of the grand jury's subpoena power has been the ability of prosecutors to obtain court orders of immunity, giving a witness limited immunity from prosecution, but ordering him to testify without regard to his fifth amendment right against self-incrimination.

The legislation I propose would make two changes in immunity procedures. A witness could be given immunity, and a corresponding order to testify, only if he agrees to this exchange. Further, the prosecutor could not approve this exchange without the approval of a majority of the members of the grand jury itself. A judge might then sign an immunity order, once the grand jury, the prosecutor, and the witness all agree to this procedure.

This bill would also require a favorable vote by a grand jury majority to subpoena a witness and to seek a court finding of contempt if a witness refuses to testify. Moreover, the Government's power to bypass a grand jury already considering a matter would be greatly restricted, as would the practice of seeking out a more pliable grand jury once one has voted against an indictment.

Also with regard to immunity, this legislation would eliminate "use immunity" which was created by the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, and subsequently applied to scores of witnesses with no visible or alleged connection with organized crime—racketeering, gambling, narcotics, and prostitution. Use immunity allows the Government to compel a witness to testify, even in a manner which incriminates himself, and then to prosecute the witness for the crime about which he testifies. The immunity offered provides only that, at any later trial, the Government may not use any of the person's compelled testimony or anything derived from that testimony.

Use immunity has been rightly criticized for the narrowness of the protection which it offers the witness. There is no way for a defendant, who had earlier been a recalcitrant witness, to trace the way in which his grand jury testimony was used by Federal, State, or local investigative agencies. Nor is there any way for a defendant to know whether the prosecutor's tactical decisions concerning presentation of the case were shaped by information derived from the defendant's compelled testimony. In light of such problems, this bill eliminates use immunity, but not transactional immunity which protects the witness from prosecution for any of the vents or actions about which he testifies.

In other sections, this bill would provide a number of procedural safeguards for the rights of witnesses appearing before grand juries, for example: Providing for 10 days' notice prior to a hearing on a contempt charge, and 7 days' notice before a subpoena is returnable; requiring the transcribing of all grand jury proceedings—except secret grand jury deliberations and consultations between a witness and counsel—and giving the witness the right to obtain a transcript of his testimony within 48 hours; allowing a witness to be represented by counsel in the grand jury room; barring any evidence obtained in violation of a witness' constitutional rights; requiring prosecutors to inform witnesses of their constitutional rights prior to questioning; and a number of other important procedural protections.

This bill also would allow citizens, with court approval, to approach a grand jury and ask it to engage in independent inquiry, as well as to allow citizens to testify in any ongoing inquiry. Watergate has pointed out the difficulties inherent in attempts by a grand jury to investigate criminal activity in which members of the executive branch of the Government may be implicated. This is one reason why the right of citizens to approach the grand jury is of critical importance. This is also why the bill takes the major step of allowing grand juries to retain their own attorneys when they are investigating crimes in which current or former Government officials may be involved. Such attorneys would be empowered to sign indictments in lieu of attorneys for the Government.

I include a summary of the Grand Jury Reform Act of 1975 at this point in the Record:

SUMMARY OF THE GRAND JURY REFORM ACT OF 1975

RECALCITRANT WITNESSES

Twelve or more members of the grand jury must vote to make application to the court for an order directing a recalcitrant witness to show cause in a hearing why he/she should not be held in contempt.

Gives the witness ten days notice of a contempt hearing. In the case of a witness subpoenaed to trial, and upon a showing of special need, shorter notice may be given, but not less than five days.

The witness has the right to appointed counsel in contempt proceedings, if the witness is unable to afford it.

Imprisonment shall be in a Federal institution, unless the witness waives this right.

Reduces the period of imprisonment from a maximum of 18 to 6 months for civil contempt, and prohibits reiterative contempt, by making the 6 months cumulative, applying it against any confinement resulting from prior, subsequent, or related grand jury investigations.

Provides that the confined person shall be admitted to bail, pending appeal, unless the appeal is patently frivolous and taken for delay. Appeals shall be disposed of pursuant to an expedited schedule, eliminating the unique "30 day rule", which requires that appeals be decided within 30 days.

Provides that a refusal to answer questions or provide other information shall not be punished if the question or the request is based on any violation of the witness' Constitutional or statutory rights.

Applies all of the above protections to witnesses subpoenaed to trial as well as grand jury witnesses, with the exception of grand jury voting, where in trial the determination is made by the court.

NOTICE TO THE GRAND JURY OF ITS RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Requires that the district court judge who empanels the grand jury give instructions to the grand jurors at the beginning of their term, including: grand jury powers with respect to independent investigation, its right to call and interrogate witnesses, its right to request documents and evidence, the subject matter of the investigation, the necessity of legally sufficient evidence to indict, and the power of the grand jury to vote before a witness may be subpoenaed, granted immunity, be given a contempt hearing or indicted.

Prescribes that failure to so instruct the grand jury is just cause for a refusal to testify or for dismissal of an indictment by that or by a subsequent grand jury on the same matter.

INDEPENDENT INQUIRY

Allows the grand jury, upon notice to the court, to inquire on its own initiative into offenses committed by government or former government officials. The grand jury shall serve for 12 months with no more than two extensions for a maximum of 24 months.

Provides that the court, upon a vote of the grand jury, shall appoint a special attorney to assist the grand jury in investigation. Such attorney will be paid \$100/day and may fix compensation for such assistants as is deemed necessary, with the approval of the court. Such attorney shall have exclusive power to assist the grand jury and shall sign any indictment, in lieu of a government attorney.

RIGHTS OF GRAND JURY WITNESSES

Provides that subpoenas be issued only on an affirmative vote of 12 or more members of the grand jury. Subpoenas are not returnable on less than seven days notice. The subpoena must advise the witness of the right to counsel, the right against self-incrimination, whether his/her conduct is under investiga-

tion, the subject matter of the inquiry, and the substantive statutes involved. Any witness not advised of these rights cannot be prosecuted, subjected to penalty, or have the evidence used against him/her in court.

Gives witnesses the right to have counsel in the grand jury room, such counsel to be court appointed where appropriate. Counsel shall not be bound by secrecy.

Prescribes that when an investigation includes violations of substantive criminal statutes as well as conspiracy, the grand jury may not be convened in the district where only the conspiracy is alleged. On the motion of the witness the court shall transfer the investigation to another district in which the proceedings may be properly convened. The court shall take into account the distance of the proceedings from the residence of the witness, other burdens on the witness, and the existence and nature of any related proceedings.

Once a grand jury has considered a matter, the government shall not bring the same matter to another grand jury unless the government shows and the court finds that the government has discovered additional relevant evidence.

Provides that transcripts shall be made of the proceedings and be available to the witness, a copy shall be furnished without cost.

Gives the witness and his/her counsel the right to examine and copy any statement of the witness in the possession of the United States which relates to the matter under investigation.

Provides that no person shall be required to testify or be confined if, upon evidentiary hearing, the court finds: (a) a primary purpose or effect of the subpoena is to secure for trial evidence against a person already under indictment, or formal accusation. (b) Compliance with the subpoena is unreasonable or oppressive and involves unnecessary appearances; or the only testimony that can reasonably be expected is cumulative, unnecessary, or privileged. (c) The primary purpose of the subpoena is punitive.

Gives the court in the district out of which the subpoena was issued, the court in the district in which the subpoena was served, and the court in the district in which a witness resides concurrent jurisdiction over motions to quash and other relief. It allows such motions at any time. If a motion is made prior to or during an appearance, the appearance is stayed, pending ruling. If the motion is made during or subsequent to the appearance, the motion must be made in the district of the empaneled jury.

Any person may testify on a matter before a grand jury or appear before a grand jury to request that it engage in independent inquiry, unless the court finds that such testimony or such appearance would serve no relevant purpose.

IMMUNITY OF WITNESSES

Abolishes all forced and use immunity before grand juries and courts. Transactional immunity is allowed with the written consent of the witness, and by affirmative vote of twelve or more members of the grand jury; or, in the case of a trial proceeding, with the consent of the witness and by application of the U.S. attorney.

Provides transactional immunity for witnesses before Congressional committees and agency hearings.

REPORTS CONCERNING GRAND JURY INVESTIGATIONS

Requires the Attorney General to file detailed annual grand jury reports, describing: (a) the number and nature of investigations in which grand juries were utilized, (b) the number of reports for orders compelling testimony, and the number granted, (c) the number of immunity grants requested, the number approved, and the nature of the in-

vestigations, (d) the number of witnesses imprisoned for contempt, and the dates of their confinement, (e) an assessment of the effectiveness of immunity, including the number of arrests, indictments, no-bills, etc., resulting from compelled testimony, and (f) a description of the data banks, etc., by which grand jury data is processed and used by the Justice Department.

EVIDENCE

Requires the government to introduce all evidence in its possession tending to prove the innocence of a potential defendant.

Prohibits the grand jury from returning an indictment on the basis of hearsay evidence alone.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I, along with 169 of my colleagues, voted against an increase in the public debt limit. I hope the President takes the time to analyze that vote because I, for one, was sending him a message.

That message is very clear and very simple. The President can not ask me to vote our country into its deepest peacetime debt in history, as he has done with the fiscal 1976 budget.

I was not opposed to allowing our country to meet its obligations when I voted against raising the deficit ceiling. I am opposed to reckless Federal spending on those programs that have little or no effect on the general welfare of the people of this country. A billion dollar a day budget is unacceptable, and the people of this country will not stand for it.

The country needs a two-prong attack to combat the economic distress it is experiencing. It needs to stimulate the economy through a massive input of capital. And it needs to offset the inflationary impact of that input through a tight, bare necessities budget. It is in the second area that the administration is particularly lacking.

The new budget calls for a \$51.9 billion deficit. Yet the budget message states that \$91.8 billion is lost as revenue due to tax preferences. That is more than one quarter of the current budget. While there are tax preferences which are beneficial, such as deductions for charitable contributions and medical costs, there are loopholes such as oil and gas preferences which cost the Government \$4.4 billion a year or preferential treatment of capital gains which costs the Government \$4.9 billion a year. We must end some of these preferences.

Over one-quarter of the \$349.4 billion budget is slated for defense. While I would never do anything which might jeopardize this country's capabilities, there must be some expendable money in that program. And the same goes for all departments and agencies in the Government. The President has proposed \$17 billion in limitations and reductions in spending. But a large portion of that is supposed to come out of social benefit programs such as social security and food stamps. In rejecting a cutback in food

stamp benefits the Congress has already overwhelmingly indicated to the President that in this time when millions of Americans are undergoing fiscal shock, cutting back on benefit programs is extremely ill advised.

The administration can learn a lot from the experience of the town of Wilimantic, Conn., in the second district. Faced with a city budget they considered too large, the voters repeatedly refused to authorize their government to spend, tax, or borrow. For 45 days they stood firm, until a budget proposal offering a 9-percent tax cut was accepted.

That is what this country needs to tell the Ford administration and the Congress. Tell them we want a better offer than the one they submitted. The taxpayers of this country are sick to death with irresponsible spending, and they will not stand for almost one-tenth of the 1976 budget being spent on interest on the national debt.

The Congress, I feel, is starting to respond to the taxpayers' needs, but the executive is lagging far behind. My mail has been filled with letters from constituents who do not want their tax dollars poured down the drain.

If the voters of the country could have stood in the well of the House and voted on raising the debt ceiling yesterday, they would have voted "no" just as I did to let the President and the Congress know that it is about time this country opened its eyes to the realities of an ever-growing economic crisis.

THE GOURMET'S ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHINESE HAWAIIAN COOKING: A WEALTH OF FOOD IDEAS FOR THE CHINESE NEW YEAR

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1975

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for thousands of Chinese Americans throughout our country, this weekend will mark the beginning of the Chinese New Year—the Year of the Hare. Like their fellow citizens, the Chinese welcome the New Year with traditional festivities, including the colorful lion dance. Throughout this week they will be partaking of holiday feasts, including roast suckling pig for abundance, gold coin chicken for prosperity, and phoenix liver with quail eggs for joy and warmth.

With the thought that my colleagues may wish to share in this wealth of good food and good fellowship, I would like to bring to their attention "The Gourmet's Encyclopedia of Chinese-Hawaiian Cooking," a new cookbook published by Hawaii's "host and hostess with the mostest," Alyce and Theodore Char. Mr. and Mrs. Char, both active in civic and cultural affairs in Hawaii, are renowned throughout the island State for their fabulous parties—especially for the gourmet food they serve. At last, at the urging of their many friends, they have compiled a definite cookbook of Chinese-Hawaiian foods including not

only their most popular recipes and menus, but a wealth of information about the Chinese kitchen and Chinese customs related to cooking and dining. "The Gourmet's Encyclopedia of Chinese Hawaiian Cooking," published by the Exposition Press, would be an invaluable source for anyone who enjoys Chinese and Hawaiian cooking, and that now includes almost everyone.

I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two recipes taken from "The Gourmet's Encyclopedia of Chinese Hawaiian Cooking," both for dishes traditionally served during the Chinese New Year celebration. I urge you to try them and wish you and yours Kung Hee Fat Choy—A Happy New Year.

The recipes follow:

GOLD COIN CHICKEN

(Gum Chin Gai)—serves 8-10.

1 lb. cooked Virginia ham fat
1 lb. cooked Virginia ham
1 lb. filet of chicken
½ cup honey
1 tsp. sesame oil
Dash of pepper
2 tbsp. sherry
¼ cup cornstarch
1 egg white

1. Slice ham fat ¼" thick and cut circles 2" in diameter.

2. Slice ham ⅛" thick and cut circles as above.

3. Mix both ham and ham fat with honey and sesame oil.

4. Slice chicken ¼" thick and cut circles 2" in diameter.

5. Sprinkle pepper and sherry on chicken and mix; then coat with two tablespoons cornstarch.

6. Put remaining cornstarch on saucer. Coat piece of ham fat on one side and set down, coated side up; dip piece of ham in cornstarch and then in egg white and place on ham fat; dip piece of chicken in cornstarch and in egg white and set it on ham; gently press all three together. Place on broiler.

7. Repeat, making these stacks of fat, ham, and chicken. This recipe should make 24 to 30 stacks.

8. Broil on second groove in broiler until chicken is cooked. This should take 5 minutes.

ROAST SUCKLING PIG

(Cantonese Style)—serves 20-30.

1 Suckling Pig, 20-30 lbs. dressed
2 cups rock salt
½ cup thick red soy
2 tbsp. salt
1 tsp. pepper

SAUCE

2 cups bean sauce
½ cup brown sugar
½ cup sherry
¼ cup soy sauce
1 cup honey
3 tbsp. water chestnut flour
2 cups green onions, cut 1" long
2 bunches Chinese parsley, cut short
1 tbsp. fragrant spices

1. Rub suckling pig inside and outside with rock salt, rinse and wipe dry.

2. Smear with red soy and sprinkle salt and pepper, inside and outside.

3. Prepare sauce and rub on inside of pig, using handful of greens (onions and parsley) to work with, for ease of spreading sauce. Use remaining sauce to spread on skin of pig.

4. Roast in oven 450° to start. When skin is browned and shows signs of being pitted (about 20 minutes), turn pig over to brown and "burst." Keep rotating until all sides are brown and crispy.

5. While pig is browning, roasting pan will

begin to scorch. Pour boiling water in, 1 cup at a time, as liquid evaporates. This will keep sauce moist and yield flavor for gravy.

6. When skin is well browned, reduce heat to 350° and continue roasting 1 hour; then reduce heat to 325° and finish roasting

another hour, or until done. Be sure that there is water in the pan at all times.

7. Occasionally sprinkle with cold water mixed with a little honey, to speed crisping process.

8. Make pan gravy, adding tomato wedges

for extra flavor and nourishment. Season to taste.

A large monkey-pod pig board makes an attractive and practical serving platter. Garnish with cherry tomatoes, scallop-edged radishes and onions.

SENATE—Friday, February 7, 1975

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

The Reverend Gabriel Duffy, chairman of the Ecumenical Commission of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington, College Park, Md., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Heavenly Father:

Praise and thanksgiving be to You for Your goodness and for the love You manifest by creating and sustaining us.

Praise to You for guiding our forefathers to found this Nation.

Praise to You for keeping us in safety and happiness through these two centuries.

Praise to You for the hope and courage we find in our hearts making it possible for us to face all danger, disappointment, and trouble.

We stand so much in need. Never fail to show us Your mercy and gracious understanding.

In every way bless these United States of America. Particularly bless this Senate. Grant to every Member the power to be motivated always by goodness and love as You are, Father, so that each, by his unique talents, will contribute to the healing of all men in their frailty and present pain.

Hear us and heed us, O gracious God, for You are truly merciful and a lover of mankind. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1975.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 5, 1975, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1975

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, we are enlightened from time to time by unsurprising announcements of candidacies for the Presidency. Some may be spurred on by the new campaign elections bill. All, I hope, will be spurred on by the precedent set for sunshine legislative activity. I hope that we will at all times have full disclosure of the financing, as required by law, and I expect that we will.

I hope that we will also have full disclosure of the views of candidates. It is not enough to take one's stance sternly and unflinchingly for motherhood, although it is a vast constituency.

As to the numerous candidates for the Presidency, many of whom honor this body by either their presence or their absence, as exigencies determine, I hope their candidacies will not interfere with the business of the Senate. I hope the necessity for effective legislative action will take high priority over the call of the campaign trail, the lure of the distant places.

I recall previous campaigns during which frequently we in the Senate had to wait until somebody had returned from an earthshaking round of Squash Hollow, Podunk, and Center Corners.

I do not think the Senate will be deterred from its unflagging pursuit of excellence by these absences, however necessary they may seem personally to our numerous candidates. I hope that they will adumbrate the dark places; that they will enlighten us on their views with a considerable degree of specificity; that they will put the national interest above all other interests, including the interests of pressure groups and nationalities, and that they will treat the agencies of constituencies with responsibility and statesmanship.

If I seem to be asking too much, it is because the American people have always expected that of their candidates.

We have a very good President. The burden of proof will be on those who disagree.

So I hope that the Senate can proceed with its business undeterred by distractions of ambition and that we may be able to give a good account of ourselves to the American people.

Good government is the best politics. While, so far, these announcements have had all the impact of a marshmallow on a feather bed, one still hopes that from dialog may emerge an understanding of issues and a clarification of positions, as a result of which the American people will be able to make an informed choice, comes that day, which now seems so far away, in November of 1976.

In the Bicentennial, we will be proud of many things. I want us to be most proud of our democratic system; and I think that if we all keep that at the front of our minds, the public interest will benefit accordingly.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Republican leader has called attention to the importance of our being on the job and working to deal with the problems that confront the Nation.

May I say, in defense of all Senators, that the attendance of all Senators—I am not sure as to my figures, but I think I am relatively safe in saying this—over the past year has been very high, on the average. I have the impression that most Senators, practically all Senators, had a voting attendance last year of certainly above 85 percent, and possibly above 90 percent.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I think it was approximately 86 percent.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. With respect to those who are Presidential candidates or who may be Presidential candidates, I think that their attendance record, also, had been good.

I believe that only one Senator has announced that he will be a candidate for the nomination, and that was the announcement of Mr. JACKSON. If I am not incorrect, or if my recollection does not mislead me, I believe that his voting record last year was in the area of 98 or 99 percent attendance.

There are others who are being mentioned as possible Presidential candidates. I believe that a close look at their records will show that over their period of service in the Senate, their records are not open for criticism. Senator BENTSEN, for example, is not an announced candidate, but there is considerable speculation as to whether or not he will become one. I imagine that his voting record over the period that he has been