

H.J. Res. 913. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FREY, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.J. Res. 914. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. THONE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. DENT, Mr. GINN, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. STRATTON):

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution providing for continued close relations with the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 900. Resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 807; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Res. 902. Resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURGNER:

H. Res. 903. Resolution in support of continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H. Res. 904. Resolution to declare U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 905. Resolution providing for the disapproval of the recommendation of the President of the United States with respect to the rates of pay of officers and positions within the purview of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 643; Public Law 90-206) transmitted by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 906. Resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 807; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BYRON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. WON PAT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. MITCHELL of New York):

H. Res. 907. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of shortages of materials and natural resources affecting the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 908. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 909. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Res. 910. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Members of Congress and legislative officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H. Res. 911. Resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 826; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 912. Resolution to commend U.S. initiatives in seeking international cooperative solutions to the oil crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H. Res. 913. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to rates of pay of Members of Congress transmitted to the Congress in the appendix to the budget for the fiscal year 1975, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Res. 914. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Members of Congress transmitted to the Congress in the appendix to the budget for the fiscal year 1975, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Res. 915. Resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (Senate Joint Res. 176) to authorize and direct the development of and the production of petroleum from naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and to direct the exploration of naval petroleum reserves No. 1 and 4, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 916. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

352. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, relative to emergency generators in housing for the elderly to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13005. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Capt. Ferdinand Mendenhall, U.S. Navy Reserves, retired, to the grade of rear admiral on the Reserves retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 13006. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Capt. Ferdinand Mendenhall, U.S. Navy Reserves, retired, to the grade of rear admiral on the Reserves retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 13007. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Archer C. Ford, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PANAMA CANAL

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the January 28 edition of the Lynchburg News included a thoughtful editorial regarding the potential surrender by the United States of its sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

The editorial discusses the historical background of the creation of the canal and concludes that historical right and strategic necessity demand that the United States maintain its control over this vital waterway.

I deplore the recent action of Secretary of State Kissinger in committing the United States to prompt conclusion of negotiations with Panama leading to our surrender of sovereignty. I shall oppose

any pact incorporating such a surrender when it is submitted to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Trite But Important," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News,

Jan. 28, 1974]

TRITE BUT IMPORTANT

Comparatively little public attention is given to the efforts of Panama to take over the Panama Canal, and the increasingly acquiescent attitude of the United States' current Administration toward the Panamanian effort. It is virtually a trite news item to many, but it is nevertheless very important, and requires a powerful public negation of the trend toward turning the canal over to the Panamanian government. It absolutely must not be done, even though the present Leftist government should shift to a Central or Rightist one.

There are still a few of us around who recall how the canal came into being. First

consideration was given to building a canal across Nicaragua. France was the first proponent and shifted to Panama, a part of Colombia, and actually began construction resulting in excavation of 78,000,000 cubic yards before costs and disease stopped the project.

When the United States later decided to go ahead they had trouble with Colombia and as a result aided Panama in setting up as an independent Republic and went to work on the canal. The United States then built the canal and with new weapons against tropical diseases also made the strip adequately healthful for the workers and the native people.

It was at the time considered to be the creation of first, United States Marines, second, engineering skill, and dominating all else health measures that removed the health obstacles that more than all else had made such a project almost impossible.

Only the Left movements of the last few decades, now stronger in the Western Hemisphere, have produced the insistence by Panama of taking over the Panama Canal though they are in no way in a position to finance, operate and protect.

Unfortunately the Nixon Administration is too deficient to understand the situation and flatly refuse to consider change. They may hold that the canal is dispensable, that aircraft make its shipping value too unimportant to preserve and improve the canal, but the political and technical proof have not been documented so far.

To permit Panama and the canal to become a Communist property would be inviting trouble to a degree wholly condemnatory of the responsibility of our own government. Our intervention prevented the French and British from keeping the Suez Canal open. Even the current administration should have enough sense and responsibility not to repeat such idiocy.

VETERANS' EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 19, the House debated and passed H.R. 12628, which will increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and other persons; and make improvements in the educational programs.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 initiated a program which has enabled millions of veterans to attend a college or university for 4 years. Under the original law, the Government provided payments to schools for a veteran's tuition, books and fees, and a living allowance for the veteran and his dependents. In 1952 the program was expanded to include Korean war veterans and altered so that all educational benefits were paid directly to the veteran through a monthly allowance. In 1966 the Veteran's Readjustment Act of 1966 was enacted expanding the program so that veterans could receive benefits for the acquisition of new trades or skills and for vocational rehabilitation.

This program has proven extremely good for our country as I am sure all will agree. The basis provision of H.R. 12628 is a 13.6 percent across the board increase in the rate of allowances with proportional increases for dependents. Although Congress increased benefit levels by 30 percent in 1967, 34.6 percent in 1970, and 25.7 percent in 1972, the steady rise in costs both of education and of living necessitate another 13.6-percent increase this year.

I regret the necessity for these annual increases, but the inflationary spiral has sped continuously upward for many years now and we must recognize the impact it has on important programs.

In addition to the 13.6 percent increase, H.R. 12628 provides four other good features: First, it increases the time during which a veteran must complete his or her training from 8 years after

discharge or release to 10 years; second, it removes the current limitation on the number of veterans who may receive assistance under the work-study program; third, it makes it possible for a veteran to receive up to 6 months of refresher training provided the veteran begins training within 12 months after service and the training is continuous except for interruptions beyond control; and fourth, it sets up a Vietnam-Era Veteran's Communication Center within the Veterans' Administration to make periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the veteran's outreach services program which distributes information about training program activities to veterans.

I was pleased to support and vote for this measure and I am sure that many fine young people will benefit from this and will render good service to their country in the future as they have already done in the past.

FAILURE OF PENTAGON TO SUPPORT RESERVE FORCES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial in the February 4, 1974, issue of the Kansas City Times makes some excellent point reference to Pentagon support of the Guard and Reserve.

There are many missions the Guard and Reserve can perform at a more economical rate than Regular forces. It is about time a defense-wide review of such roles be undertaken.

Some talk about the \$5 billion it now costs to finance the Reserve and Guard but these same individuals fail to mention that for this money we are receiving about 30 percent of our Nation's military strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, Feb. 4, 1974]

PENTAGON FAILS THE RESERVE FORCE

Without the overhanging threat of being drafted into the full-time Army, young Americans no longer are lining up in large numbers to enlist in the National Guard and other reserve forces. In Missouri this loss of pulling power for the civilian reserves has inspired a month-long recruiting program by the Army National Guard. The guard's assigned strength in Missouri is said to be on the verge of being cut drastically if the units here and elsewhere in the state do not fill up their vacancies.

Locally the goal of six guard units is to attract 500 recruits. The new armory at 7600 Ozark Road is as well equipped as any in the country and the guard itself has much to offer young men willing to invest in a part-time military career.

But there is still the matter of incentives

and there is just so much that any recruiting effort can accomplish. The reserve and guard programs can be made more attractive only with specific new displays of support by the federal government.

It is beginning to appear that the Pentagon is not really serious about its earlier talk of going all-out to attract more men to reserve and National Guard ranks. The indication of foot-dragging is the request by William P. Clements, deputy secretary of defense, for congressional delay on legislation that would create enlistment and re-enlistment bonuses for the nonactive duty forces. This is a strange attitude in view of the fact that the civilian part-time units, absorbing only 5 per cent of the defense budget, are being depended on to provide 30 per cent of the nation's ready military strength. This is possible because six reservists or guardsmen can be maintained for the same amount of money it takes to maintain one full-time serviceman.

The Pentagon seems to have decided that substantial cuts in the strength of reserve forces are inevitable so why bother to strengthen their recruiting campaigns. But reserve service can be made more appealing if the Pentagon will ask Congress for the help that it probably would be willing to provide. National Guard and reserve recruiting drives will only start getting the sustained results they deserve when it is clear that they are being supported at the top all the way.

ENCOURAGING MINORITY BUSINESS IN MISSOURI

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, encouragement of minority-owned and managed businesses is an important part of Missouri's Governor Christopher S. "Kit" Bond's commitment to strengthen the entire economic climate in Missouri. I am very proud of the efforts which the Bond administration is making toward these goals.

Governor Bond's recent address before the Governor's Conference on Minority Business Development held in Columbia, Mo., exemplifies his strong commitment.

Governor Bond's speech follows:

MINORITY BUSINESS CONFERENCE

"Encouraging minority-owned and managed businesses is an important part of my administration's commitment to strengthening the entire Missouri economy."

Minority-owned businesses and economic vitality, currently the key strategies among minorities, are not new ideas. In fact, the current flurry of activity among minorities to develop an art of making money, a prime feature of American culture, has historical precedent as far back as the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During this time in American history there were numerous blacks who had amassed fortunes in almost all branches of business. In 1789, for example, a number of blacks ran small shops in the main business district of Philadelphia, and in 1796 blacks established a beneficial insurance society.

Participation by blacks in business continued at a relatively high level into the early 1800's. But after the 1820's black busi-

ness began to decline for a variety of racial and economic reasons. This downward trend was followed by stringent enforcement of segregation patterns, which further constrained business opportunities.

Today, however, blacks and other minorities are re-entering the economic life of the Nation.

In many ways minority businesses have the same hurdles to overcome that other businesses do: most are too small to afford large advertising budgets or to attract large amounts of capital for growth, and most have difficulty obtaining contracts for goods and services needed by major buyers.

But in certain important ways, minority businesses are subject to additional disadvantages. Almost one-third of all minority businesses are based upon a capital investment of less than \$5,000 and are less than five years old. In addition, it is difficult for many minority businessmen to obtain adequate insurance because of their location in high-risk neighborhoods.

For too long we have looked upon minority business as limited not only in size and operation but also to the extent it participates in the business community. We know today that nationally only nine percent of minority businesses have more than five employees; that 91 percent have less than \$200,000 gross receipts; that manufacturing and other capital intensive businesses remain virtually out of reach; that equity is all too scarce; and that the kind of useful, expert assistance which a business needs is too often not available or is untimely.

The minority businessman in Missouri is relatively well educated in terms of high school and college attendance. However, he lacks business training and managerial skills and is not equipped to overcome all of the difficulties inherent in doing business in a ghetto economy. Thus, the traditional education he has received, is not entirely adequate in the situation in which he finds himself.

The minority businessman started his business because he wanted to work for himself and gain financially. He, too, is profit motivated. Most minority businesses are relatively new, and have been operating for five years or less. They are small, with a value of \$5,000 or less and employ few full-time people other than the owner.

At present, the minority businessman appears to acquire his technical information on a hit-or-miss basis, drawing on business publications, the Small Business Administration and the various business development organizations. Little help comes from private agencies—either because it is not asked for or it is not offered. Governmental organizations are also considered poor sources of information, as many businessmen rank their efforts as token or inadequate.

The minority businessman in Missouri does not advertise sufficiently to promote his business. At present, he relies primarily on word-of-mouth advertising. When he does have a more professional approach to marketing his product, the publicity is often too sparse to be truly effective. The major reason behind the minority businessman's failure to advertise more effectively is his lack of capital. Without this capital, he cannot advertise, which means that he finds it difficult to attract new customers, either from inside or outside the minority community. Inability to build up his business, of course, also means inability to obtain more capital.

Capital, however, is only half the key to enabling the minority businessman to advertise more effectively. He must also learn how to advertise and what to advertise. In this respect, the capital must be supplemented by marketing studies.

Another need of the minority businessman is for market and location analysis. The business must be located in a place where it can serve its market most effectively. Thus, if the

minority businessman wants to move from his present location to another location where he will find it easier to attract customers, his move should be supported by marketing and location studies.

The minority businessman also faces problems in dealing with major buyers. A number of the businessmen stated that they did not deal with major buyers because they do not offer the products they want. Those who might be able to sell to major buyers, however, report being frustrated by the bidding procedures or failing to contact the buyer. In this area it appears that minority businessmen could benefit from specific management assistance aimed at developing those skills necessary to deal with major buyers.

Minority businessmen suggest five ways to improve the programs that assist them:

1. Make more available risk capital in minority banks.
2. Non-minority businesses must take the initiative in offering help.
3. Minority businesses must expand their contacts outside the minority neighborhood.
4. Develop more technical know-how to become more competent and competitive entrepreneurs.
5. Improve the bonding mechanism so minority businesses can compete on a larger scale.

The goals of the minority businessman are no different than the goals of most entrepreneurs. He personally wants to make more money, achieve a certain percentage of his investment, and sell a quality product or service at the best competitive price. The minority businessman, however, is hampered in achieving these goals and he does recognize that he is seriously deficient in three areas: available risk capital, leverage awareness, and entrepreneurial skills. Each of these is an essential ingredient of success in the competitive activity of the market place.

I am happy to welcome you to this conference. I hope that tomorrow, during the workshops, you will begin to find solutions to these problems. This conference is a beginning; working together we can insure it will not be the end.

I hope this conference will serve as an important first step in the long process of economic development in the minority community. The immediate objective of the conference is to initiate a dialogue between minority businessmen and the other parts of the business sector. I expect you will also be discussing the formation of a state office of minority business development, and procedures for business contracting, including an analysis of agreements to channel a certain percentage of purchases to minority business.

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, as the chief sponsor of legislation which in 1971 removed the ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome, I feel that the Senate made a serious mistake last December in voting to reimpose this sanction.

A good analysis of the arguments involved in the Rhodesian chrome debate was published on the editorial page of the Dallas News on January 14. The editorial points out the inconsistency of shutting off commerce with Rhodesia while encouraging trade with the Soviet Union and Communist China.

I feel that this is a valid point, and I hope it will be carefully considered as the Senate-passed measure is considered in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Chrome and Consistency" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHROME AND CONSISTENCY

Just before it adjourned, the Senate voted to restore a ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome. The move is about as consistent as a barkeep's refusal to sell a glass of sarsaparilla five minutes after the town drunk has walked out.

Here we are in the midst of detente. The President of the United States has raised a glass with Mao Tse-tung and with Leonid Brezhnev, in token of presumable friendship and cooperation. Yet the United States refuses steadfastly to deal with the small, friendly, peaceable and pro-Western nation of Rhodesia.

Up to now we have bought Rhodesian chrome only because Virginia Sen. Harry Byrd Jr. persuaded his colleagues two years ago that we needed it for economic and defense purposes. U.S. liberals, mindful that Rhodesia has been declared a pariah by the United Nations (native Africans far outnumber the country's ruling whites), dislike any kind of contact with the former British colony.

Arguing, then, that we don't really need Rhodesian chrome, they got the Senate to restore the ban.

Byrd and other senators countered that the chrome indeed is still essential to us; that if we don't buy it from Rhodesia, we will grow dependent on Soviet chrome, no very safe thing to do.

It's possible to go even beyond this, however. We should not be boycotting Rhodesian chrome or Rhodesian anything else. Not when we are warming up to nations of manifestly hostile philosophy like China and the Soviet Union. Say what one will of Rhodesia's white rulers, they are civilized men imbued with British traditions; theirs is no prison-camp state.

Nor does it make sense to go on supporting a U.N. boycott whose only purpose is the appeasement of African nations more truly racist than Rhodesia. If we really want someone to boycott, why not Uganda President Idi Amin, who has said more than once that Hitler was dead right in killing the Jews?

ERASURE THEORY CHALLENGED

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the barrage of charges leveled against the President, one of the supposedly most damaging ones has been the assertion of the so-called electronics experts that the missing 18½-minute segment of an important White House tape was due to "deliberate erasures." The implication has been that these erasures were part of an ongoing coverup on Watergate.

Evidence has now surfaced that the experts themselves tampered with a key piece of evidence—Miss Woods' tape recorder—and did not even report their action to the judge.

I draw my colleagues' attention to a discussion of this important misuse of expertise, contained in Joseph Alsop's column of February 20, from the Washington Post. This column serves as a salutary reminder that jumping to conclusions before all the evidence is in can be a very bad mistake, as well as legally indefensible. The article follows:

THE TAPES: CHALLENGING THE EXPERTS
(By Joseph Alsop)

The gravest charges have now been convincingly made against Judge John J. Sirica's panel of experts on the Watergate tapes. They have been accused of tampering with vital evidence. They have also been accused of quite possible gross error.

If the charges stand up, the President and his staff are guiltless just where they have been found most guilty, in the matter of doctoring the tapes. This is startling enough. But what makes the charges far more startling is their source.

The source is Science. This magazine is the weekly organ of much of the American scientific community; and the editors of Science are not much more fond of President Nixon than the editors of the most anti-Nixon newspapers you can think of. Yet here is Science galloping to the President's rescue in the manner of Young Lochinvar.

The Science article, written by Nicholas Wade, concerns the ultra-famous Watergate tape with the 18½-minute gap filled only by a buzz. Judge Sirica's experts found that the gap was unquestionably made by purposeful erasure of the tape. This was said to be proven by electronic stop/start "signatures" numbering at least five, and perhaps as many as nine.

To make their study, the five experts, chaired by Richard H. Bolt, were given the Uher 5000 tape recorder used by the President's personal secretary, Miss Rose Mary Woods, plus the original of the tape with the 18½-minute gap. The whole strange plot revolves around the fact that the Uher 5000 recorder was defective, to the point of breaking down in the hands of the five experts.

When this happened, the evidence-tampering occurred—no doubt innocently yet quite unchallengeably. By their own admission, the experts "opened up the interior" of the machine, replaced a diode bridge and tightened screws and probably ground connections as well. In other words, the Uher 5000, a most material piece of evidence, was physically altered in a most material way.

It may therefore be impossible, hereafter, to test the machine's possible malfunctions before it came into the hands of the panel of experts. With a view to such tests, however, Judge Sirica has already been asked for the defective diode bridge that was replaced, plus the exact record of the other changes made in the Uher 5000 by the expert panel. No answer has yet been forthcoming. It even appears possible that no record was kept by the experts and the defective diode bridge was simply thrown away.

This is all vitally important, in turn, because of a peculiar characteristic of the Uher 5000 recorder. A voltage drop resulting from malfunction can just as easily produce the stop/start signatures found by the expert panel as can a purposeful effort to erase the tape.

Incredibly enough, by their own admission in court, the expert panel tested this question of erasure by malfunction on a Sony recorder instead of on the Uher 5000. The Sony does not have the Uher peculiar characteristic above noted. Thus the possibility of erasure of the tape by malfunction was dismissed after a phony test in a shockingly slipshod way.

To make the whole tangle stranger, none

of the foregoing might have surfaced if it had not been for a group of ex-military intelligence officers. These men have formed their own little electronic company, Dektor Counterintelligence and Security Inc., Springfield, Va.

The company makes de-bugging equipment and the like. Its head, Allan D. Bell, is a special expert on tape recorders—whereas, none of Judge Sirica's experts has ever had any known practical experience with tape recorders.

Bell read the report of the expert panel, smelled a rat and wrote another report for his own amusement, concluding that the "power supply problems" (in the Uher 5000) were an "equally feasible alternative" to the purposeful erasure explanation of the Sirica experts.

Bell's company does no government work, has no White House connections, and gets no reward for the Bell report. One evening, however, another officer of the company got "fed up with the circus on television." Hence, he called Miss Rose Mary Woods' lawyer, Charles Rhyne. Thus the Bell report's challenge to the Sirica experts later found its way into Science, which supports the challenge in its careful article.

There are still plenty of other technical complications, concerning that telephone call by Miss Woods, for instance, that supposedly had something to do with the gap in the tape. The existence of an "equally feasible explanation" does not mean that the Sirica experts' explanation is quite certainly wrong either.

Yet in this country, a man is presumed innocent until he is solidly proven guilty. The opposite rule has clearly been followed in this case, and with the President of the United States. So this is not a very pretty story.

NAVAL RESERVE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a thorough yet inclusive article, written by James D. Hessman, appeared in the February 1974 issue of Sea Power magazine.

This article is the best summation I have seen to date on the strong points, weak points, and future requirements of the Naval Reserve.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Sea Power magazine, February 1974]

NAVAL RESERVE: SOLID ACCOMPLISHMENTS,
AND LIP SERVICE, TOO
(By James D. Hessman)

"It is obvious that the Navy's mobilization requirements have increased. It is equally obvious that the strength and authorization you have requested for the Navy's Selected Reserve is inadequate. Why, then, are you requesting a reduction in force of your Selected Reserve?"

The interrogator was Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and one of that panel's staunchest supporters, through the years, of strong and dependable Reserve forces. His question was addressed to Vice Admiral Damon W. Cooper, USN,

appearing before the committee (on July 14, 1973) as Chief of the Naval Reserve Command, newly created out of the previously separate air and surface Reserve commands.

The question was a good one. The Navy's mobilization requirements have, in fact, increased, as have those of all the services. And yet the Navy had proposed, in its FY 1974 funding request, to cut (from 129,000 to 116,981) the number of Reserves in drill-pay status. And this despite the fact that, according to figures provided the committee by the Department of Defense, the Navy already lags far behind the other services in its capability to meet mobilization requirements with personnel in drill-pay status.

The Navy's answer to Senator Thurmond and to similar questions posed time and again by other members of the committee during the course of the hearings, boiled down to this: (1) part of the FY 1974 decrease, 3,910 spaces, was a bookkeeping change reflecting the fact that a number of junior enlisted personnel previously counted in the USNR non-active duty inventory were, in fact, already on or enroute to active duty—at basic training or in various technical schools—and therefore not really "mobilizable." (2) An additional 8,910 drill spaces were cut because of what was delicately referred to as "budget constraints." Translated, that meant that the Navy was reducing its on-board USNR body count in order to have enough money "to fund operation of five additional Naval Reserve ships [two destroyers and three ocean minesweepers]."

In Admiral Cooper's words, "the decision was made [within the Navy itself, Defense Department and Navy witnesses made clear] to upgrade the Naval Reserve capability through the conversion of drill pay funds into additional ships and hardware. The net results will be an increase in the number of Naval Reserve (NRF) units available to augment the active forces upon mobilization."

THE 1968 DISASTER

Unwelcome as that reply was to committee members and others who believe the Naval Reserve should be substantially increased in numbers rather than reduced, it was also undoubtedly quite realistic. For several years now, following the disastrous mobilization of 1968 which found most units called up unfit for service—and which also led to an agonizing reappraisal of the Reserve Forces concept itself—the emphasis has been on quality and on readiness. Within the Navy the change also has meant a shift in focus from individual to unit training, with top priority given the so-called "Selected Reserve," an elite and highly trained nucleus of "mission-capable, task-performing recallable units"—such as ships, air squadrons, seabee battalions, and inshore undersea warfare teams—earmarked for immediate call up and able to render immediate assistance to full-time active duty Navy forces in a mobilization emergency.

Results to date have been impressive. Personnel performance has improved dramatically. Ships, aircraft, and other hardware items have been updated and modernized. Most important of all, there has been a noticeable change in attitude within the Navy's upper echelons toward the Naval Reserve, once an unwanted and much unloved stepchild of the "regular Navy" but now a fullfledged partner (almost) in the "One Navy" team concept being vigorously pushed by Admiral Cooper—with the necessary strong backing from Navy Secretary John Warner and Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.

One witness to the increased effectiveness of the new Naval Reserve is Dr. Theodore C. Marrs, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, who told the Senate Armed Services Committee during the same hearings that in 1969 "there were 35

obsolete or non-combat serviceable destroyers which were designated as Reserve training ships. All but one of these are now gone, the designation has been changed to delete the word 'training,' and there are 36 fleet rehabilitation and modernization (FRAM-I) mission compatible destroyers in the Naval Reserve.

"Minesweepers have also been modernized through replacement," Dr. Marrs continued. "The first of the riverine craft have been added, and—on the Naval Air Reserve side of the house—there has been such a revolutionary change in quality of aircraft that it is sometimes difficult to believe they are the same force I saw following the mobilization of 1968."

A few additional examples, of the many which could be cited, of progress and improvements which have been put into effect since 1968:

Funding for all Reserve and National Guard programs has increased appreciably, both as a percentage of the total Defense Department budget and in absolute terms. The Department's "Reserve Component budget" totaled \$2.2 billion in FY 1969; in FY 1974 the total was close to \$4.4 billion, or almost exactly double the earlier figure.

All services have been doing a much better job of integrating active and Reserve forces. Some Reserve units have been deployed to the Western Pacific, others to the Mediterranean. Within the Navy: two Reserve destroyers (USS DYESS and USS STRONG) were deployed to the Med for two and a half months and operated there with units of the Sixth Fleet; 12 Pacific Coast NRF destroyers, with 1,700 Reservists embarked, cruised to the Middle Pacific for fleet command exercises; and Naval Air Reserve Patrol (VP) squadrons deployed, for six months in each of three consecutive years, to Rota, Spain, for ASW patrol and other operational assignments directed by the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe.

In addition to the FRAM destroyers and other ships of more recent vintage which have replaced the old World War II workhorses, the USNR's hardware inventory has been beefed up in other ways. Three light jet attack squadrons have shifted, or are in the process of shifting, to the modern A-7A Corsair II attack aircraft, five patrol squadrons have transitioned to the P-3 Orion, and F-4 Phantom fighters are being introduced to replace the older F-8 Crusaders.

From a rating of "almost totally unsatisfactory" five years ago, Naval Reserve ships today are considered a highly reliable backup to the active fleet and are, with few exceptions, available for early combat duty. The same is true, only more so, for Naval Air Reserve squadrons, which have on occasion outshot the "regular" squadrons in fleet competition, and which have consistently demonstrated outstanding performance in the area of safety—Reserve squadrons won the CNO Aviation Safety Award in FY 1972, and in FY 1973 were runnersup in the safety ashore category.

THREE STARS ARE BETTER THAN TWO

The most important evidence of change, however, has been the improved attitude toward the Naval Reserve within the Navy's upper echelons, particularly as reflected in the extensive and still ongoing reorganization of the Naval Reserve which has followed the merger of the previously independent air and surface Reserve components, each of which had been headed by a rear admiral. The selection of Admiral Cooper to head the new command was considered particularly felicitous. As a three-star officer he will have much more clout than his predecessors; as a USN officer he is an *ex officio* symbol of the One Navy concept; and as one of the Navy's top combat veterans—he was Commander of the Attack Carrier Striking Force off Vietnam during the last two years of the war—

he is visible proof that the command is not intended to become a final-tour billet for also-rans among the Navy's flag officers.

Admiral Cooper wears a second hat, moreover, as Director, Naval Reserve, on the GNO's staff. The title is much more than honorary. It recognizes the legitimacy of the Naval Reserve, in effect, as a "major claimant" for Navy funds and means that from now on the Chief of the Naval Reserve will be able, himself, not only to determine the Naval Reserve's manning and monetary requirements but to control the allocation of USNR funds authorized and appropriated by Congress. In the past, the Reserve had to be satisfied with the sometimes paltry scrapings left by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, which traditionally has been richer in requirements than in resources.

Under Admiral Cooper, the Selected Reserve has been evolving into what in the future will be called a "Contingency Response Force." Under present plans, many existing USNR programs and units will be merged into new units, most of which are still in the planning phase. Multiple drills on weekends at centralized drill sites, called Naval Reserve Readiness Commands, will replace the previously standard one-evening-per-week drilling routine.

Readiness Commands already have been established in Houston, San Francisco, and Baltimore. Nineteen additional are planned, most of them in major metropolitan areas around the country. The commands will be provided new and better equipment, with heavy emphasis on simulators, team training systems, and "hands on" hardware. Learning by doing, rather than by looking and/or listening, will be the watchword.

To enable the Naval Reserve to assist the active duty Navy "across the contingency spectrum, from small brush fire emergencies to the vital first step capabilities needed in reacting to major contingencies involving full or total mobilization," the new USNR structure will be divided into 11 "Forces programs": submarine; mine warfare; service; surface combatant; air; cargo handling; construction; amphibious; Marine Corps; naval inshore warfare; and special and general support. The mission of each Force program will be to develop team and individual capability within five functional areas of activity: combat operations; mobile support; base support; operational staff; and mission training.

On the apparently valid premise that most possible future confrontation scenarios put a premium on immediate response rather than the potential for protracted conflict, Force programs are being organized into four types of units:

Complete Capability Response Unit (CRU)—USNR-manned Naval Reserve ships and aircraft squadrons, capable of operating independently and of carrying out any mission normally assigned similarly organized and equipped active duty ships and squadrons.

Ship or Squadron Reinforcement Unit (SRU)—"task-performing" teams, such as a bridge watch section or damage control team, designed to augment and assist active force ships and aircraft squadrons.

Other Reinforcement Units (ORU)—similar to SRUs, but organized and trained to assist the active duty Navy other than ships or aircraft squadrons—shore-based staff and fleet support units, for example.

Individual Reinforcement Unit (IRU)—"individuals with very special skills, such as doctors, chaplains, etc.," who will supplement the active duty Navy "on a one-to-one replacement basis."

GREATEST NATIONAL SECURITY BARGAIN

The long-awaited upgrading and reorganization of the Naval Reserve is taking place none too soon. White House and Pentagon officials have said repeatedly over the past several years that, in the event the United

States does become militarily involved in future conflicts, Reserve and National Guard forces will be "the initial and primary source of augmentation of the active forces." Three relatively new factors in the national security equation have made it evident, moreover, that there is no other alternative now available to the Executive Branch in any case:

(1) The draft has been killed, and its place taken by the still-experimental All-Volunteer Force (AVF). If a fight starts there will be no time to gear up a new Selective Service system.

(2) Active duty forces have been cut precipitously. The Navy's on-board strength at the end of FY 1969 was 775,644 officers and men. At the end of FY 1974 it will be only about 550,000 or so. There will be only 253 "active major combat ships" in the inventory at the end of FY 1974, compared with 434 in FY 1968. The number of active USAF, Navy, and USMC tactical fighter and attack squadrons has similarly declined—from 210 in FY 1968 to 163 (projected) at the end of FY 1974. Even in peacetime, active duty forces are already overextended. If war comes there will be no choice but to call up the Reserves.

(3) The cost of maintaining active duty forces has soared, and likely will continue to increase. The Reserve components, only slightly less effective for most naval and military purposes, according to witness after witness in the FY 1974 manpower hearings, are much less expensive. Lieutenant General Robert C. Taber, USA, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, told Congress that Guard and Reserve forces "are potentially our greatest national security bargain. Paying, clothing and feeding a Guardsman or Reservist costs only one-sixth as much as the comparable cost for supporting his active duty counterpart."

Putting a dollar value on the Taber estimate, Dr. Marrs later told the Committee the annual personnel cost of an activated Reserve force "would be \$8.7 billion, an addition of \$6.9 billion to the present Defense budget. The present personnel costs for the Reserve Components' contribution to our national security is only 20 per cent of what the cost would be if they were on full time active duty." And Admiral Cooper himself, writing in the Fall, 1973, issue of *Naval Reservist Magazine*, said Naval Air Reserve squadrons (admittedly more "hardware intensive," and therefore somewhat more costly, than Army and USMC ground force units) "Today . . . have the capability of maintaining about 90 per cent of Fleet readiness standards at one third the cost of comparable active duty squadrons."

DEBIT SIDE OF THE LEDGER

Despite the economic benefits to be gained, the Navy has, for reasons still not explained to the complete satisfaction of Congress, remained in a distant last place in support of the Reserve. Without minimizing the admittedly encouraging progress to date, it is only accurate to report that there is still much more to be done: in attitude, in funding, and in the personnel area.

Attitude: There is lurking suspicion that, below the top leadership echelon, the active duty Navy's commitment to the Reserve program is less than total. Rear Admiral Herman Kessler, former Commandant of the Sixth Naval District, expressed concern last year, in his retirement remarks, that the active duty Navy is failing to give "adequate support" to the Naval Reserve. Senator Thurmond, who called attention to Admiral Kessler's remarks during the hearings, was more blunt, calling it "a rather serious charge" and adding—in remarks applicable, he said, to "all of the services"—that "frankly we have gotten entirely too much lip service out of the Defense Department and not enough action for the Reserves."

Captain Leslie A. Willig, USNR, then na-

tional president of the Naval Reserve Association, a 15,000-member organization which has been the most active and effective spokesman for the Naval Reserve within the civilian community, specifically charged, in May 10, 1973 testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, that "Navy planners have apparently submitted to pressures for cuts and reductions in striking a compromise between the number of drilling Reservists that ought to be provided and is fully justified by defense requirements, and the number that could be suitably supported within the anticipated resource allocation for the Naval Reserve. They even appear to have leaned in the direction of compromise toward reductions by a preconception of a number thought to be 'reasonably attainable.'"

Funds: Substantiating Captain Willig's accusation is the fact that, despite substantial USNR funding increases within the past several years, the Navy's share (\$579.8 million) of the entire FY 1974 Reserve components budget (\$4.4 billion) is only about 11 per cent of the overall total. For USNR procurement the Navy's funding request, \$6.2 million, was infinitesimal compared to the Defense Department's overall \$444.2 million allocation for Guard and Reserve procurement.

Personnel: Here, again, the Navy can be faulted, in several particulars. In their FY 1974 budget plans all services, except the Navy, requested drill pay funds for 90 per cent or more of their "mobilization requirements" (the number of personnel who would have to be called up during the first 30 days of a national emergency). The Navy requested drill pay funds for only 43 per cent of its mobilization requirements. Moreover, asked specifically if the Naval Reserve "could . . . achieve an annual average strength of 129,000 if Congress authorized that level for FY 1974 instead of the lower level requested," Navy witnesses said "No, sir." That reply appears also to have been dictated by "fiscal constraints", however, particularly considering that the Army National Guard and Army Reserve—which, it would seem, have more difficult recruiting jobs than does the Naval Reserve—both set FY 1974 recruiting retention goals (53,385 and 40,197, respectively) much higher than the USNR's more modest 24,607 total.

The fiscal year was half over before the FY 1974 Defense appropriations bill was finally signed into law, and for this reason—as well as, perhaps, the fact that the Naval Reserve was still in the throes of change—Congress acceded to the Navy's plan to cut its drill pay strength—a token 2,250 billets were added to the original 117,000 planned, however.

But now the Navy has had a full year of grace, and it is doubtful Congress will be as patient in FY 1975. Once again, Senator Thurmond made the point most clearly and most forcefully: "I think that the Congress has made up its mind now, by its actions, that they expect the Defense Department to give more action and less lip service," he told Dr. Marris during the late stages of the FY 1974 hearings.

"And if it doesn't do it," he added meaningfully, "I think the Congress is going to take further steps. . . . Because for years and years this has been going on and the time has come now, I think, where action is demanded."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 723d anniversary of the found-

ing of the Lithuanian State and the 56th anniversary of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

I want to pay tribute to the proud heritage of the Lithuanian State which, since 1940, has been a part of the "Captive Nations" bloc by the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian people, those who reside in the Republic and those who have escaped from the "Iron Umbrella," exemplify the historic truism that a government of tyranny can never enslave man's spirit.

In light of the recent events surrounding the arrest and exile of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, it is fitting that Americans and all citizens of the "Free World" be reminded of the flagrant violation of human rights that pervade the acts of the Soviet Union. It is essential—for the survival of Lithuania and the other captive states victimized by Russian aggression—to know that their plight does not go unrecognized. To abandon any peoples, or any single individual, as we did the Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, by refusing him asylum, would be criminal and indefensible. The United States, as the leading free power in the world, must reaffirm to our partners, in détente that the abrogation of individual rights will not be tolerated.

Our greatest weapon in that struggle is our economic power. Use of that power, would not jeopardize the spirit of détente. More importantly, to turn our backs on millions of people struggling for the most basic of human freedoms would render that spirit morally bankrupt.

The Lithuanian people in this country and behind the Soviet arm will not be silenced. They know that must be done, and they will haunt every individual, every government and every institution that utters reverence for the rights of mankind until their actions match their words.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the January 25 edition of the Williamsport, Pa., Sun-Gazette included an excellent editorial concerning views on Government finance expressed at the annual meeting of the Tax Foundation in New York City.

The editorial quotes opinions expressed by Dr. Paul W. McCracken, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and myself. Both of us feel that the present level of Federal spending is excessive.

I said at the Tax Foundation meeting, and I say again, that until we get Federal spending under control, we are not going to get inflation under control. And every day, inflation is robbing more and more from the pockets of the wage earners of this Nation.

I insert the editorial "Fiscal Discipline," at this point in the Extensions of Remarks:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun-Gazette, Jan. 25, 1974]

FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The Tax Foundation, Inc. held a national tax conference early in December to hear experts express opinions over the federal government's spending woes and deficit budgets.

Among those who spoke were two leaders whose observations have a special pertinency right now as taxpayers await their first \$300 billion federal budget.

One of the men is Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia. He called for a return to the "old time religion" of a balanced federal budget. He declared it is the only way to halt inflation. He remarked that a year ago Congress was fired up to set a spending ceiling but now that another January is here, the old procedures still stand, and huge spending continues unabated.

He was joined by Dr. Paul McCracken, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in lamenting the spending pace.

"What the tax system and the nation both need most now is a slower rise in public spending." He blames lack of fiscal discipline. He traced the decline in spending responsibility all the way back to 1865. That was when Congress began having separate committees to consider revenues and expenditures, he explained.

Isn't it time to put handling those respective duties together again?

PENSION BILLS DISCRIMINATE AGAINST OUR YOUNG WORKERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 26, two pension bills will come before the House, H.R. 12906 and H.R. 12855. These bills discriminate against those in the labor force between the ages of 16 and 24. They do so by stipulating under the "5- to 15-year vesting plan" that an employee who has at least 5 years of service has a nonforfeitable right to a percentage of his accrued benefit derived from employer contributions, but that service before the age of 25 need not be considered when computing the period of service. This means that those employees working from the age of 25 to 30 will receive a percentage of their accrued benefits, but those working any years prior to this age of 25 will receive no percentage.

Mr. Speaker, there are many young people who will be affected by this provision in each bill. Of the 88 million people in our labor force, 21 million are of this 16- to 24-age bracket, which constitutes approximately one-fourth of the total labor force. To simply disregard this large number of citizens based on excuses that the young do not care about pensions or that the bookwork would be costly seems just a bit extreme.

There are many people not only aware of, but disturbed about, this discrimina-

tion. Ron Hendren, for example, recently published an article in the Washington Weekly concerning this problem. His article reads as follows:

PENSION PLAN LEGISLATION DISFAVORS YOUNG WORKERS
(By Ron Hendren)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is moving at long last to provide some degree of federal control over the nation's 178,000 private pension plans, but the legislation, which is likely to become law in the next few weeks, contains provisions that permit employers to exclude workers under age 25 from participating in company-funded retirement programs.

This means that persons who enter the work force right out of high school could be employed by a firm seven years or longer without accruing any retirement benefits under their employer's pension plan.

One Senate aide who has been working on the legislation admitted to me that the age cut-off provision is arbitrary and discriminates against young workers, but argued that the economics of most private plans necessitates such a restriction in order to insure that monthly benefits paid to retired workers are sufficiently large. Even with the anticipated age restriction, he told me, monthly checks to most retired workers will rarely exceed \$100. Without the restriction, he maintained, they would be much lower, because young workers who moved from one employer to another would take rights to their benefits with them, causing an additional drain on companies' retirement fund pools.

Thus the rationale in this first federal attempt to regulate private pension plans has been to insure that the rights of every worker participating in such a plan are protected, except during the first few years of his work career.

Out of luck, however, is the young employee who works as long as seven years for a firm which provides retirement benefits, but then moves while he is still under age 25 to an employer who does not offer a pension plan. He will have accrued nothing toward his retirement except Social Security benefits.

Part of the problem (aside from the fact that neither young people nor old people have very effective lobbies in Capitol Hill) appears to be that young workers are far more interested in fighting for higher salaries than in planning effectively for their retirement years. Thus this provision got through the Senate and is about to pass the House without the benefit of testimony from a single individual or organization purporting to represent the interests or views of young workers.

The Senate version of the bill, H.R. 4200 (it ended up with a House number by virtue of a procedural quirk) passed there by a vote of 93 to 0 on September 19 of last year. The House version was reported from the Ways and Means Committee to the House floor on February 4, and assuming there are no hitches to floor action, staffers expect the bill to go to conference committees where minor differences will be worked out sometime in March.

In any event, the provision disfavoring young workers is likely to stay in the final measure, since both the Senate and House now appear to be in substantial agreement on it.

Well, Ron Hendren's pessimistic view is unwarranted in this case; the entire House is not in favor of this provision. I am writing an amendment to H.R. 12906 and will present it on Tuesday. I hope that my distinguished colleagues will join me in this stand against discrimination.

THE CUBAN QUESTION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years we have witnessed the efforts of the present administration to seek détente with the Soviet Union and to achieve a normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, our two primary nemesis of the cold war. Although the cold war has long since passed, we continue to maintain an essentially hostile attitude toward a small Western Hemisphere republic of less than 9 million people—while simultaneously striving to achieve better relations with two nations with hundreds of millions of people. Obviously, a situation such as this warrants a thorough re-examination.

I believe it can be accurately stated that Cuba no longer poses the threat which it may have presented to this Nation over a decade ago and current events and conditions far overshadow the premises upon which our Cuban policy has been based. A number of Western Hemisphere states—Peru, Mexico, Argentina, Jamaica, Canada, Barbados, and Trinidad-Tobago—already maintain diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba and I imagine a number of other Latin nations would take similar steps if the United States were to adjust its current policy.

Last week a very timely and perceptive article appeared on the "Op-Ed" page of the New York Times about the apparent interest of the Cuban Government in taking steps to restore relations between our two countries. I believe the observations made in this article warrant full and careful consideration and I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1974]

A SIGNAL, PERHAPS, FROM HAVANA

(By Ben F. Meyer)

WASHINGTON.—There is the nagging thought here that Washington may have missed a signal indicating that Fidel Castro's Government may be ready to seek an end to the United States' 13-year boycott of Cuba.

Various circumstances suggest such a sounding by Havana. Cuba's economy still is in chaos and her dependence on the Soviet Union is increasing despite Premier Castro's known desire for greater freedom of action.

The question of United States-Cuban relations arose at a news conference of Cuba's Ambassador to Mexico, Fernando L. Lopez Muñio, when he said: "We are not in a holy war with the United States. We would be willing to talk to the United States, given a single and irrevocable condition—that it end the blockade of Cuba."

To many, this appeared a strong hint that if Washington dropped its boycott, imposed when it broke relations with Havana on Jan. 3, 1961, Washington might find it possible to end the thorny problem of relations with Havana.

Some newsmen in Moscow have even thought that the Soviet Union may have suggested such a feeler by Mr. Castro. The Soviet Union has been reported urging Cuba to drop her hostility toward other Western Hemisphere governments and also not to get

caught in any more attempts at invasion or guerrilla warfare.

The reasoning here is that if the Cuban Ambassador was not putting out a feeler he could have answered the question by saying simply, "There is nothing new on that matter."

A Cuban Foreign Ministry comment, issued after Washington indicated no enthusiasm for the idea, was couched in the tart language characteristic of Foreign Minister Raúl Roa. But it did not actually rule out the idea of negotiation.

If it was a feeler, it would not be the first time that Washington has fumbled in dealing with Cuba. A notable case occurred after a hijacked United States plane landed in Havana on Oct. 29, 1972. It had hardly touched ground before Havana suggested a discussion of means to end the bothersome hijacking business.

A few days later another hijacked United States plane, carrying two rapists who had escaped from a Tennessee prison, landed in Havana, adding to its growing problem of playing host to a collection of murderers and other criminals. Apparently still lacking a real response from Washington, the Castro Government decided to force the State Department's hand.

On Nov. 15—seventeen days after its original invitation—the Cuban Government jolted the United States with a broadcast announcement, patently aimed at public opinion and the Congress in this country, that Havana was ready to negotiate "without delay." Soon afterward, an agreement was negotiated and the hijackings from the United States ended.

Recently, editors of outstanding newspapers in the United States, members of Congress and others have become increasingly vocal in urging an end of the United States boycott. They say that the trade embargo has outlived any usefulness it may have had and that the United States stand on the sanctions voted by the Organization of American States in 1962 and 1964 disturbs inter-American relations.

In addition, the United States position patently forces Havana to remain under Moscow's domination and gives the Soviet Union a splendid geographical base for military, economic, political and subversive activity in this hemisphere.

United States officials concede that Cuba has diminished her subversive activity in Latin America, but say she has not ended it altogether. They say also that the Cuban situation poses no military threat to the United States or to other hemisphere nations—a contention that most laymen find hard to believe in the light of Soviet submarine, air and ship activities in the Cuban area. It would seem highly advantageous to have relations that would permit much closer scrutiny of military and subversive activities in Cuba.

One thing bothering Washington is that Latin America is divided on the Cuban question. Only three countries, Argentina, Mexico and Peru, have relations with Havana, as do four former British colonies, Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago.

The ideal solution for Washington would be for Latin American nations to get together and make a decision. But some countries are reluctant to take the risks involved. For these, it would be much simpler for the United States to stick its neck out.

The issue might arise late this month when foreign ministers of the Americas meet with Secretary of State Kissinger to present their ideas and to hear his about the future of United States-Latin American relations. There would perhaps be much more time for discussion of Cuba at the April meeting in Atlanta of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1974

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 723d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 56th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. I share the deep pride of my constituents and all Americans of Lithuanian descent on this occasion. There is a rich heritage of courage and conviction which has been the hallmark of a people whose national pride is undaunted by a long and dark oppression.

The establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, was ruthlessly destroyed in 1940 when the Russians forcibly invaded, occupied, and annexed the Baltic States into the Soviet Empire. Despite this domination, the steadfast spirit of these brave people lives on. Daily they risk their lives to secure the common liberties that we as Americans so often take for granted.

All Americans should remain mindful of the struggle of Lithuania during this time of commemoration, and throughout the year. Each of us should carry in his heart the message borne by all Lithuanians and those of Lithuanian descent: That all mankind is entitled to political and religious freedom and the struggle to gain or maintain these freedoms is lifegiving.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in my remarks the resolution passed by the Lithuanian American Council of Linden, N.J., on the occasion of this observance of Lithuanian Independence Day:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the 56th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, we, American-Lithuanians of Linden and vicinity assembled this first day of February, 1974, at Linden to:

Commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence on February 16, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State, having more than 700 years of history, was restored;

Honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian people who have fought and died for their national independence;

Condemn the forcible occupation and illegal annexation of the independent Republic of Lithuania by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940 as a result of an agreement between Stalin and Hitler;

Express our sincere gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued non-recognition of the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union;

Alarm the free world over the violation of all human rights in the Soviet subjugated Lithuania, especially, over the mass arrests of Lithuanians that are taking place during the past months in Lithuania for religious and political reasons;

Draw the attention of the free nations to the continuous colonization of Lithuania by Russians and the Soviet efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania;

Recall the ill fate of Simas Kudirkas, who is

now for years lingering in a prison camp in the Soviet Union;

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

1. That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereignty and self-government, of which they were deprived as the result of a conspiracy between the dictator of the Soviet Union, Stalin, and the war criminal, Hitler;

2. That we request the President of the United States to make the issue of liberation of Lithuania an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States in seeking European security;

3. That we respectfully request President Nixon to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Lithuanian people and to protest the present violation of human rights and the Soviet colonial rule in the occupied Lithuania;

4. That Simas Kudirkas, who unsuccessfully sought freedom in the United States be released with his family from the Soviet Union into the free world;

Copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, United States Ambassador to the United Nations John Scall, United States Senators from New Jersey, Harrison A. Williams and Clifford P. Case, members of the United States Congress from New Jersey, Matthew J. Rinaldo, Edward J. Patten and Governor of New Jersey, Berndan T. Byrne.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL TO
THE USA, INC., LINDEN DIVISION,
VLADAS TURSA, President.
ELENA SESTOKAS,
Secretary of Resolution Committee.

SUCCESS IN TEACHING SLOW
LEARNERS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, U.S. News & World Report on February 18 carried an article which I should like to recommend to my House colleagues.

The House of Representatives will be shortly considering the revised Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have, I believe, changed the allocation formula to make it much more equitable, as well as providing the option for the local school districts to more accurately provide compensatory education to the most educationally deprived children because of an amendment which, with bipartisan support, passed the Committee on Education and Labor at my urging.

I invite my colleagues to especially note the words of Dr. John Porter, Superintendent of Michigan schools. Compensatory education is working, and I believe that the strong bipartisan bill which was reported from committee will provide the States with an improved Federal tool for achieving this goal in education.

The article follows:

SIGNS OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING SLOW
LEARNERS

There's something approaching a breakthrough in remedial education. Teaching

techniques are improving. So are the skills of "problem pupils."

Compensatory education, mired in controversy and frustration since it began in the mid-1960s, at last is showing results in helping slow learners catch up with other children in U.S. public schools.

Some educators—looking at successes claimed in several States in the last year or so—see a new era developing in this critical field after years of trial and error.

In a number of places, children in compensatory education are moving ahead as much as two years or more in a single school year. In Michigan, tests show that most children are progressing at a normal pace or better.

The Federal Government is spending about 1.7 billion dollars this year on compensatory education. Upwards of 6 million disadvantaged children are getting special attention.

Thirteen States have supplemented the federal effort with remedial programs of their own. The biggest projects are in New York, Ohio and California.

"We have come a long way, and now we're hitting pay dirt," said Dr. Richard Fairley, director of the U.S. Office of Education's Division of Compensatory Education.

There are proposals now to pour additional millions into "catch up" programs, making them available not only to poor children—mostly blacks in impoverished urban areas—but also to every boy and girl who is having learning troubles.

The idea of compensatory education is to put a great amount of extra effort into the teaching of reading, writing and basic arithmetic. In that way it is hoped to overcome such adverse factors in family life as absent fathers, distracted mothers, limited cultural backgrounds and bitter poverty.

Generally, most teachers want the children to get a normal months' gain in education for every month of supplemental instruction. If they can learn even faster, and catch up with their original classmates, so much the better.

Compensatory education has been controversial since its beginnings in the mid-60s. Some educators have attacked it as a waste of time and taxpayers' money.

Against that viewpoint, Dr. Jerome Kagan, professor of human development at Harvard, now maintains that the poor are educable. His view:

"Every year, psychologists and educators, administering intervention studies with poor children, demonstrate that sophisticated use of curriculums can facilitate intellectual ability.

"When educators say the poor are not educable, they mean that it is difficult to close the gap between poor and middle class with respect to currently accepted levels of mastery."

Especially encouraging to educators are the results of programs being tested in Michigan, where the State department of public education is headed by a black, Dr. John W. Porter.

Evaluations of the work in his State, Dr. Porter said, "indicate that indeed we can make a difference in the performance of students in the basic skills.

"We believe," he added, "that there are certain basic educational goals that can be reached by children in Michigan regardless of their color or race or their geographical location or their parents' socio-economic status.

"When we began, we believed that the black child and the disadvantaged child could learn the same basic skills the schools have been teaching other children if we adjusted our delivery system and increased our basic support."

BACKING AN IDEA

For the last three years, Michigan has been investing about 23 million dollars annually in

this belief, spending most of the money on extra teachers and teaching assistants. The program reaches about 127,000 elementary students who are from 1 to 1½ years behind their peers in either language or math skills.

The Michigan plan differs from other corrective programs in several key respects. For one thing, funds are allocated to districts not on the basis of poverty but of educational needs, as determined by Statewide testing.

Furthermore, Michigan requires "performance pacts," under which participating school districts can lose their aid money if they don't show results.

Every year, children in the program are tested to determine how much progress they have made. The test must show either one month's growth in academic ability for each month of special training or 75 per cent of a normal year's growth over the full school year.

Dr. Porter reported that almost 60 per cent of the children in the program have achieved a month's gain in comprehension for each month of instruction. Some youngsters are said to have almost doubled that progress.

In Detroit, where more than 59,000 children are enrolled in the State program, school leaders are enthusiastic about what is happening.

"Socio-economic class doesn't make the difference in learning," said Dr. Maurice E. Lax, principal of Edison Elementary School. "What makes the difference is the time the parent spends with the child and the attitude the parent has toward learning."

"We're using bright-colored books, programmed learning techniques, audiovisual tools—anything we can think of to motivate these kids."

"We look for ideas from anyone. We've had parents come in to teach. We bring in firemen and policemen to talk about their jobs. We come up with anything and anyone we can."

ELEMENTS OF FAILURE

Children enrolled in compensatory-education programs have serious learning problems. After several years of schooling, many can't read a sentence, add 2 and 2 or write their own names. A large number are found to have defective sight or hearing. Some are not getting enough to eat or wear, which also affects their classroom performance.

Results: Disadvantaged youngsters keep losing more and more ground compared with other pupils.

"Studies show that disadvantaged youngsters normally gain only 6.7 months during the 10-month school year," said Dr. Fairley at the Office of Education. "The goal of compensatory education is to provide supplementary educational services that will enable these youngsters to achieve 10 months in a 10-month school year."

"How? We encourage schools to do a needs assessment—look at the child's test scores, grades, his health, home conditions. Then the schools should develop a program around these needs."

In California, there is a new 82-million-dollar State program for "educationally disadvantaged youth." Like that in Michigan, it requires school districts to show results if they want to stay in it.

In the federal programs in California, some 54 percent of the effort is centered in kindergarten and the first three grades. Training has reached a point where students, for the first time in a decade, are scoring above the national average for reading.

San Diego's school superintendent, Dr. Thomas Goodman, said:

"In our programs we get into the community and the community gets into the schools. The school has the kids for only six hours a day. The community has them for 18. The community has to help if we are to succeed."

Manuel Ceja, director of compensatory education in California, reported current pro-

grams are reaching about 400,000 children. He estimated 600,000 other youngsters in California need extra help.

Another large program, in New York State, is spending 50 million dollars currently on remedial education. Efforts are aimed at the lowest 25 per cent of students, measured in terms of academic nonachievement and economic deprivation. According to Dr. Leo Doherty, chief of urban and economic programs:

"In the main, we are achieving our objective, which is to bring about increments in academic achievement. Not only have we arrested our students' rate of falling further behind, but over a long period of time—three to four years per student—we will close the gap for a majority of them."

CAREFUL STUDY

Special testing and close observation by teachers help to identify learning problems. Then extra teachers are called in to start special classes for students who need help.

Findings so far show that 80 per cent of some 35,000 children getting reading help in New York State have reached satisfactory performance levels.

Success stories are also emerging from other States. Robert W. Sparks, director of federal projects in Virginia, declared that "where an educationally disadvantaged child receives individual instruction or attention, the results of compensatory education are fantastic."

In neighboring West Virginia, compensatory education was called "very successful" by Robert M. Taylor, federal program specialist for that State.

Mr. Taylor reported that in one county "educationally disadvantaged students showed 2½ years of progress in one school year."

It is reports like these that are convincing authorities that compensatory education is beginning to pay dividends.

Representative Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee, is spokesman for a growing group of people who believe that compensatory education is ready for expansion.

"The poor have no monopoly on educational needs," Mr. Quie said. "I believe that we have to begin testing kids and providing the money for anybody who is educationally disadvantaged."

"If we don't help those kids, they are going to be a federal burden, a welfare burden or in manpower retraining. We are not beginning to reach all the kids who need help."

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year, nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "My Responsibility as a Citizen."

I am proud that the winning contestant from Oklahoma is Miss Denise Michelle Vickers of Enid, Okla., in my congressional district. Denise's speech is reprinted below and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

(By Miss Denise Vickers)

It's a tradition in my family to spend Christmas with my grandparents. It's a very special thing to me and the moment I recall most is when my grandfather took me on his knee and told me of a great war of his time, the war to end all wars, World War I. Twice later I was to recall that moment: Once, when my father told me of fighting in World War II, and again, when my brother told me of Vietnam. These men, in three generations, have served their country, which brings me to a conclusive fact: That there is a

RESPONSIBILITY TO CITIZENSHIP

Now this fact may not seem too astounding to you until you realize just how much of a responsibility citizenship is.

The liberties of this country, the freedoms listed in the Constitution, are worth defending. They were given to us as a rightful inheritance by our forefathers who paid for them with their honor, bravery, money, and even their lives. The things they gave us cost a great price, and it's our responsibility to defend them.

One of the biggest ways we have of protecting our freedoms is by using a system set up in this country nearly 200 years ago; that of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; in other words, voting.

I took a survey in my town before the 1972 elections. Out of over 200 people, only 17 took a firm stand in the beliefs of their party and were committed as to who they were going to vote for and why. One hundred seventy-six didn't care, and twelve weren't even registered voters. Over 85 percent listened as the world passed by. Wendell Phillips once said that "The price of liberty is vigilance," and was he ever right. People in this country had better wake up because apathy will destroy America.

The problem of apathy is a grave problem, but I'd like to discuss another one with you that concerns nationalism. Nationalism is a feeling of pride that comes from a common heritage, a common language, and a common outlook for the future. Without it no democracy can exist, and nationalism in America is dying.

Several examples of the dying of nationalism come immediately to mind, but two stand out clearly. America was degraded when at Munich, Germany, two Americans, gold and silver medalists, laughed and joked during the American National Anthem. At Oklahoma University the American flag was hauled down, while that of the Viet Cong was raised. The flag that hundreds of thousands of men had died to save lay trampled on the ground. No, America will not perish from an outside attack, but will fall, as Rome fell, from an inner gnawing; something that starts from inside and works out until the structure crumbles. We have got to take a stand before it's too late. We've only got one chance at making this democracy work, and if we fail, America will perish.

The problems of apathy, and those of nationalism, these are problems of the present. What about the future? The future of this country lies in the hands of the children, and I pray to God that they'll know what it's all about. Remember, when you were little, and you memorized the Pledge of Allegiance but didn't know what the words meant. The children of today have got to know what those words mean and others just like them: Patriotism, nationalism, and pride. And the best way is by giving the children a living example.

This brings to mind a picture of my father. He's a teacher in a Jr. High School in my town. One day, during an assembly, I watched him as the flag passed. His eyes filled with pride, his back straightened, his hand went immediately to his heart, and he stood in my eyes, not just as my father, but as an exam-

ple of one American who was proud of his country.

So you see it's up to you now, whether America, as a democracy, will stand, or will fall. It's your responsibility to protect your rights by having a say in who governs your society: To present an example of patriotism and instill pride in this generation, and generations to come. The weight rests on your shoulders. It's your responsibility to citizenship.

SIXTH GRADERS WHO LOVE FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, the Sertoma Club of East Indianapolis recently sponsored an essay contest in observance of International Freedom Week. The subject was: "What Freedom Means To Me." Over 3,000 entries were received from Indianapolis sixth graders, who gave their thought and attention to this most important subject. The Sertoma Clubs of America are committed to the ideal of "service to mankind" as we all know, and it is certainly gratifying to discover adults who are encouraging young people to think about the blessing of freedom that we enjoy here in America. And it is certainly heartwarming to know that in this day and age when we often hear cynical words expressed about our country, patriotic sentiments are still harbored in the hearts of our children. Not everyone who entered the contest could be a winner, but everyone showed a love of country and an appreciation for the privilege that is ours to call ourselves Americans—and that should be an inspiration to us all.

I was proud to be at the awards ceremony on February 14 when the first place winners from each school were honored, and the three finalists were presented bronze plaques of the Declaration of Independence. Knowing how much these awards meant to the children involved, their parents, teachers and classmates, and to Sertomans themselves. I am taking the liberty of mentioning their names and schools, and inserting the winning essay at this point in the Record:

Joyce Smith, Lowell School.
Lisa Harakas, Sunny Heights School.
Ellen Glassmeyer, Our Lady of Lourdes School.

Marie Kennedy, St. Simon School.
Phillip Wiggins, St. Rita School.
Paul Struck, Public School No. 62.
Clare Campbell, St. Lawrence School.
Jim Powner, Hawthorne School.
Felice Knarr, Holy Cross Central.
Audrey Anderson, Public School No. 111.
Cindy Wilburn, Public School No. 77.
James Rent, Public School No. 57.
Sandy Wingfield, Public School No. 82.
Shirley Butler, Grassy Creek School.
Debbie Bailey, Public School No. 37.
Becky Banta, Public School No. 53.
Debby Johnson, Brookview School.
Mike Hollandbeck, Lakeside School.
Kelli Templeton, Public School No. 89.
Lisa Case, Public School No. 94.
Janice Foor, Little Flower School.
Paul Matthers, Holy Spirit School.

Teresa Chao, Moorhead School.
John Althardt, Heather Hills School.
Lisa Young, Public School No. 68.
Kenneth Smith, Public School No. 81.
Jerry Lowe, South Grove School.
Anita Adorn, Pleasant Run School.
Diane Demaree, Central School.
Andrea Stoeffler, Eastridge School.
Beth Lasich, St. Matthew School.
Sherrl Bracken, St. Bernadette.
Rodna Marlow, Public School No. 54.
Cheryl Dale, Public School No. 112.
Stephanie Fattic, Public School No. 88.
Maria Hutson, Heather Hills School.

FREEDOM

(By Jim Powner)

All right team, our goal is freedom. Now let's get out there and win freedom. We know what the plays are, congressmen forwards, Judicial branch guards, and Legislative branch center. Now pass that love, dribble that kindness, but most of all make every shot at freedom count.

When the game is over, if we win, we will really want to hang on to our victory, to help our fans live peacefully. The team's captain is the Executive branch. After the game is over we can thank our coach, the Heavenly Father. The trophy we will be presented with will be the greatest and most treasured honor that the United States will receive. We choose to dedicate this game to the freedom fighters of America.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it was not until fiscal year 1962 that a budget, submitted by President Kennedy, passed the \$100 billion mark. Plus, it took over 170 years to reach the \$100 billion spending level. Four years ago President Nixon submitted the first \$200 billion budget and now we see the first \$300 billion budget in our history—to be more exact, the first \$304 billion budget. It has only taken 12 years to go from \$100 to \$300 billion, a 200-percent increase. The Republican Party has long spoken of the necessity of cutting excessive governmental spending. Unfortunately, the President's proposed budget does damage to those desires. Frederic Malek, Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has stated:

The President will not tolerate a recession. If it means busting the budget, then he will bust the budget to keep people from losing their jobs.

The American taxpayers learned that increased governmental spending does not solve problems, but only raises taxes and creates even greater inflation. Unfortunately, it seems the President, in the words of John Lofton's February 11 column:

Equates increased federal spending with progress when, if anything, the record shows an inverse correlation: the more of the former the less of the latter.

At this point I include in the Record the text of John Lofton's column of February 11, 1974, entitled "What Happened, Mr. Nixon?":

WHAT HAPPENED, MR. NIXON?

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Looking over the President's 51-page State of the Union Address and his \$304 billion (B) budget, one question immediately leaps to mind:

What happened to the Richard Nixon, who told us in November 1972 that the federal government was too big; too expensive; needed thinning out and had failed at problem-solving during the 1960s because it simply threw money at problems?

Where has the Richard Nixon gone who bragged to Washington Evening Star reporter Garnett Horner that his '72 campaign was "the first campaign of a candidate who didn't go out with a whole bag of goodies" to get votes?

Instead, the President spoke of government reform to nurture in the American people "a new spirit of independence" and "self-reliance."

Even though he said he knew his attitude would be "tut-tutted" by the Georgetown cocktail set, the President said he totally disagreed with the idea that the answer to problems is always some massive new government program.

"What we need now, rather than more government, is better government," he declared resolutely. "I realize that is a cliché, but rather than more is better, many times the better is not the fatter, but leaner."

But when one looks at this year's State of the Union message and federal budget, they are clearly Fat City.

The President literally exults over the amount of money his Administration has thrown at problems. He repeatedly equates increased federal funding with progress when, if anything, the record shows an inverse correlation: the more of the former, the less of the latter.

I am unable to find any real accomplishments other than those things Mr. Nixon feels are accomplishments, things like being the first President to spend X amount of dollars on Y program.

This, despite the fact that the Budget in Brief document says that the President's initiative on managing for results requires the development of specific objectives such as focusing on accomplishments and not just actions.

For example, in his State of the Union message, the President notes that since he came into office in 1969:

Consumer safety programs have received almost a four-fold increase in federal dough and federal aid to education has risen 76 per cent, from \$4.3 billion (B) to \$7.6 billion.

Civil rights activities and economic development for minorities has more than tripled; Indians are getting twice what they were and the amount being spent on community development is double that ever spent by the government in this area during the "entire history of the nation."

Support for public TV has "dramatically increased." Aid to urban public transportation is at eight times the level it was. The National Endowment for the Humanities is 10 times larger than five years ago.

And on and on ad nauseam.

The President's entire emphasis is on input—how much we have spent on various programs. He tells us absolutely nothing about output—what it is the spending of these billions has accomplished.

The outlook for the future is not any brighter than the past. The 1975 budget calls for a new system of comprehensive, national health insurance; millions for health maintenance organizations across the country; a Health Resources Planning Act; "new" and "expanded" national health service scholarship legislation; and "general expansion" of the guaranteed student loan program.

Also requested are: a Federal Energy Administration; an Energy Research and Development

opment Administration; and eventually a Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

The President has also vowed to support legislation to hike the minimum wage and thinks we should have something called the Economic Adjustment Assistant Program.

A national Institute of Education and a National Foundation for Higher Education are necessary, the President feels, as well as an Emergency School Aid Program and a Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program.

GI bill benefits should increase eight per cent; "full funding" is required for the Land and Conservation Fund; both the Better Communities Act and the Responsive Government Act should be passed; and there must be a three-stage increase in executive, legislative and judicial salaries at the rate of seven and a half per cent for each of the next three years. The President has even proposed that government money be spent to study how government money is being spent.

"Recognizing the vital role social sciences must play in America's growth," he says in his State of the Union message, "money will be made available for studying the social effects of various government income distribution and redistribution plans."

In his November 1972 interview with reporter Horner, President Nixon expressed his strong feeling that what the American people wanted is a new feeling of responsibility and self-discipline rather than a return to the mind-set of the 1960s that it was government's job to solve all the problems.

I think the President was right. It's just too bad he hasn't done what he said he would.

There are those who argue that President Nixon should not be removed from office because this would allow a subversion of the 1972 mandate by those unable to win at the ballot box.

These people should get another argument. The mandate has already been subverted and by Richard Nixon himself. It was an inside job. Not a shot was fired. That which does not exist cannot be preserved.

WIN OR LOSE—HE PERFORMS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, testimonials and tributes are not at all uncommon in this day and age. People are often feted or eulogized far in excess of their individual achievements. The ceremony surrounding these affairs often overshadows the style of the person it was designed to honor.

This however, was not the case last evening in Chicago. "Stan Mikita Night" was done in the style of the man. No excessive frills or elaborate gifts. No long speeches or shiny cars. In fact, Stan Mikita went so far to alter the evening's format that he became the donor rather than the recipient of gifts. He donated all the special night's proceeds to a trust fund that he has set up at Elmhurst College to provide scholarships for needy students. It is this spirit of selflessness that has symbolized Mikita's style both on and off the ice.

Life has never been easy for Stan. From growing up in Nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia, to skating with the "big guys" in the NHL, he has always had to give a little more to stay even—but, that

he has done, and done much better than most.

So, in a sense, last night's tribute in Chicago Stadium was not only a tribute to a man, but to his lifestyle. A style of performance that in itself personifies the greatness of the man.

He is truly an inspiration to all that have come in contact with him. Both my wife, LaVerne, and I, as well as Congressman COLLIER and his wife, Carol, are happy to have had the privilege of his friendship. We would like to thank Stan and his lovely wife, Jill, for their contributions to our community and to its style of life.

Jill Cerny Mikita is in her own right an example of dedication and determination whose former career brought her quite close to all of us. For, in those earlier days, she served as a congressional aide on the staff of my Illinois colleague, Congressman HAROLD COLLIER.

The Mikitas' have long demonstrated a pride in their city and last night, their city returned the compliment and showed how proud it was of them.

BREEZEWOOD, PA., EMERGENCY
FUEL NUMBER: 814-735-4888

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the energy squeeze is having a serious impact on our Nation's travelers. Americans, who are among the most adventuresome people in the world, are becoming increasingly hesitant to travel far from home out of the very real fear of running out of gas. Horror stories still abound about people becoming stranded in strange areas, far from home, with no gas and nowhere to turn for help.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Breezewood Tourist Association, serving an area of central Pennsylvania in my congressional district, has instituted a program to help stranded motorists find that precious commodity—gasoline. The association records a periodic telephone message describing the gasoline situation in Breezewood and the surrounding area of central Pennsylvania—telling stranded and desperate, and even just cautious, motorists where they can get gas.

Mr. Speaker, the telephone number for that recorded message may be as valuable to motorists as a spare tire or a bumper jack. Since Breezewood is located in the hub of several major arteries—the Pennsylvania Turnpike, Interstate Route 70S, and U.S. Route 30—I strongly recommend that anyone who expects to travel in this area in the foreseeable future record this important number and keep it in the car. The number is: Area code 814-735-4888.

I commend the Breezewood Tourist Association for this public service, Mr. Speaker, and I encourage other similar organizations to follow their lead and inaugurate similar programs throughout the Nation.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the February 10, 1974, Chicago Tribune magazine contains an excellent essay by Harold Blake Walker on the subject of "Freedom and Responsibility." In his comments, Dr. Walker clearly points out that there is a dangerous trend in this country; namely, that society is becoming more and more willing to exchange personal freedom for State controlled order. This situation would be unnecessary, however, if only man would learn to accept, and act, with moral, and not just legal, responsibility.

The problem today is that people are starting to expect the State to oversee morality. There is a failure to recognize that just because some act may not be against the law, that does not necessarily mean that the act is moral. Dr. Walker correctly asserts that if we are to turn to a higher, Supreme law, we will find that it is quite easy to retain one's freedom and responsibility. Otherwise, the choice may well have to be made between freedom and responsibility.

FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

(By Harold Blake Walker)

To those of us who believe in freedom, it is disturbing to notice that two-thirds or more of the world's people in the developing countries appear willing to exchange freedom for order or for order in tandem with economic growth and national prestige. The assumption seems to be that progress requires ultimate external restraint and coercion to limit the freedom of men to speak and to act as individuals.

We in the Western world have inherited faith in freedom, a firm belief that progress comes as a result of individual initiative and struggle. Traditionally we have assumed that in the providence of God, reason will triumph over unreason, sense over nonsense, and truth over falsehood. We have been willing to risk the interplay of competitive forces with a minimum of external regulation.

Now and then we have doubted our own faith, wondering if law and order could be maintained in a free society. Under stress, we have been tempted to exchange freedom for order, as if freedom might be too great a luxury to be endured in a disrupted society. At the moment, we seem to be uncertain of ourselves. Arthur Bremer, who shot Gov. George Wallace, suggested a disturbing mood when he remarked, "I would have liked it if society had protected me from myself."

In the past, society has sought to protect us from ourselves with moral sanctions, established conventions simply perceived and accepted by consensus. Essentially, the word "morality" meant "mores," meaning customs or social regulations. To be sure, even those standards of behavior accepted by consensus often were violated, but the violations were recognized as violations. The "mores" of society imposed restraints that helped to protect us from ourselves.

Morality, however, has a second meaning, one valued in Christian thought and in the thought of other great religions; namely, that morality is a matter of the spirit. Socrates called it "integrity of soul." It goes beyond customs or social regulations and involves inner integrity, respect for the rights of others, and caring concern for persons. It is only as society helps to inspire inner integrity in

persons that society is able to protect us more adequately from ourselves and to undergird social order.

The upshot of the matter can be put in the words of Edmund Burke back in the 18th Century. He wrote:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains on their own appetites. . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the internal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

Unless we are able to "put moral chains" on our own appetites in such fashion that we are protected from ourselves, and so provide protection for society, we will be more and more disposed to trade freedom for order. If we are tempted to shy away from the idea of "moral chains," let me suggest that the only such chains I mean are those that are inwardly imposed by the demands of our own integrity of mind and spirit.

The weakening of those inner moral chains that protect both ourselves and society has been coincident with the decline of religion in our time. Having forsaken both Sinai and Golgotha as symbols of the highest, we have undermined the ethical foundations on which freedom rests. If we wish both freedom and order, we will need to affirm once again: "In God We Trust."

LOS ALAMOS HIGH SCHOOL
AWARDED BELLAMY FLAG

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, Los Alamos High School in New Mexico has been awarded the National Bellamy Award, an award named after the late Francis Bellamy who first authored the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag in 1892.

The award to Los Alamos High School speaks proudly about its present achievements—not only by the faculty—but by the present student body. Therefore, I ask special permission to have the article written by the Los Alamos Monitor printed in the RECORD to show the achievements that this fine high school, with its faculty and student body, has dedicated itself to.

The article follows:

LOS ALAMOS HIGH SCHOOL AWARDED
BELLAMY FLAG

Los Alamos High School has been designated the "standard bearer" for all High Schools in New Mexico as winner of the 33rd annual Bellamy Flag Award.

The announcement of the award was made last night by LAHS Principal Robert L. Loar during commencement exercises for 390 seniors. The formal presentation of the award will be made in the high school auditorium Oct. 11, 1974.

LAHS will retain the honor for a 50-year period "in the distinguished group of outstanding and representative secondary schools throughout the nation."

Each year, the National Bellamy Award selection board selects one state in the nation and one high school in that state to receive the award. For 1974, New Mexico was chosen as the state and LAHS as the school to receive the award.

The Bellamy Flag award is a large outdoor United States Flag that has flown over the Capitol in Washington, D.C., and honors

Francis Bellamy, minister, journalist and advertising man, who authored the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America in 1892. He wrote the pledge for the National Public School Celebration of Columbus Day and commemorating the nation's quadro-centennial.

"The National Bellamy Award gives conspicuous acknowledgment to the vital role the public schools, an instrument of the American ideal, plays in helping to mold and to realize the ideals and goals of our country," Dr. Margarette S. Miller, director of the award program, said in a letter to LAHS Principal Robert L. Loar announcing the award.

This honor is not one obtained by the mere efforts of administration, faculty and students during the year of study," she said. "The school is chosen for its history of accomplishment along with its continuous accumulation of awards, honors, innovation in teaching, the accomplishments of the alumni, faculty and the present school body. It is anticipated that these accomplishments will continue and grow in the future.

"Fine schools take the concerted effort of every member of the school system and the community. The educational experiences and training gained at Los Alamos High School should produce a strong foundation for the young people to mature into responsible adult citizens", the letter said.

"Los Alamos High School was selected on the basis of ten areas of accomplishments. "Los Alamos High School will receive the coveted honor for these specific reasons:

"The Proficient Performance of Duty by the Administration: Robert L. Loar, principal, and Dr. Duane W. Smith, superintendent, are cited for leadership, inaugurating and establishing innovative techniques, and "constantly moving forward in varying levels, with methods and theory, along the path of true individualization."

"Individual and Enormous Achievements of the "Faculty-surpassing any in the history of the National Bellamy Award—who "exhibit outstanding technical competence, a great desire to be of service and hold the highest level of professionalism." This calibre staff in a highly intellectual environment enables Los Alamos to be termed the "nation's best educated" city by the U.S. Census.

"Absolute and Definite Concern for National and International Standards—"a parochial local view of the responsibility of education is totally inadequate and would threaten school system with the error of trying to do well that which is not worth doing at all."

Encouragement in Furthering Student and Idea Exchange—through athletics, the arts; programs of study "in order to foster students' awareness of people . . ."; the acceptance of "speakers on timely topics, including representatives of political, ethnic, and religious groups"; controversial subjects and individuals are not outlawed.

A Student Body Excelling Academically—more than two dozen students honored by National Merit this year alone; National French Council achievements with 5 national and 11 regional winners; the National Science Foundation; lauded by the Commission on Presidential Scholars, and the National Council of Teachers of English. NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English) ". . . have never known a school which so supported a national institute."

An Accomplished Alumni—on national and international levels exhibiting excellence in the fields of creative arts, education, science, medicine and engineering.

A Responsive Community Eager for Constant Improvement in the Schools—that any superior educational system may still be surpassed. The business community works closely with the school through the Alternatives Program lending added experiences in medicine, criminology, silversmithing and forestry, among other specialized interests.

Free Thought and Honest in Publications—La Loma 1972 Yearbook—creative and thought-provoking: the right and wrong of the nation in its introductory pages:

We die in Vietnam and walk on the moon.
We pave the desert and high plateau and fly through sky faster than the sun.

We take the power of atoms to make a bomb, and to probe the darkness of disease.

We find a mountain paradise and build our city there.

We are alone and we are together.

The School Philosophy—in part—which recognizes "that because of the insular nature of Los Alamos, our students need additional association with people of diverse racial and socioeconomic backgrounds . . ." A Student Attitude Survey, prepared by Associated Public Schools Systems (Teachers College, Columbia), dealing partially with Peer Group Relations, brought to light "there were no distinct ethnic groups in the minds of Los Alamos students."

A Cooperative, Supportive Local Press—interested in carrying school activities and accomplishments; in promoting the plus side of education.

LET US END CONTROLS
COMPLETELY

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, there has been great controversy about wage and price controls, but the following article by the former head of the Price Control Commission neatly summarizes the fallacies and dangers of continuing such controls.

The article follows:

LET'S END CONTROLS—COMPLETELY

(By C. Jackson Grayson, Jr.)

The wage-price control or decontrol debate has shifted from whether we are going to decontrol to (A) how far, (B) when, and (C) how?

A consensus prediction seems to be that (1) gradual decontrol will continue, (2) that some sectors, probably energy, construction, and health will continue under long term controls, (3) that the Stabilization Act will be extended, and (4) that a wage-price control "stand-by" mechanism will be created.

I find a growing attitude of almost "inevitability" that this is the course that we will (or should) follow among Congressmen, businessmen, labor leaders, the press and members of the administration.

I challenge the necessity, wisdom, or inevitability of any or all of these. Before it is too late, I urge instead: (1) end all controls totally by April 30, (2) let the Stabilization Act expire, and (3) do not establish the proposed "stand-by" control mechanism.

Total decontrol sounds frightening to some, particularly politicians fearing voter reaction. "How can I vote for decontrol?" complained one decontrol-minded Congressman. "A vote for decontrol sounds like a vote for inflation."

It is true that if all sectors were decontrolled, there would be some wage and price increase. Some might be large and rapid as the market moved to adjustments level necessary to ration resources and attract capital and labor.

But the economy-wide increases on total release will not be nearly as large as some fear. Much of the economy has already been released, and forecasts are for a slackening economy.

Who will be sending prices and wages upward? The market. Purchasers (industrial and consumers) will be signalling "more"

or "less" of a wage, good, or service. The market, not the controllers, will be allocating resources to society's most efficient uses.

NOT PERFECT, BUT ...

Those who argue that this market mechanism is imperfect because of market power by business or labor or structural defects, should work to correct such faults rather than continue reliance on a mechanism that is far more dangerous to the market mechanism than such alleged imperfections. This line of argument will tend to keep us in controls forever as a countervailing power to alleged blocks to competition.

Arguments will surely be made, in rebuttal, that price increases will hurt the poor more than the rich. By definition, this is true. The poor have less money. Any price increases hurt them more, controls or not.

But if society wishes to increase economic opportunity for those with lower income (as I think we should), this is best done by means other than controls. In fact, continued controls, in many ways, hurt the poor. They tend to drive low markup items from the shelves, provide those with higher incomes and better education opportunities to get around the system. And they increased unemployment for marginal workers whose productivity is not as great.

Other arguments against total decontrol will be raised. "Now is not the time. Wait a little longer."

In late 1972 it was the fear of large wage settlements in 1973 that postponed decontrol. These did not materialize despite a more flexible Phase 3 and rapidly escalating prices. Shortages (fuel, steel, fiber, paper, etc.) are now being advanced as a reason for continued controls: "Price increases will not increase capacity in the short run and will merely result in higher profits."

Continued controls are not going to help the shortage problem. If anything, they will prolong shortages because of the lack of increased incentive (profits) to invest and expand quickly. Management, labor, and capital will delay action or even flow elsewhere. The result could then reach a point where arguments would be made that the federal government must invest to expand capacity through direct investment (to wit, the proposed federal oil and gas corporation).

While some people would agree with the philosophy of total decontrol, they would stop short of energy decontrol. For the same reasons as given above, I would not.

Yes, prices will increase. (They are going to increase anyway, with controls.) Yes, prices would increase more rapidly with decontrol. But the solution to the shortages would also be faster as price served its function of rationing and as incentives were increased for supply of more energy sources. Again, help for people with lower incomes should be done with mechanisms other than continued wage/price controls.

Similar arguments can be made for also removing controls from other sectors popularly nominated for long term controls—construction, health, food.

Finally, continued selective decontrol, while appealing to those who believe they know how to manipulate the allocation system, is dangerous. It increases the distortions among industries and services of different sizes; but more importantly, it increases the distortion of the flow of capital and labor due to unforeseen effects of substitution, interdependencies, false price signals, and administrative lags among controlled and non-controlled sectors. It was for these reasons that we shied away from industry-by-industry controls altogether in the Price Commission.

Our economic understanding and models are simply not powerful enough to handle such a large and complex economic system better than the marketplace. Partial decontrol (for its converse, partial control), tends to build a false belief in the minds of the public that controllers really "can" manip-

ulate the system more efficiently, and will increase the cry for selective "recontrol" later on. After all, they knew how to selectively decontrol, didn't they?

I also don't believe that the Stabilization Act should be continued past April 30, even if decontrol were complete prior to that date.

If the act sat on the books, there would be tremendous pressure and temptation to reimpose controls in the near future. Even in a stable economy, some prices rise dramatically, some stay stable, some decline. But the headlines go to the increases, and political pressure will be heavy to reimpose controls over this or that sector.

If Congressmen think they will have immediate political problems now from decontrol they should think what they are letting themselves in for over the next year or two as prices fluctuate and successive delegations descend on them. They and the Executive Branch will be continually besieged to put controls back on across the entire economy, or selectively on visible wage settlements and price increases.

I recommend that the act expire now. Then, if the nation wishes to re-embark on the controls road again, the decision would be subject to full public debate, and not decided by administrative decision in the Executive Branch.

PRESSURES AND POLITICS

Finally, I recommend strongly against establishment of the proposed stand-by wage/price agency. If such an agency were created, whether responsible to the Executive or Legislative Branch, it would be subject to continual pressure to reimpose controls, totally or selectively. The monitors would find it almost impossible not to take "action" (direct controls or jawboning) even when price increases represented pure demand shifts. Prices would be determined as much by politics as economics.

Secondly, the "responsibility" for control of inflation would be thought to rest in the hands of this agency instead of at the more fundamental levels of fiscal and monetary policy, increased productivity, structural reform to increase competition, and widespread acceptance of individual responsibility to help control inflation.

Third, such an agency would undoubtedly be staffed by able people, anxious to do a job. The temptation of such a combat-ready group to "fine-tune" the wage/price mechanism would well nigh be irresistible. Parkinson's Law would surely operate. Many bright economists would like nothing better than to get their hands on the throttle of the economy to install their honest beliefs about "necessary" government intervention in the market.

Fourth, its proposed main activity of "jawboning" is not innocuous. To most people, that term means public spirited appeals for restraint and cooperation on wages and prices. But, if past history is any judge, jawboning will also include threats to pass punitive legislation, to unleash a Justice or FTC investigation, to sell stockpiles to depress markets, to issue or leak derogatory stories to the press, and to issue or deny government contracts. At the personal level, jawboning can include subtle offers or denials of government appointments, or even threats to audit personal tax returns. All have been used. In my opinion, these are all abuses of power and contrary to the American sense of fair play and civil liberties.

Finally, the mere existence of such an agency would encourage price increases and discourage price decreases.

An unfortunate lesson learned from the various phases is that you'd better get wage/price increases while you can. Time and again, the "good guys" got hurt by exercising restraint. Many businessmen have told me that they will not reduce prices for fear that a new freeze, a new rule, or a new recontrol will catch them with their prices down. If such an agency were sitting there, symboli-

cally hovering over the marketplace with a sniper's rifle, I think we would not see many price decreases, and would see instantaneous price increases. We would be institutionalizing inflation.

NEW SCENARIO IS POSSIBLE

Many of these points have been made before. Yet I am alarmed at the feeling of inevitability of the events of the next few months—partial decontrol, extension of the act, and creation of a stand-by mechanism. Businessmen seem resigned to this fact as a way of getting at least partially out. Administration officials apparently believe that this is the course to be followed to get congressional agreement. Many Congressmen believe that they can't completely decontrol because of public backlash.

The scenario does not have to come out that way. We can decontrol, with better long-range consequences for everyone, including the poor.

Why do I, who ran a price control program, argue as strongly as I do? I know price controls intimately and how people work in them. I know the distorting effects and political pressures. Controls do have some value, but for a limited time period and under special circumstances. After that, they should be abandoned.

More importantly, I know from first hand experience that allocations by the marketplace are far superior to any centrally directed system, and are most consistent with personal freedom.

It's easy to get into controls, but as we are now witnessing, hard to get out. It is time to act with courage. Let's get out, and let's get out completely.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 56th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia, and I would like to call to our attention the plight of this Baltic nation.

Despite its 1918 declaration of independence from Russia, the republic was occupied by the Soviets in 1940, and today remains under Communist control.

After proclaiming their independence, the Estonians were forced to defend themselves for 2 years from attacking Russian armies attempting to conquer the country. In 1920, they repulsed the Soviet armies, and ended their war of independence with the signing of a favorable peace treaty. They then drew up a constitution, and in the 20 short years of freedom that they enjoyed, the Estonians achieved a remarkable level of scientific, industrial, educational and cultural advancement.

In the years of Communist domination since 1940, the Estonians have received little reward from their oppressors. The Soviets have attempted to scatter the Estonian people by a massive program of settlement of Russians in Estonia and dispersal of native Estonians to the Soviet Union.

Today, however, the Estonians' desire for freedom is unabated, and their spirit for independence is unbroken, despite the aggression they have suffered in defense of their right to their own land.

As a leader of liberty in the free world, the United States must support the

Estonians in their struggle for lasting independence. Our country has never recognized the legality of the occupation and incorporation of Estonia by Russia, and because the Soviet regime in the Republic lacks legal basis we must regard it as only a temporary military occupation.

On this occasion of the anniversary of the Estonian declaration of independence, we must pray that justice will prevail and allow the freedom so long sought by the people of that nation to be theirs.

HOPEFUL OUTLOOK FOR U.S. ENERGY SITUATION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Oscar Kiessling, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article by Mr. Kiessling into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1974]

HOPEFUL OUTLOOK FOR U.S. ENERGY SITUATION

(By Oscar Kiessling*)

Large increases in prices of gasoline, heating oil and utility services have made most citizens aware of significant developments taking place in the energy market. Anxious inquiries are being made as to how all this came about and whether the energy shortage is temporary or permanent. Fortunately, information available from engineers, geologists and other scientists provides a basis for appraising both the present situation and the future.

Much of our prosperity and high standard of living has been due to the application of ever increasing doses of energy in virtually all facets of the economy—at factories, farms, on the highways and in homes.

This has been going on for decades. A recent study of the Interior Department reported that gross energy consumption more than doubled from 33 quadrillion British thermal units in 1947 to 69 quadrillion in 1971, a 3.1 per cent annual growth rate over the period. The annual growth rate in recent years—4.8 per cent for 1965-70—has been higher than the long-term average.

In terms of quantity, total energy use increased by 23 per cent from 1951 to 1961, and by 51 per cent from 1961 to 1971. Despite the imposing figures on present use, the country has remained largely self-sufficient with only moderate imports, almost entirely of oil.

Total energy is a mixed bag filled from several sources. In 1971, petroleum contributed 41 per cent of the total, natural gas 37 per cent, bituminous coal 17 per cent, hydropower 4 per cent and nuclear power less than 1 per cent.

There have been substantial changes in the relative position of the three major supplying sources over the past 20 years. In 1951, coal accounted for 33 per cent of the total, petroleum for 38 per cent and natural gas for 32 per cent. In terms of quantity, petroleum increased by 101 per cent from 1951 to 1971, natural gas increased by 214 per cent and coal remained about stationary.

Imports of energy materials have not been a major factor in the domestic energy scene. Such imports have consisted mainly of petro-

leum and have been moderate, ranging from 12 per cent of domestic crude oil consumption in 1967 to 15 per cent in 1971. The bulk of the crude oil imports have come consistently from Canada and Venezuela, and these countries supplied 39 per cent and 12 per cent of imports, respectively, in 1972. In the same year, seven Middle East countries supplied an aggregate 28 per cent of the imports. Thus, the position of Middle East countries as suppliers in the U.S. crude petroleum market has not been dominant, and it has been relatively small with regard to total energy consumption.

Until recently, foreign oil has been very much cheaper than domestic oil and imports doubtless would have been larger if they had not been restrained by a U.S. import quota. This import quota was terminated April 18. During 1973, however, the quoted price for Middle East oil increased from \$2.59 a barrel to \$11.65. As the latter price is more than twice that for most domestic oil, there is less financial incentive for importation.

Numerous forecasts of even greater needs in the period ahead add a special dimension to the energy problem. This comes down to the question of whether, with expected increased use, our supplies will be adequate for reasonable self-sufficiency to avoid being victimized by the capricious whims of foreign suppliers. The outlook for achieving this goal is not as bleak as often painted; while the situation does not look rosy for the immediate future, supplies should be adequate after a few years needed to get properly organized.

With regard to petroleum, completion of the Alaska pipeline and access to the huge reserves of the arctic North Slope are already within range. But this is not all. The U.S. Geological Survey reports that the Atlantic continental shelf from Cape Hatteras to Canada—no more than 100 miles offshore, much of it only 30 to 50 miles offshore—contains an estimated 46 billion barrels of oil along with 228 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The same agency estimates that all our continental shelves—the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific and Gulf of Alaska—contain at least 180 billion barrels of oil and 900 trillion cubic feet of gas.

Reserves of such magnitude are not peanuts even in the light of recent annual domestic oil output around 3.5 billion barrels. Geological estimates of reserves, moreover, have consistently understated by a wide margin the potential of producing areas. There are legal and ecological problems in developing these vast resources, but it is unreasonable to believe they will not be solved if there is sufficient urgency.

The thick seams of good grade coal at relatively shallow depths that underlie vast areas of the U.S. constitute one of the world's greatest energy bonanzas. It will be recalled that the Germans fought a first-class mechanized war with very little natural oil. They did it by synthesizing their low-grade coal into crude petroleum from which they derived motor fuel and strategic basic chemicals.

What the Germans did 30 years ago we can now do better and much cheaper. The Interior Department Office of Coal Research has contracts with 60 organizations running pilot plants and conducting research in coal gasification and liquefaction.

Large areas of Montana, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, and some other western states have huge coal deposits that have been little utilized because of high transportation costs to major consuming centers. The coal can now be mined and converted at the site into pipeline-quality gas or synthetic crude oil and shipped to distant markets in pipelines that already cross these areas. This would require large amounts of capital and creation of virtually a new industry. But it is unlikely that the capital cost would equal the cost of converting millions of home heating plants and of making electric buggies out of our 100 million passenger cars and 20 million trucks, even if we could do it.

In addition to the increased use of coal directly in power generation and as a chemical raw material, a significant increase in nuclear power is under way. These projects require substantial lead time and it is not yet clear what their ultimate contribution will be.

Not much increase can be expected from hydropower since the most economic sites have been largely developed, but hydropower is important, and saves fossil fuels, particularly in areas such as the Public Northwest and the Tennessee Valley.

Oil shale, of which there are large deposits in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming (processing yield estimated at 30 gallons of oil per ton of rock) also ultimately may contribute supplemental supplies. The government leasing program for these deposits has just gotten under way with some takers.

The nation's potential energy resources are so imposing that the present shortage, if there really is one, should be of only moderate duration. Prompt and proper action by industry and government can assure adequate domestic supplies for many years to come. The recent escalation in prices has been triggered mainly by short-term panic psychological influences without regard to our strong long-term supply position.

"WASHIES" CELEBRATE CENTURY OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY, PEOPLE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the 100th anniversary of Washington Fire Co. No. 1 of Conshohocken, Pa.

In these times when the selflessness of our citizens is being put to the test, I believe the example set by Washington Fire Co. No. 1—"Washies," as they are known to the people they serve—and the thousands of other volunteer fire companies throughout the country should serve as reminders of the innate helpfulness of Americans.

Steeped in historical tradition, the volunteer fire companies of this Nation have performed heroic and valuable services through the decades. There is something so honest and so American about a volunteer fire company. The firemen and the women who stand behind them, in a very real sense, typify the best traits of our communities.

The record of the "Washies" during a history-crammed century is proud and admirable. In serving one of the oldest boroughs in Montgomery County, Pa., the "Washies" exemplify the finest in our community life in terms of protecting lives and properties of their neighbors.

The officers of the "Washies" are: Henry Hilliard, president; Theodore Schylack, vice president; Samuel Januzelli, recording secretary; William Hand, financial secretary; John Ostapowicz, treasurer; Ellwood Heller, fire chief; Benjamin Eyerly and Robert Nolan, assistant fire chiefs; and Edward Campbell, fire marshal.

I offer my warmest congratulations to the officers and men of the "Washies" and to their ladies auxiliary on this momentous occasion.

*Dr. Kiessling has served as editor of the Minerals Yearbook, director of the decennial Census of Minerals and special industrial adviser to the U.S. Tariff Commission.

**EFFECT OF EMERGENCY ACT ON
LOCAL AIR POLLUTION PRO-
GRAMS**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Energy Act, among other things, would allow the Federal Government to suspend local air pollution control regulations, in order to permit the use of polluting fuels—such as coal—until 1979.

This measure would, in effect, usurp the States' authority to provide for the health and welfare of its citizens and shift decisionmaking responsibility from State and county officials to Washing-

ton. Because of this preemption, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, on the motion of Supervisor James Hayes, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the provision authorizing Federal, rather than local, control over air pollution standards. In addition, the California Air Resources Board opposes this action.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and a letter from Mr. Charles J. Conrad, the chairman of the California Air Resources Board:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Each Member, California Delegation to Congress

On motion of Supervisor Hayes, seconded by Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, both Houses of Congress now are engaged in floor debate on "The Energy Bill," U.S. Senate Bill 2589, and the bill appears close to passage; and

Whereas, Section 201 of this bill pre-empts the authority of the Air Pollution Control District to enforce its rules prohibiting the use of high sulfur fuel oil and allows the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to assume complete jurisdiction in this field; and

Whereas, under this bill the Federal Administrator is made the sole arbiter of the questions of whether there is a supply of low sulfur fuel adequate to meet needs, and whether there will be "an imminent and substantial endangerment to the health of persons," and

Whereas, this destroys the authority of the Air Pollution Control District Hearing Board to grant or deny variances and to impose conditions upon them; and

Whereas, critical hearings are presently going on or pending concerning variances for the power plants in Los Angeles County to burn high sulfur fuel, and these hearings would be made meaningless; and

Whereas, under the powers granted in U.S. Senate Bill 2589 the use of air-contaminating coal could be authorized in the Los Angeles Basin by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

Whereas, those sections of the Clean Air Act providing for challenge and judicial review of the actions of the Administrator will be suspended; and

Whereas, the enactment of Section 201 of U.S. Senate Bill 2589 adding Section 119 to the Clean Air Act is an intolerable invasion of home rule and of the police power of the

State to protect the health and well-being of its citizens and will strike that power from the hands of local elected authorities who are close to the people, and place it in the control of a distant federal bureaucracy unequipped to deal with the problems of Los Angeles County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Board of Supervisors, which is the Air Pollution Control Board of Los Angeles County, goes on record as being most strongly opposed to the enactment of Section 201 of U.S. Senate Bill 2589, and urges the California Delegation to the Congress to unite in opposing the enactment of legislation so contrary to the interests and well-being of the residents of this area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the California Congressional Delegation, to the Governor and to the Air Resources Board, and that our legislative advocates in Washington be directed to work actively against the enactment of this measure.

AIR RESOURCES BOARD,

Sacramento, Calif., February 15, 1974.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: The Energy Emergency Act (S. 2589) contains substantial and important revisions of the Clean Air Act. Among these the Suspension Authority (Sec. 201) is of grave concern to the California Air Resources Board and the local air pollution control districts which are responsible for the administration of air pollution control regulations applied to nonvehicular sources.

Section 201 would empower the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with his concepts of energy needs, to suspend any local authority over the regulation of the quality or type of fuel used in any control district, and would transfer jurisdiction in these matters to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Such preemption by the federal government of the powers and obligation of the States is a bold assumption of state powers by the national government and is both unwarranted and unneeded. Under the laws of California and the regulations of the air pollution control districts in this state, ample authority and ability exist for the state and local government to make adjustments necessary during the energy emergency, subject to the same conditions of need and safeguards of the public health that the Act would apply to the Administrator.

The Air Resources Board, therefore, opposes the enactment of Section 201 of S. 2589, and respectfully urges the California representatives in the Congress and the Senate to do likewise.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. CONRAD, Chairman.

**NO PLACE TO HIDE—FROM
INFLATION**

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile, somebody tells it straight with regard to Federal controls on the economy. The Farm Journal in a recent editorial zeroed in on most of what has gone wrong with our economy and the resulting shortages in resources and commodities. I would like to enter that editorial

from the February issue in the hope that it gets the message across to some of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

NO PLACE TO HIDE—FROM INFLATION

Every time you go to buy something these days, you feel like the roof is falling in. But it isn't the roof. It's all those carefully constructed price ceilings:

Regular gasoline up 7¢ a gallon since August;

Fertilizer up 37% since decontrol Oct. 25; Fuel oil up 4¢ a gallon the first week of January;

And repeated warnings that the price of everything made from or with oil (which is practically everything) is going to jump in the months ahead.

In a now-familiar chorus, we all ask: "Why doesn't the government stop it?"

The truth is the government can't stop inflation with controls—any more than it could stop those food price increases last summer. If it tries, you'll quickly see much worse fertilizer shortages (see page 24).

And we make a mistake if we blame it all on the Arabs. Most fertilizer companies quit building new plants three or four years before the Arabs started their boycott—for the simple reason that nobody was making money on fertilizer. When good farm prices did return, fertilizer prices were frozen. Nobody was going to start new plants with price controls on.

You may be tempted to ask for export controls. That might bring temporary price relief, but it would guarantee bigger supply and price problems later.

No, we've ducked and dodged fiscal responsibility as long as we can, for that is the main cause of inflation. Now we face what will likely be the most severe inflation this country has seen. The price controllers are working desperately to remove controls entirely—not because they have inflation whipped, but because they know controls won't work from here on.

This inflation has been 20 years in the building, so it won't be easy to stop. We started it in the early 1950s when we kept so many soldiers overseas, allowing them to spend unlimited American dollars for Mercedes cars and Nikon cameras. We spent more borrowed billions in the 1960s to fight a war we weren't willing to pay for with taxes.

By 1971, we had so many dollars overseas that our foreign customers no longer trusted their value. When President Nixon finally devalued the dollar, we all heaved a sigh of relief that we had found such a painless answer.

But those devalued dollars have come back to haunt us. It's not just that we're paying as much as 20% to 30% more for the cars, the cameras and tape recorders we import. We're having to bid against those expensive German marks for the phosphates from our own mines in Florida; against Japanese yen for the lumber from our own forests in Oregon.

And don't think the results would have been different with a different Administration. Inflation is just time payments on all those years of deficit spending.

Inflation may slow down after a year or so, once business gains enough confidence to expand and catch up with demand. That is unless we continue to blow more than we've got on still more programs. But with more people chasing fewer raw materials, we may as well prepare to live permanently with a higher rate of inflation. Here are some things you can do:

Wage rates may keep going up, but not so fast as the price of raw materials. So gradually, you'll find it worth your time to recycle and reuse—once more we'll haul manure and pull nails out of scrap lumber.

Keep the pressure on your congressman to hold down government spending—even if it

means giving up one of our favorite programs. If the public goes on demanding more government-guaranteed housing, health and incomes regardless of cost, we must expect inflation rates that could go to 15% or 25% a year.

See that you stay abreast of inflation with the return on your own investments. A return of even 6% or 7% is no longer fair—not when the country suffered a 5.8% inflation in 1973 alone. You need at least 9% or 10% to realize an honest 3% or 4% return.

The public may scream about "excess profits," but until we all realize that "high" prices, including "high" interest rates and "high" dividends, are simply time payments on previous government expenditures, we'll go right on having more of the same.

GREAT ORATORY

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the February 10, 1974, Chicago Tribune contains excerpts from an excellent speech by the Honorable Julius Hoffman, senior judge of the U.S. District Court in Chicago. Judge Hoffman takes note of the decline of great oratory in this country. This is partially true because, in this day and age, it seems that a speech has to be "with it" and use popular catch words and phrases. The answer, says Judge Hoffman, is for our speechmakers to stop being so condescending toward their audiences and, instead, give them due credit for their native intelligence.

Since all of us here often have to give speeches, I would highly recommend that my colleagues pay particular attention to Judge Hoffman's remarks. I have always believed that the best speeches are made with the simplest words, and Judge Hoffman's comments once again prove the validity of that claim:

FROM THE MOUTHS OF NEARLY EVERYBODY:
GABBLE

(By Julius J. Hoffman)

The author is senior judge of the United States District Court in Chicago. This article is excerpted from a recent address to the young lawyers section of the Chicago Bar Association.

Thomas Mann wrote in "The Magic Mountain": "Speech is civilization itself. The word, even the most contradictory word, preserves contact—it is silent which isolates."

But civilization is a variable. It differs from place to place, from time to time, and one who listens critically to American speech . . . might think that our civilization has been overrated.

In this country, great oratory is now so rare that anyone who admires it may be considered either a reactionary or a creature who has gone so far around the circle that he belongs to a new avant-garde. Nevertheless, there is something to be said for a return to the old standard of elocution on which our statesmen once operated.

Oratory, of course, is a ticklish word which, like politician, more often has an overtone of derision than of respect. But great oratory is not bombast any more than a successful politician is necessary a shady character.

It is speech by a man who has some thing to say and says it forcefully, with

exactness, clarity, and grace. It is neither a medley of sweet sounds nor a composition that cannot be fully comprehended until it is analyzed in a graduate seminar.

Great oratory combines grandeur or nobility of thought with grandeur or nobility of expression. The thought is paramount, of course, but stirring thoughts are robbed of their power when clothed in weak words and trite phrases. This is easily demonstrated by rewriting any piece of fine prose in pedestrian language.

See what happens when we paraphrase Churchill's "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Would he have stirred the British people, if he had said, "I can't promise you folks anything except that you're going to have to fight, work, cry, and perspire?"

To be sure, few men have Churchill's gift of words; but any statesman or other leader should speak at least as eloquently as a man who broadcasts a weather report.

Campaign speeches are only a small part of our annual output of oratory, pseudo-oratory, and plain gabble. Lawyers and judges along talk so much that libraries are obliged to build additions to hold the printed records of their words.

If the churches should undertake to place all the sermons delivered in the United States one on top of the other the pile would soon reach the pearly gates. And then there are all of those speeches that are injected into that continued story called the Congressional Record.

It is unlikely that the most careful search of all these works would reveal many speeches that would do credit to Henry Clay or Patrick Henry. Today, instead of their lucid English, many speakers talk some professional jargon or outrageous combinations of jargons interspersed with popular catch-words and ready-made expressions.

These labor-saving devices that relieve a speaker of the chore of ferreting out just the right words and putting them together with precision. They also enable the speaker to demonstrate his familiarity with high-style speech; but in their inexactness and ostentation the clichés and reuse of phrases are not very different from the old Fourth of July speaker's resounding but hollow words.

Altho it may be possible to extricate some good ideas from a mixture of clichés, these tried but not necessarily true expressions often signify a shortage of ideas.

The products of hard thinking are often buried in muddy language. Second-hand ideas and phrases are often substituted for seasoned thought and are subject to sharp depreciation.

An unknown Irish wit is supposed to have said, "The human brain is a wonderful thing. It starts working the moment you are born and never stops until you stand up to speak in public." Perhaps that is why some impromptu speeches proceed from the vocal cords alone.

On the other hand, the man who really knows his subject can often make an excellent speech on the spur of the moment because, actually, it is not *ex tempore* at all but simply the release of thoughts which he has been formulating for a long time.

Of late, we have had too much talking off the top of the head and too little from the bottom of the heart.

There is a place for blue jeans and the vernacular but that place is seldom a rostrum. There can be pleasure in the shallow light-hearted speech, but it isn't oratory.

One of the curious phenomena of our times is that we send more and more students to college and talk to them more and more as if they were still in the third grade. This has not been the practice of our really great orators. They did not assume that the man who

wanted to speak up to the people had to talk down to them.

This notion which seems to be prevalent today, may have sprung from an unflattering estimate of the intelligence of the average audience and a peculiar feeling that the use of fine language is a form of snobbery. Colloquialism seems to be equated with democracy and used, like a too-familiar slap on the back, to convey the idea that a speaker and his listeners are buddies.

There are other possibilities, of course. It may be that speakers do not choose to be colloquial and commonplace but that they have no choice since they never learned to be anything else.

Our schools, in other words, have not done enough to help future speakers acquire the broad background, the literary appreciation, the habits of mind, and the verbal skill that went into many speeches in the past.

It cannot be said that no memorable speeches have been made in recent years. The trouble is that there have been too few and that the national average has dropped too low. Surely it is time for a revival of an old art.

There is no reason to believe that Americans today are inferior to their ancestors and unable to produce speakers worthy of being called orators.

Given enough good speeches we might develop a national taste for them.

There is nothing wrong with either the hope that the public will again begin to expect good oratory or faith in the innate ability of Americans to cultivate it, but copious charity might reduce the incentive.

We have a right to expect good sense and comparative eloquence on the part of speakers from the elementary school valedictorian to the headliner at a university commencement. We have a right to expect great words from men who occupy places of great importance.

RIISING COST OF FOOD PRODUCTION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, much is said in the news today about the increasing prices for farm products, however little emphasis is placed upon the rising costs of food production. As we all know, land, fertilizer equipment, livestock, seed, feed and fuel are essential for food and production. Farmers are currently facing spiraling costs in all of these areas.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently issued a report on the farm estate market. This report stated that in 1973, the index of farm real estate values shot up 21 percent, the highest yearly increase since 1920. It also pointed out that since 1967, farmland values have increased approximately 70 percent.

The demand for farm and ranch land remains strong as farmers respond to the Nation's and world's demand for expanded acreage planted to food crops and raising livestock. This strong demand is expected to push prices up another 5 to 10 percent in 1974.

If farmers and ranchers are to buy additional land to expand their food crop and livestock acreage, they will need as-

sistance in meeting the high cost of land. Therefore I feel that the Congress should increase the maximum limit on Farmers Home Administration—FHA—real estate loans from the present \$100,000 to the more realistic maximum of \$200,000.

Maximum limits on farm operating loans should also be increased to meet higher input costs and encourage production. The prices of fertilizer, fuel, equipment, interest, livestock, feed, and seed—essential inputs in food production—have soared during the past few months.

Since the price controls on fertilizer were lifted in October, costs have risen dramatically. Nitrogen fertilizer now costs 50 to 75 percent more than it did a year ago and phosphates are up 40 percent or more. Additionally, potash prices are 20 percent higher.

Efforts to increase the acreage used for crop production in 1974 have placed intensive pressure on present fertilizer supplies. The Department of Agriculture estimates that the 1974 fertilizer bill for farmers may reach as high as \$4 billion, which is almost 40 percent above the 1973 figure.

Also, fuel costs have risen dramatically and farm fuel needs are increasing as farmers plant additional acres. Statistics from the Federal Energy Office estimate that the farm fuel needs in 1974 will increase by 1 million barrels of gasoline, 12 million barrels of diesel fuel, and 2 to 4 million barrels of liquefied petroleum gas.

Expansion of food production is of crucial importance to our Nation and the world. Farmers are more than willing to expand their operations if they can obtain the needed capital. Congress must assist the farmer, and all Americans, by making sufficient capital available. The legislation which I have introduced today will do just that.

Another point that must be brought out is the need to draw more people into the agricultural community. A typical full-time owner-operated farm is capitalized at about \$250,000. As this figure rises, the Nation has a stake in assuring that today's efficient agricultural plans are continually rejuvenated with young owner-operators, lest in the future we become a country of land barons and absentee owners employing an uninvolved work force.

Historically, accumulating the needed capital to develop an economic farm unit has been a great problem for young farmers. But it grows progressively worse as inflation brings up costs and as technology requires the purchase of more farm land.

The legislation which I have introduced will provide a needed incentive to agriculture producers and those young people desiring to enter the farming and ranching business. This bill will provide the liquidity needed to have a financially sound and well rounded successful operation. The loans will be paid back with interest and at no cost to the taxpayer.

I therefore urge the Congress to increase the maximum limits on FHA real estate and farm operating loans to the more realistic levels of \$200,000 and \$100,000 respectively.

CXX—247—Part 3

DICK BOLLING: HOUSE AND NATIONAL LEADER

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, for the past year it has been my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives and on the Rules Committee with the Honorable DICK BOLLING of Missouri.

This is Dick's 25th year of service in the House of Representatives, and I believe that there have been few men in our Nation's history who have demonstrated greater leadership skills than he.

It gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an article about this exceptional Congressman. The article, which follows, was published in Dick's hometown newspaper, the Kansas City Star:

CONGRESS FINALLY MAY BE READY FOR BOLLING REFORMS (By Henry Clay Gold)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Richard Bolling is marking 25 years in the House of Representatives with the credentials of a national politician who is heard in the great debates of his time.

As a silver anniversary gift, the Kansas City Democrat can claim the year 1973 which played into his hands by bringing home the Bolling message.

For much of his career, Bolling had written and preached that a flabby Congress, the House in particular was out of order and in need of reform. Along came Watergate, secret bombing disclosures and the raw use of executive power to bolster his pleas for a strong Congress to take a lead in reshaping the national government.

Congress is attempting to respond to the lessons of 1973. The struggle to reassert itself is made through such as war powers legislation (which Bolling disliked) and budget reform. Reassertion calls for election reforms and some tinkering with the nuts-and-bolts of congressional machinery which upsets the fiefdoms of veteran legislators.

Bolling is in the forefront of both the moves toward internal reform of the House and the effort of Congress to strengthen itself in the tradition of separation of powers.

MELLOWED

The past is a useful prologue for understanding the 57-year-old representative who currently is taking his customary winter vacation on St. Barthelemy Island in the French West Indies. His record is remarkably consistent although the popular impression is that Bolling liberalism of the early post-World War II years has mellowed to include a hawkish turn in national defense.

Bolling arrived from Kansas City to take his oath of office Jan. 3, 1949, and prophetically pegged himself as a student of government by casting his second vote to reshape the House Rules Committee. (His first vote supported Rep. Sam Rayburn of Texas for speaker).

"The rules change," Bolling said in 1949, "insures the success of the program which the President (Truman) and most of the rest of us supported in our campaigns."

The claim was somewhat brash in the light of later results but 25 years later Bolling remains consistent in prodding the House to reform its ways of doing business.

Today Bolling is the third ranking Democrat on the Rules Committee which clears legislation for debate on the House floor. He

is chairman of the Select Committee on Committees with the assignment of revamping the structure of House committees.

POLITICALLY SAFE

Clearly, the seniority system is paying off for one of its leading antagonists. Bolling has been as politically safe in his Kansas City district as Southern politicians have been in their 1-party domains.

The 5th Congressional District in Kansas City would appear to be an impossible assortment of people and interests for a public official to please. It is black, white and Mexican-American, with the economic scale of its constituents running from upper income to the poverty level.

Despite all the racial, religious, economic and political diversity, Bolling has faced only two stiff challenges, both from within his own party. Near the end of his first term, rumbles of a purge coming from Democratic factions were quickly squelched when former President Truman passed the word in support of Bolling's re-election.

The second challenge came in 1964 and continued until primary election day when Hunter Phillips, a Democratic county official, was defeated despite support from strong political factions.

DISCONTENT

Bolling said he went through two years of discontent in the House after the 1964 election but not because of the hard fight he was forced to make for re-election. He sees the period as one of lost opportunity with the Democrats in tight control of Congress after the landslide reelection of President Lyndon Johnson.

A major responsibility, Bolling said, is to represent the powerless. Something needed to be done about poverty during the 1965-66 session of Congress, Bolling said in pointing to lost opportunities.

"What we did," Bolling said, "was so half-baked, so flawed, it had the seeds of self-destruction."

The Kansas Citian claims "a very strong feeling" for the residents of his diverse district. Although Bolling gives his time to issues which are national in scope, he said he tries to get "a chunk" of available programs for his district.

A Democrat has only a few chips for playing pork barrel politics when Republicans control the executive branch. Under these conditions, Bolling saved his best chip to push development of the medical complex on Hospital Hill in Kansas City.

There is other material evidence of this 25-year congressional career. After the 1951 flooding in Kansas City, Bolling lobbied hard and successfully for the first federal appropriation for the Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas.

Another testimonial to his effectiveness in Washington is the \$22-million Federal Office Building in Kansas City's Civic Center which became known as the Bolling Re-election Building in the 1964 campaign.

The political safety of a representative among his constituents rests in part on the way letters and calls from individuals are handled by a staff.

PRAISE FOR STAFF

Bolling praises his staff as "excellent—there is none better." He describes his wife as "the real politician" who can answer any question about legislation or his office.

The Bollings drive together from their Maryland home to the Rayburn Building where they share a small office. A larger room in his suite, designed for use by the representative, is used by his staff.

Washington and its obsessions have grown old to Bolling. He claims a need to retreat at the end of a work day to his home or to leave during a winter recess for St. Barthelemy. It would take a national calamity to bring him back to the Capitol during the current recess. Twice in past years he re-

fused to leave St. Barthelmy for votes which were regarded as crucial by others.

The refusal to return for one of the votes was later cited by a member of the Rules Committee as evidence that Bolling has a stubborn streak. Perhaps so but he also has a remarkable sense of knowing who he is and what he is doing.

As a brilliant student in academia, later in the military and now of government, the ruggedly handsome legislator is entitled to suggestions of superiority.

Records show that the image of Bolling became distorted during his first two election campaigns when charges of radicalism were raised. In those early days of McCarthyism, support for diplomatic recognition of China and membership in the Americans for Democratic Action were translated as soft on communism.

The lingering distortions would surface during the Vietnam War when surprise was often shown over Bolling's support of President Johnson's policies.

In his political beginning Bolling in 1948 sounded more like Richard Nixon running against Helen Gahagan Douglas than he did like a liberal in pursuit of elusive goals. His support of a strong national defense continued through the cold war, the Korean War and he now says "I'm a hawk on Israel and any free choice government that exists in the world."

"When he voted against interim aid he was voting on the side of Stalin," Bolling said in 1948 of Rep. Albert L. Reeves, Jr., his Republican opponent. "He voted exactly as the Communists wanted him to vote because he does not understand the nature of the Communist threat in Europe . . ."

The charges of radicalism also flowed from a 1948 association with the American Veterans Committee. The A.V.C. included a so-called left wing and a moderate wing. Political charges entangled Bolling with the left wing although he was elected a national vice-chairman of the A.V.C. on the moderate slate.

The A.V.C. and A.D.A. support was part of the springboard for propelling Bolling from an administrative post at the old University of Kansas City to the U.S. House.

He had come to Kansas City after compiling a World War II record which he began as a private and ended as a lieutenant colonel.

The representative takes his middle name of Walker from one of Alabama's first families. A grand-uncle and a great-grandfather served on the Alabama Supreme Court. Bolling was born in New York, however, where his father was a surgeon.

After the death of his father when Bolling was 13, the family returned to Alabama. Bolling attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., where he was class president, a football tackle and an English teacher after receiving a master's degree.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

Now, having tasted success from childhood through 25 years in the House, what type encore is Bolling likely to offer a Kansas City district and a national constituency?

With congressional redistricting behind until 1981, there is no foreseeable political threat to Bolling's continued service in the imperfect House which he loves. His 1964 election victory squelched opposition within the Democratic Party in Kansas City except for the slight chance that the black community might gamble on electing one of its own if population trends should accelerate.

Such a political demise would be a bitter ending for a lawmaker who was the prime mover behind the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first such measure to pass since Reconstruction. It was a compromise but the door was opened for the stronger Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Bolling is likely to continue covering home base in his own successful way. He doesn't believe a member of Congress should trot back and forth between his district and Washington at a fast pace because representing or speaking for a district means being in Washington.

It seemed out of character to see the self-assured veteran of the House making a grass roots campaign gesture earlier this month. He was squeezing time out of the final days of a lawmaking session to personally sign 1,500 calendars for distribution at home.

Political back-scratching and log-rolling are not Bolling's style. Despite his familiarity with the ways of the House, he might still be more at home in a classroom.

The Bolling approach of an intellectual who dislikes bending for political expediency has extracted its penalties. His 1962 bid for House majority leader was short-lived and his visions of becoming speaker have probably dimmed.

Moving ahead in House popularity contests is not consistent with the outspoken writing of Bolling in numerous articles and his two books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House."

His own ambitions aside for the moment, he is happy with and closely involved in the leadership of Speaker Carl Albert (D-Okla.). Bolling said Albert has recently handled "the most difficult of all things absolutely perfectly and those were the request of former Vice-President Spiro Agnew for a House hearing and the procedures for dealing with presidential impeachment resolutions.

The House gave Bolling a vacation send-off by voting 386 to 23 to reform the process of handling the multi-billion dollar federal budget and provide for congressional review of presidential impoundment of funds. He is chief architect of the bill which is awaiting Senate action.

The bill gives Congress the capability to decide budget totals and priorities and requires the setting of over-all spending ceilings with subceiling goals in program categories. Appropriation timetables would be changed, including fiscal year dates.

In setting up a new Budget Committee, it is the kind of legislation that requires a sponsor who fully understands the power structure of Congress. In this case, setting up a new committee is similar to performing a tight-rope act to avoid opposition from the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees.

REFORM PUSH

The essence of Bolling the congressman at this time is in his work as chairman of the Select Committee on Committees. After much carping and writing, it is his big, complex undertaking to streamline operations of the House.

There is no much political appeal at home in Kansas City in this dry, tedious and long-running project but it cuts through to the heart of power and responsiveness of the House.

The committee has filed a tentative report after a year of work, 10 weeks of hearings, four weeks of panel discussions and a full weekend recently of brainstorming at Bolling's home in Silver Spring, Md.

Hopefully, the final report will reach the House floor after the Easter recess. An outsider cannot easily understand Bolling's emotional involvement in the project or the compromises required for eventual success.

As examples of projected upheaval in the House, the tentative report does away with two committees chaired by Missourians. Those are the Internal Security Committee of Rep. Richard Ichord and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of Mrs. Leonor Sullivan.

The task of shaking up power within the House is supposed to be impossible. If success comes, Bolling said, it will not be through a miracle but through iron determination, infinite patience and a whole lot of hard work.

"When I started talking and writing about reform and reorganization of the Congress years ago many of my friends thought I was crazy and the people of the country were mostly not interested, Bolling said in a "Dear Friend" letter to his district.

"Today some of my friends still think I take on too many jobs nobody else will touch but everybody knows that reform and reorganization of the federal government is a must. I intend to keep at it.

Very predictably, Bolling will be talking and writing about reform of Congress long after his current project is complete. He has updated his book, "Power in the House" for publication in February.

With equal certainty, the Kansas Citizen will keep his good standing with organized labor. A 1965 speech on his regard for labor is as timely now as it was then.

"It would be difficult indeed," he said, "for me to function as I must and to do the things that must be done in the Congress without the support of organized labor."

The representative pledges that the House will not ignore the overriding lesson of the Watergate scandals which is the need for election reforms. Reform in financing elections was blocked this year by a House committee but Bolling believes the House will find a way around the opposition.

"One way or another unless the heat goes off—and I sure hope it doesn't—we're going to get a (election reform) bill to the floor of the House and we're going to pass something."

Strengthening Congress is not synonymous with weakening the presidency. Bolling makes that point in objecting to the war powers bill which Congress passed, the President vetoed and Congress again passed.

The war powers bill, Bolling said, was too restrictive on the President and at the same time gave him powers beyond those granted by the Constitution in permitting committal of troops for up to 90 days. The bill, Bolling said, was lousy legislation and the worst possible compromise.

The political philosophy of Bolling with his liberal tag alternately fitting and looking ridiculous continues to perplex many persons.

WILL TO WIN

Perhaps Bolling best explains himself. He disdains being a liberal with a will to fail. In an interview for the "Ralph Nader Congress Project," Bolling said:

"If we could just get all the liberals in the Democratic Caucus together, we could pass those reforms at any time. But those liberals keep flying off in all directions. . . . I keep trying to tell them that I am a living example that you can buck the system around here and still make it."

As things are moving, Bolling may make it to chairmanship of the Rules Committee where the iron grip on legislation includes determination of the House work schedule. Standing between him and one of the most influential posts in Congress are two Democrats on the committee, ages 81 and 72.

Bolling sees the committee's future as an instrument of the majority leadership. It functioned as an instrument of party policy, he said, when the Republican Party last controlled Congress.

"The classic liberal attitude," Bolling said, "is that there shouldn't be a Rules Committee."

Time, events and the passing of power seem again to be headed toward a challenge of Bolling's liberal credentials as he moves up in a system built on compromise.

PANAMA CANAL GIVEAWAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1903, Secretary of State John Hay signed an agreement with the Republic of Panama in which the United States was granted perpetual sovereignty over the Canal Zone "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

And, in return, the United States agreed, first, to pay \$10 million; second, to make annual payments of \$250,000 after 9 years; and third, to guarantee Panamanian independence.

In 1922, we agreed to increase our annual payment to \$430,000, and in 1955, we increased our payment to \$1.9 million and gave Panama \$28 million worth of real estate.

As a result of the construction and efficient operation of the canal, the Nation of Panama receives one-third of its gross national product, and Panama's per capita income is the highest in Central America and the fourth highest in Latin America.

Now, Panama is not pleased with this arrangement and seeks to renegotiate the 1903 treaty. Unfortunately, the U.S. State Department is only too willing to oblige.

Mr. Speaker, if our Government is willing to forfeit our legitimate rights whenever some nation believes it did not receive adequate compensation, then the people in the 12 States acquired by the Louisiana Purchase should learn French, and the people of Alaska should learn to speak Russian.

The Panama Canal is a valuable resource that is extremely important to our economy and security. Some 70 percent of the tonnage through the canal in recent years has either originated in the United States or been destined for the United States and that amount represents about 16 percent of our total exports and imports.

And, should the Panamanian Government, rather than the nonprofit, U.S.-owned Panama Canal Company, set the rates on tonnage, our shippers and, thus, our consumers, could be subjected to unreasonable tolls. This could result in a kind of back-door foreign aid, that could be increased merely at the whim of those who happen to be in power.

At least of equal importance are the elements of national security involved in a possible closure of the canal. The importance of the canal to U.S. security goes much further than merely providing a route for rapid deployment of naval forces between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Perhaps the most significant defense contribution is the one it makes toward defense economy.

Obviously, it is much faster and cheaper to move naval ships through the canal, rather than around the tip of South America, and resupply—the shipping of men, material, and equip-

ment—can be accomplished much more efficiently and quickly through the canal.

Throughout two world wars, the Korean conflict, the Cuban crisis, and the Vietnam war, the Panama Canal has served as the shortest and most efficient route for flexible deployment of military forces. In addition, the U.S. presence serves as a deterrent against the ambitions of powers hostile to our country.

But, now, Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Kissinger has pledged to "restore Panama's territorial sovereignty" over the Canal Zone, and thus, yield the independence of U.S. security and commerce to a government headed by a military dictator who seized power in a coup in 1968.

This proposed treaty would abandon our interests for no appreciable reason; it would threaten our security, and it would subject our economy to even higher prices due to increased tolls.

The price is too high for so little of a reward. We must retain control of the canal, and thus, be the masters of our fate.

THE U.S. RESERVE FORCES

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to review the manpower authorization request from the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1975. The Department of Defense is requesting slightly over 80,000 fewer persons for the Active Forces than requested last year, and nearly 38,000 less than were authorized for fiscal year 1974.

If these figures were standing alone, I would not be too disturbed, but they are also requesting nearly 32,000 fewer selected Reserve forces than were authorized in fiscal year 1974. This request is contrary to a long accepted doctrine, the total force policy, which maintains that significant reductions in our active forces must be balanced off by strengthening and improving our Reserve forces. Defense leaders have always accepted the doctrine as the only acceptable method by which the Nation can maintain an adequate military posture in peacetime at a price Americans will accept.

The fiscal year 1974 authorization represented a substantial reduction from the authorizations in previous years. Last year when we authorized the strength for the selected Reserve, we did so on the basis that this was a floor upon which we would build in future years. In so doing, we were merely working with the realities of the situation, since we were having difficulties filling all the selective Reserve positions.

During the past year, some of the Reserve components have failed to meet their authorized strength; others have greatly exceeded that number. For instance, the Army National Guard has a strength of over 402,000. The authorization request for 1975 is 379,848. Does it really make much sense to reduce the

strength of the National Guard at this time? I think it does not. When we recognize that the Reserve forces now are the only way that the President can augment the Active Forces since the elimination of induction authority, I feel that it is now the time to strengthen rather than weaken the Reserve components.

I recognize that perhaps some of the missions that have been assigned to the Reserve forces may have become obsolete, but rather than doing away with this ready pool of manpower, I would think a better course of action would be to find new missions for them.

I recognize current studies are underway within the Department of Defense as to the role of Reserves. Frankly, we cannot let the training resources of our defense sources be whittled away while the studies are being completed. I have urged the Secretary of Defense to reexamine this request.

I call your attention to a position paper prepared by the National Guard Association of the United States on the force reduction. I commend it to every Member of Congress:

A RESPONSE TO THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION STUDY ON THE U.S. RESERVE FORCES

The Brookings Institution has recently issued the fifth in a group of studies on defense policy. This one is entitled "The U.S. Reserve Forces: The Problem of the Week-End Warrior." The study has been prepared by Martin Binkin, a retired Air Force colonel and a senior fellow in the Brookings Foreign Policy Studies Group. He also served formerly in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis. The study was funded by money made available by the Ford Foundation.

Basically the study calls for a re-examination and restudy of our whole Reserve forces program. Binkin maintains that, if this were done, at least some of the following of his recommendations could be adopted.

- I. Reduce size of Reserve Components:
 - (a) Eliminate non-essential and marginally effective Army units.
 - (b) Merge the headquarters, training and recruiting facilities of the Army's Guard and Reserve.
 - (c) Reduce to cadre status the equivalent of four Army National Guard divisions (including associated support elements) and augment them with Reservists from IRR or standby Reserves on mobilization.
 - (d) Integrate selective elements of Army Reserve Components into five active Army divisions, thus reducing requirement for active manpower.
 - (e) Reduce number of individual Reservists in Naval Reserve and use some on assignment to Naval vessels undergoing overhaul to reduce active forces.
 - (f) Merge Air National Guard and Reserve headquarters, training and recruiting facilities. Limited integration of Reserve crews into strategic bomber and tanker forces.

II. Eliminate the need for Reserve forces recruiting bonuses by reducing Reserve manpower requirements.

III. Revise Reserve retirement compensation to eliminate the "recomp" feature which bases amount of pay on pay scales in effect at retirees age 60 rather than the date he retires.

Binkin estimates these steps would reduce active military manpower by 60,000, Reserve manpower by 310,000 and, when fully effective, would yield average annual savings of about \$1.4 billion in constant FY74 prices.

The study contains sufficient errors in fact, and an apparent lack of knowledge of some

of the key features of our Reserve Component program, as well as on-going actions in the study area, to warrant a reply at least in sufficient depth to clarify the record. Additionally, a great many serious students of national defense would disagree with some of the basic philosophy on which Binkin bases his views and his recommendations.

While the study purportedly covers all the services, by far the greatest weight of his comments and suggestions are directed solely at the Army. It is these to which we will respond.

Binkin does not appear to be aware of the great amount of time, energy and manpower that has been consistently devoted for the past twenty-five years to the examination, re-examination and restructuring of the Reserve forces, as well as their role in our total force structure. It is quite possible that these components have been more studied, reorganized, realigned and otherwise harassed than any segment or system that has been part of our defense structure. He obviously either was not aware of or chose to overlook the current arbitrary 48,000 man cut in the Army's Reserve Components force structure which DOD directed earlier this year.

He also failed to mention the latest of many major studies of the Guard and Reserve which was directed by the Secretary of Defense on 23 August 1973. Included in this study's objectives are considerations of the availability, force mix, limitations and potential of these components in a national emergency. This study is underway now, to be completed by fall of 1974.

Early in his paper, he states that "a detailed rationale for Reserve forces has remained outside the range of debate." An examination of the Congressional Record or a casual inquiry to the service force planners, the Section 5 Committee, any Army Readiness Region Commander or, for that matter, senior Reserve Component commander would have clarified that error of assumption.

At the outset, he makes a sweeping premise that starts the whole study on the wrong path when he says that the "precise role of the Reserve Components in current national security planning remains unclear." It is now and always has been. This is what the Total Force Concept is all about. It has been clearly stated on numerous occasions that our national defense posture is based on a one and one-half war strategy in which "NATO First" is a key element. The Army's contribution to this strategy is the 21 division force structure with the supporting elements.

In the Army, the Reserve Component portion is usually referred to as the 711,000 TO&E structure and includes all those elements which are considered essential to make the 21 division force viable and supportable. So there is a very clear cut rationale and understanding, not only of what units are needed, but why they are. As with any worthwhile plan, changes are required from time to time, but the basic plan remains intact. This fluctuation, particularly among smaller units, takes place with frequency.

Several times in this study, Binkin refers in a derogatory manner to the fact that the Reserve Components played no major role in Vietnam. On page 1, for example, he says, "... their failure to be used in Vietnam—the longest and most difficult war in U.S. history—cast strong doubts on their value and raises serious questions about their future role in national security." Again on page 40, "Vietnam experience cast a stigma on Reserve forces that will be difficult to erase." Nowhere in this study does he indicate that the decision not to mobilize more Reserve forces for Vietnam was a purely political decision made by President Johnson over the strongest objections of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Service Secretaries. History

has shown it to be a bad decision and one that had a devastating effect on the active establishment. It was not a decision made by the Reserve Components and there is no evidence of any reluctance on their part to serve playing any part in the decision.

Later in the paper, the author cites a GAO report to point up that those Army units which were called up were disappointing. All three of the points he cites have to do with individual training and equipment and personnel shortages. He does admit these units were undergoing reorganization at the time they were called up. He fails to point out that during the six months or so before callup, they were flooded with untrained people that even a trained cadre couldn't digest. Surely he would not hold these units responsible for equipment shortages over which they had no control. These allegations make an individual basis for judging "value" or "future role in national security."

One other basic point that obviously colors Binkin's thinking needs to be clarified before going on to address some of his specifics. On page 19, he states the view that "The basic rationale for maintaining Reserve forces rests on economic grounds." This reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of our historic aversion to overly large standing forces and our traditional reliance on the citizen-soldier concept that is part of our constitutional heritage.

One would gather from the tenor of this study that Binkin sides with the adherents of the short war policy who believe, a) that Europe is probably the only place we would fight again, and b) that it would be all over so swiftly that the Reserve Components would not get involved in time to make a significant contribution.

The record of the past twenty-five years would seem to refute adequately the idea that the United States would not respond anywhere in the world where our basic interests were seriously challenged.

The concept of short wars has long been the Lorelei of military philosophers and, more significantly, political leaders. Geoffrey Blainey, in his excellent new book, *The Causes of War*, points out that one of the most recurrent clues illuminating the causes of war and so of peace is the optimism with which most wars were commenced. He goes on to document the point in great detail, using, among others as prime examples, World Wars I & II, the Soviets in Finland, North Korea's attack on the South, Anglo-French Campaign in the Suez and the fantastic case of India and China in 1962.

Moving on now to an examination of specific points in the Binkin study, let us examine these in more or less chronological order for ease of checking.

On the credit side, the author is quick to acknowledge that in the absence of the draft, "the Reserves have become the primary option available to the President for quickly expanding military forces in a national emergency." He could have been more precise by saying the *only* option available.

He suggests that hard choices await national security planners, who are faced with fitting maximum defense capabilities "within more limited defense resources." Successive Secretaries of Defense, as well as the President of the United States, have been at considerable pains to point out that our national priorities *have already been reordered* through the massive cuts which have already been made in our defense establishment and that what we are working at now is increased efficiency and effectiveness on what may be a *modestly rising* scale of defense expenditures. We have had occasion in the past to quote from the President's Foreign Policy Report to Congress three years ago. Perhaps it is pertinent to repeat: "It needs to be understood with total clarity . . . that defense programs are not infinitely adjustable . . . there

is an absolute point below which our security forces must not be allowed to go. That is the level of sufficiency. Above or at that level, our defense forces protect national security adequately. Below that level is one vast undifferentiated area of no security at all. For it serves no useful purpose in conflicts between nations to have been almost strong enough."

Binkin goes on to discuss some of the problems incident to mobilization. He rightly points out that it does take a longer time to deploy Reserve Component units than those in the active establishment. He doesn't acknowledge the very active efforts to reduce the administrative work loads involved in mobilization and to get the maximum amount done prior to call-up. Nor is it clear, as it should be, in his remarks that deployment schedules take into account that our equipment pipeline and transportation system limitations make it evident that all units cannot be digested at once. In the order of priority, Reserve Component units are worked into the schedule at realistic intervals which take into account these problems. The fact remains, however, that readiness and deployment goals are being shortened as rapidly as conditions permit and should soon be substantially better than his estimate indicates. Certainly the active Army views this as a manageable problem.

This would have been the appropriate place for Binkin to describe and assess the really massive effort which the Army has put in motion to assist with these very problems. In a major reorganization effected by the Army early last year, training and readiness support of the Reserve Components was made the sole responsibility of the commanders of each of the three CONUS Armies which operate directly under the Army's new Forces Command. Under the CONUS Armies are nine Readiness Regions, each organized into subordinate groups and teams of experts who work shoulder to shoulder with Reservists to improve their readiness. These active Army people are doers and specialists in hands-on training, not staff supervisors. Since their mission is aimed exclusively at improving Reserve Component training and readiness, it is unfortunate that Binkin chose to ignore this effort. It should do much to change his views on this basic problem.

Binkin states that at the beginning of FY 73, about 60% of the Reserve maneuver units were without weekend training areas. This is incorrect. Only 18% are without necessary areas today. There is an on-going program to which he refers for armories and training areas that will improve this even more.

Again discussing readiness, he says that "Army National Guard units are designed to attain readiness at the company level" and "the post-mobilization training would delay division-sized deployments for perhaps four months." The company level training is a *minimum*. There is considerable training above that level that has been going on for some time. In the January 1974 issue of *Soldiers* magazine, there is a good description of the seven maneuver training commands which have been established from Army Reserve Training Division Brigades to write and organize field exercises for the active Army as well as the Reserve Components and to conduct tests from battalion to corps level.

But it would be wrong to infer that large units will ever get to the point where post-mobilization training is not required. The goal is to reduce the time. If the Reserve could be left alone for a while and the active Army's current support effort be given a chance to work, these goals can be met.

His chapter four suggests that sinister political forces are constantly plotting to maintain over-large Reserve forces to the detriment of our country's welfare.

There are political forces exercised in all segments of our society and many far more effectively than those on behalf of the Reserve Components. This will be borne out, if proof is needed, by data which those two "prosperous, united, articulate and highly active" Reserve Component lobby organizations would be willing to supply.

In the latter half of his paper, Binkin gives us his rationale which he believes could result in substantial cuts in the size and costs of our Reserve forces. He first addresses what he describes as "relatively small, obscure support units and activities." His first target is the 53 civil affairs units which he says have about 7,000 plus men. There may very well be too many of these units. But for an Army that has spent 25 years helping govern one of the world's major cities in Berlin and governed our second largest trading partner for a number of years before drafting her constitution, the civil affairs function needs a nucleus of units which are able to perform their specialty when we need them. So, while there may be more units than we need, it would be foolhardy to wipe them out as Binkin suggests.

Binkin is also of the opinion that medics, lawyers, construction workers and administrative people whose civilian skills are required need not be in units. One could apply the same logic to licensed pilots. In the first place, the President has no authority to call individuals to duty without Congressional action, so we would have to have complete mobilization before these people could be called up as individuals. But, even beyond this, to suggest that an amalgam of civilians, however talented, could be welded quickly into a functioning military unit flies in the face of all our past experience.

A minor point, Binkin raises the question as to why we still need 4,500 Army Guardsmen in Nike/Hercules units. The answer is we don't, and the slots assigned to these organizations have already been eliminated—another example of the continual up-dating of our Reserve organization.

Binkin also questions the need for the 21 separate brigades, including the special mission brigades. The answer is that all of these are specifically targeted for early deployment in our total force mobilization plan.

He assumes that of the roughly 300,000 people in the non-divisional units he's been discussing, 200,000 are of marginal use and could be eliminated. This suggestion reveals a lack of knowledge of the functioning of land forces and the diverse elements whose teamwork is required for success in combat.

Binkin next makes a pitch for another try at some sort of a merger of the Guard and Reserve. He takes cognizance of past attempts in this direction and is fairly pragmatic in his assessments of the meager chances for a success of another effort. He offers a variation with his suggestion that the Army Guard and Reserve be combined into the Guard while the air components of each be combined. Although he rightly says that the elimination of headquarters saves very little, he nevertheless arbitrarily assigns annual savings of \$30-\$50 million to his merger plan on the assumption that combined base operations, training and recruiting would provide such savings. This is pure crystal ball.

As a further means of saving money, Binkin next suggests that four Reserve Component divisions and their supporting elements could be reduced to cadre status, since there would be time after mobilization to assign the additional personnel required, issue equipment, etc. As we have pointed out, there is a place in our Total Force Plan for these divisions, and it calls for them to be ready far sooner than they could be under any cadre system. In-being units can obviously be whipped into top shape far faster than those requiring so much filling and training after mobilization. Units that can be deployed in the first 60 days after mobilization are more valuable

than those that come along later. Finally, anyone who has ever had any exposure to a cadre operation is aware of its severe limitations. Cadre units cannot adequately maintain the unit's equipment. They are not susceptible to effective training over any extended period of time. They do not provide the basis for either leadership or team training, both of which are essential, particularly for units of the combat arms. There is no teamwork, esprit or the other essentials to a successful military unit. In short, it's a bad idea.

He goes on to make a gratuitous comment that deserves refutation. He says: "Motivated in part by the past performance of Reserve units, and possibly by the conviction that current active forces will need but limited assistance to meet the range of likely contingencies, many defense planners appear to be counting on no more than four—and perhaps as few as two—National Guard divisions in the first six months following mobilization." He doesn't identify the planners, but that statement contradicts the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army and the Army's Chief of Staff. On the record, this statement is completely opposite from the DOD positions.

He moves on next to suggest the possible replacement of some active Army units with Reserve Component units in what he terms "hybrid" divisions. Basically, what he is suggesting is that possibly a battalion of each brigade, and a battery of each of the artillery support units could be a Reserve Component unit. The same would apply to the division base units. He would only do this in CONUS land divisions "not likely" to be needed immediately in an emergency.

There may be occasions when our active divisions will be employed without mobilization. Obviously the "hybrid" divisions would be at only 2/3 of their strength if this took place.

There would always be a disparity in readiness between active and Reserve units which, in a "hybrid" situation, would slow the combat deployment of the total unit.

In all of his suggestions, the basic thought keeps coming through that we will face only one contingency at a time (if, in fact, we face any at all) or, if we do get committed, it will be all over in less than 90 days. Fortunately, our defense planners have a more prudent view.

The concept of leaving Reserve Component units satellited on active units for training does have merit. The Army has been experimenting with that idea for the last two years at Fort Hood in its so-called "Round Out" concept. Emerging from this experience is an "affiliation" program now being worked up which would provide for separate battalions and brigades to be attached to active Army units for training, supervision, et al. It is even contemplated that they would fight with these units as an *augmentation*.

His final suggestion for cutting costs is in chapter seven, dealing with what he calls "Compensation Efficiencies."

First, he makes a pitch for not making available recruiting bonuses for the Reserve Components. As is the case elsewhere, not all his facts are straight.

He takes the Reserve Components to task when he says, "If greater reliance were placed on attracting people with previous service, possible shortages could be alleviated." The problem is *exactly* the opposite. The Reserve Components have not been meeting their quotas of *non-prior service personnel*. They have already been relying too heavily on prior-service people and with that source drying up when the remaining draftees leave the Army this fall, they will have to rely on getting non-prior service people. This was pointed up again in an article in the January 1974 *Soldiers* magazine: "Latest figures reveal the Guard is at 95% strength, the Reserves at 90% strength. But the figures are deceiving. Both the Guard and the Reserve are

hitting lows when it comes to getting non-prior service people. The Guard, for example, is getting 1,700 monthly against a 4,000 requirement. The Reserve is not faring much better."

Actually, as the foregoing quote also points up, recruiting for the Reserve Components has improved considerably, and, were the recruiting aids requested made available by the Congress, many working on the problem believe the Reserve Components could maintain their strength goals.

Binkin would reduce the recruiting problem further by the massive cuts in authorized strength he has suggested.

The author's final point is his concern that the Reserve Component retirees may be over-compensated. He advocates that Reserve retirees be paid their retirement based on the pay scales in force on the date of their retirement rather than those prevailing at their age 60, when they actually begin to draw the pay. This suggestion will undoubtedly be considered with other facets of the retirement program now being examined.

In any consideration of retirement, it is useful to have a feel for the numbers under discussion. He did not include them. In response to query, we were advised by the Department of the Army that, as of 3 November 1973, the following were considered careerists and apt to go on to retirement:

<i>Army National Guard</i>		<i>Percent</i>
Officer		69.8
Enlisted		21.7
<i>Army Reserve</i>		<i>Percent</i>
Officer		64.8
Enlisted		16.5

In one of his last chapters, Binkin presents the case for the short war which would, of course, make all mobilization plans obsolete. In his scenario, he gives no weight at all to what an adequate in-being total force defense establishment can do to prevent even a short war from starting.

Frankly, this study is a disappointment. It is shallow, negative and counterproductive. Criticism is undoubtedly warranted in many areas of our Reserves program. Hopefully, the on-going DOD study will identify those areas, so that our full effort can turn again to improving the strength, readiness and training of our Reserve Components.

TRIBUTE TO LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 16, marked the 56th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

The history of this nation of independent spirit dates back as far as A.D. 1215, when the first independent kingdom of Lithuania was established.

This desire for independence can best be illustrated by the continual struggles of this proud people. Participation in the underground movement for independence cost more than 20,000 Lithuanians their lives in the years from 1944 to 1953.

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

few places in Europe where education and religious tolerance were practiced during the Middle Ages.

I join my colleagues in commemorating the proud and distinguished heritage of all Lithuanians.

TAXPAYERS BANKROLLING ELECTIONS A BAD IDEA

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article from *Battle Line* as one of the finest statements on the subject of campaign financing I have had the opportunity to read. My distinguished colleague, Mr. KETCHUM, of California, provides valuable insight into the disastrous ramifications any legislation to publicly finance campaigns would have. The article follows:

TAXPAYERS BANKROLLING ELECTIONS A BAD IDEA

(By Representative KETCHUM)

(Because legislation to finance elections with taxpayer's money will undoubtedly be introduced again this session of Congress, the following facts put out by Republican Representative WILLIAM KETCHUM of California are of particular interest.)

In my opinion, federal financing of elections will not guarantee honesty and purity in politics. What it will do is: (1) greatly assist the re-election of incumbents, (2) lead to marked decrease in voter participation and responsibility, (3) transfer a considerable amount of power over our political process from private citizens to government officials, and (4) upset, perhaps drastically, the delicate balance worked out over 360 years of American political history between the government and the individual, between politicians and voters, between political parties and members of those parties, government and the states.

The following are serious difficulties inherent in all of the financing proposals.

1. *Centralization of Power.* If election campaigns are financed wholly or even in large part from Washington, this will greatly increase the potential power of the federal government.

2. *Power Over Minority Parties.* Since the amount of money and the rules for apportionment of funds will inevitably be set by the majority party in Congress this will give the majority party considerable power over the funding of other parties.

3. *Discouragement of Third Parties.* Most of these proposals would tie the amount of money granted to each party to a formula based on the number of votes that party received in the last election. This would obviously give the party which had a majority at the last election a tremendous advantage over the second party and even more of an advantage over a third party, especially a new third party which was not in existence at the last election. This would gravely distort the democratic process ... to say the least.

4. *Discouragement of Challengers and Protection of Incumbents.* Since 1954, only 10% of all Members of the House of Representatives who have run for re-election have been defeated. There is no doubt that an incumbent Congressman (or President; since 1912 only one President running for re-election has been defeated, Herbert Hoover) has

a great advantage under the present system. As an incumbent, he has ready access to the media, the use of the franking privilege to publicize his work, the benefits of seniority, etc. In order to compensate for these natural advantages and to have a chance of defeating an incumbent, a challenger has to start campaigning early and has to spend at least as much in advertising (usually more) to catch up with a well-known office-holder. A system which apportions funds according to the number of votes garnered in the last election amounts to an Incumbent's Re-Election A-t.

5. *Infringement of Freedom of Speech.* An Act which denies a private citizen the right to use some of his money to propagate his political views is simply an infringement of his freedom of speech. It would also be impossible to enforce in practice. There is no Constitutional way in which the AMA, for instance, can be prohibited from advertising its views opposing socialized medicine and thereby indirectly aiding Candidate A who also opposes socialized medicine and hurting Candidate B who wants to fly a Red flag in front of every home. Nor can COPE be prevented from campaigning against what they view as the hated Right-to-Work Law and thereby aiding some candidates and taking votes away from others.

6. *Difficulty of Distinguishing Between Cash and Non-Cash Contributions.* If the executives of the Wojunk Works, Inc. favor Candidate A and give him a total of \$10,000 in contributions, that would be recorded under present law and forbidden under many of the new proposals. However, if the Labor Political Education Committee of Wojunk Works, Inc. rounds up 1,000 of their members who work 20 hours a week manning telephones and distributing leaflets on Candidate B's behalf, that is not counted as a "contribution" under present law and would presumably not be forbidden in an era of federal financing. As we saw in Point 5, to date would be unconstitutional.

7. *Discouragement of Popular Interest and Participation.* Americans have traditionally been great "joiners" and have promoted many enterprises (schools, museums, charities, opera houses, sports, etc.) by "community action." It would be against our traditions to deny Americans the right to put their money where their mouth is and participate in election campaigns. Making campaign funds dependent on a subsidy from the federal government would tend to discourage popular interest and participation in campaigns and in government.

8. *Oversupply of Minor Candidates.* As with all other attempts by government to control the economy, the market for political candidates is bound to be distorted. Depending upon the wording of specific proposals, some current bills would grant federal money to anyone who can get his name on the ballot. This would unduly encourage frivolous candidates who will not have to prove their ability to raise at least some funds in order to wage a campaign.

9. *Low Voter Turnout.* If campaigns are financed by the government there will be a tendency among many voters to "Let George Do It." If they believe they are not needed and not involved many will stay home on election day. A plethora of amateurish minor candidates will also provide a boring or even frivolous campaign and thereby alienate many voters. These trends would also have the effect of increasing the chances for victory of the incumbent. The end result of this will be to make incumbents less responsive to the people.

10. *Weakening of Party Responsibility.* If parties no longer have the responsibility of raising funds (and persuading a substantial number of people that they merit financial support) our traditional political party system will inevitably be weakened. If politicians receive their campaign money directly

from the federal government they will be less responsive to their colleagues and the elected officials of their party. Party responsibility (allowing for independence, of course, on matters of conscience) is an important element in insuring political and national stability.

11. *Problem of Funding Local Candidates.* Most of the current proposals provide government finance for federal candidates. However, if most people have the impression that the government is now financing elections, it will be more difficult to raise money to fund local campaigns.

12. *Ironically, More Money Would Be Spent on Federal Elections.* Many of the proposers of these campaign reforms believe that too much money is being spent on electioneering. Yet, as a general rule, whenever the federal government begins to spend money (for medical care for the aged, for a new weapon, etc.) the costs almost always are far higher than the original estimates. The supply of federal money will encourage candidates to obtain and to spend as much as they possibly can. At the present time only about 50 House races are hotly contested; if candidates are able to obtain "free" federal money for the asking, however, they will be tempted to use it whether they really need it or not.

13. *The Increasing Cost to the Taxpayers.* All of the disadvantages mentioned above will come about at the expense of the taxpayer. His money will be used, whether he likes it or not, to support candidates that do not even interest him or even those to which he may be strongly opposed. The taxpayer will be forced to pay for the campaigns of increasing numbers of minor candidates who might not have been able to raise any significant amount of funds in the "open market."

14. *Federal Financing Will Not (In Itself) Prevent Corruption.* Unless one of these bills includes a section to repeal Original Sin within the territory of the United States, federal financing will be just as subject to possible corruption as private financing is now. Illegal, "under-the-table" gifts of cash or of manpower (especially from Union groups) will still be possible. As many have said, guns do not kill people, people kill people. Any system is open to misuse. It is not clear how federal financing will make honest elections more likely; it is clear, however, that it will introduce a host of new dangers and difficulties.

MORDECAI LEVI, SR.—INVENTOR—
A MAN WHOSE WORK SHADOWED
TODAY'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we marked the Second Annual National Inventors Day. As a means of paying tribute to those Americans whose creative skill and originality of thought have brought about the issuance of some four million patents by the U.S. Patent Office.

Almost all of our national programs during the past 150 years is traceable directly or indirectly to the work of these innovators. Today we are deeply concerned with the problems of transportation, and I want to take this opportunity to bring to you the story of a man who lived in my home community and who, before the turn of this century, scored a

breakthrough in transportation and pointed the way toward our road and street system of today.

I refer to Mordecai Levi, Sr. of Charleston, W. Va., who in 1870 laid the first brick street pavement in that community and later improved the process and secured a patent dated April 23, 1889. The first experimental brick paving laid in Charleston in 1870 was also the first such paving anywhere in the United States.

During the first 3 decades of our national independence, vehicle travel was rough and unreliable. In Charleston the situation became so serious that an ordinance was passed requiring citizens to work on the public roads and streets. The ordinance was passed by citizen authorities in 1818, and provided that:

All male persons within the Town of Charleston, of the age of 16 or more shall work upon the streets, highways or landing of the town. For every person directed by this ordinance to work upon the streets, highway or landing, who when required by the supervision shall without legal cause or disability, fail to attend with such proper tools as the supervisor may direct, or shall refuse to work when there, or find some other person equally able to work in his room, the sum of \$1.50 for every day's offense, shall be paid by himself, if he be a free man of full age; if an infant, then by his parent, guardian or master; and if a slave then by his master or owner.

I am indebted to Mrs. Robert Barr Cassady of Charleston, granddaughter of Mordecai Levi, Sr., for the following summary of events bearing on this important patent:

INVENTION OF MORDECAI LEVI, SR.

The first brick street pavement was invented by Mordecai Levi Sr. of Charleston, W. Va. and laid on Summers Street in 1870. The original patent is in the possession of Mrs. Robert Cassady (grand-daughter) of Charleston. Mr. Levi's invention of the method of paving streets with brick resulted in streets in Charleston and in some other cities of the U.S. being paved by this method. The Charleston streets so paved lasted for many years.

The first block of brick street pavement ever to be laid in the U.S. was laid on Summers Street in Charleston, with Mr. Levi supervising the work and Mr. Gates superintending. Dr. John Hale went to the city council and asked permission to have the experimental block of paving laid at his own expense. The work then proceeded. This was 1870. In 1873 the street paving was extended over the entire block from Virginia to Kanawha Street. A company was later formed by Gates, Hale and Levi to obtain a patent for Levi's invention, after Mr. Levi had improved on his invention. The patent is dated April 23, 1889.

On January 16, 1914 The Kanawha Citizen in writing Mr. M Levi Sr's obituary said: "Mr. Levi was the patentee of the brick pavement now being laid in so many cities, he having tested the durability of the pavement by laying one street in Charleston . . . that block between Virginia Street and Kanawha Street, on Summers."

On August 13, 1939, under the heading, "First Brick Pavement Laid in City" The Charleston Daily Mail printed an article by Geo. W. Summers (a native Charlestonian) in which he stated: "Mr. M. Levi invented brick street paving and superintended the laying in Summers Street, it being the first block of such paving in history. He also assisted in building the first State Capitol in Charleston, and The Hale House, the latter in its time the largest and finest hotel in the

state. He was the first superintendent of The Charleston Water Works." Mr. Summers then goes on to recount: "The first attempt to build hard-surfaced streets in Charleston . . . was when the block of Summers Street between Kanawha and Virginia was paved with brick in the fall of 1873." (This was after the experimental section was laid on Summer Street in front of Gates Store in 1870.) Mr. Summers' narrative continues by saying: "And it was the first brick street paving laid in the history of the world." Under the sub-heading titled, "Invented Method," the article states: "The system of paving was devised by Mordecai Levi, close business associate of Dr. John P. Hale who . . . financed the experiment. Dr. Hale obtained permission from the city council to lay this block of brick paving as an experiment, the city to pay him for it when it could. The block of paving was laid on Levi's plans, with Levi directing the work and Hale bearing the expense." Mr. Summers then describes the method of paving which Mr. Levi invented, and goes on to say that, "The street paving was by no means the only work of public improvement in which Dr. Hale and Mr. Levi were associated. . . . Charleston's first Capitol, and also The Hale House, were built of the same partnership . . . with Mr. Levi as contractor. Mr. Levi built The Hale House in 91 days, after contractors from the East had said it would take them six months . . . and this saved the Capital for Charleston." (This was of course when the capital was being moved from Wheeling, and the legislators were demanding better hotel accommodations than were then available in Charleston.)

The Summers article further reports: "Mr. Levi superintended the construction for Dr. Hale and made both buildings possible. To Levi as builder as well as to Dr. Hale, who financed these structures, Charleston owes much today." . . . "Mr. Levi was for many years superintendent of The Charleston Water Works System. He built the mechanical part and installed the Levi High Pressure Filter, a great improvement on earlier methods of filtration for the city water supply. . . . Mr. Levi was also associated with Dr. Hale in brick making." . . .

In addition to Mr. Summers' account in The Charleston Daily Mail, The Charleston Gazette published an article entitled, "Story of the Streets, Out of the Mud," by Wm. H. Maginnis (October 4, 1953). This article also reviewed the old history of the streets of Charleston (W. Va.) and showed the drawing (from the patent grant) of a cross-section of the brick pavement which Mr. M. Levi (Sr.) invented and patented. The article states that the pavement was the "invention of Mordecai Levi, who was backed financially by Dr. John P. Hale."

Mr. Maginnis goes on to say: "A reproduction of that paving was among 51 items of historic interest exhibited by The National Research Council at The Century of Progress Exposition in Chicago, Ill., in 1933, after the Research Council had decided that the first brick street pavement had been invented by Mr. Levi, who laid it on Summers Street, Charleston, W.Va. Mr. Maginnis reports: "The method of laying the pavement was invented by Mr. Levi. . . . Later a company was formed by Hale, Gates and Levi, which obtained a patent for Levi's invention." Dr. Roy Bird Cook supplied some of the original brick, which were then used in the model of the first brick street pavement when the reproduction was exhibited in Chicago. Mr. Maginnis states that "copies of records pertaining to the invention are in the collection owned by Dr. Roy Bird Cook."

Biographical note: Mr. Mordecai Levi Sr. was a resident of Charleston from 1870 when he moved his family from Cannelton, Kanawha Co. Va., where he was supervisor of The Cannel Coal Company, until his

death in 1914. He was born in Brown Co., Ohio in 1835 and when he was a small child his family moved to Maysville, Ky. He was educated in engineering in Maysville. In 1858 he moved to Cannelton, and in 1859 he was married there to Nancy Harriman Trimble, grand-daughter of Aaron Stockton who was a descendant of Richard Stockton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

In 1862 Mr. Levi enlisted in the Confederate Army, serving as superintendent of the construction of roads, forts and bridges in The Confederate Engineering Corps, Co. E. Third Regiment. At the end of the war he returned to Cannelton and resumed his position with the Cannel Coal Co.

Mr. M. Levi Sr.'s six children lived in Charleston all their lives with the exception of John Hale Levi who, with Mr. Carl Fisher, developed Miami Beach, Mr. Fisher as the financial backer, Mr. John Levi as the engineer. Other sons of M. Levi Sr.'s were M. Levi Jr., Plus Noyes Rand Levi, and William Trimble Levi. His two daughters were Alice Levi Woodward (Mrs. D. A. Woodward) and Rebecca Trimble Levi Wilson (Mrs. L. H. Wilson.) Descendants of the two daughters still live in Charleston. Only two of Mr. Levi Sr.'s sons married and neither one had children.

THE INCREASE IN PRICES OF EVERYTHING

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my major concerns is the tremendous increase in the price of everything. Price controls go off, under present law, very soon, and this is why we want to call everyone's attention to this point. Prices have gone up astronomically in everything—for example, milk in New Jersey has gone from \$1.05 a gallon to \$1.85 a gallon.

When we talk about the production of food, I want to call to the attention of the people that I am not aiming this at the grower and the producer. I am confident that they are not getting the money and are not sharing in the increases. The dairy farmer has long been knocked out of business in New Jersey. His price had to go up long ago, but there is a difference in his price and the retail selling price.

Eggs are twice the price of a year ago. New Jersey, which was one of the largest producers of eggs, is now producing at a minimal pace. They have been priced out of the market. Much of this is due to inflation but a lot is not. A lot is due to manipulation, in my judgment.

We are now experiencing manipulation in the supply of gasoline. The price of gasoline has increased 25 percent in the last 30 days. A state of pandemonium exists in New Jersey. In the metropolitan area of the Garden State Parkway and the New Jersey Turnpike, we can only buy \$1 worth of gas and that may not get you to the next gas station on either road. In other areas, the supply is unlimited.

It would seem to me, addressing ourselves first to the availability of these needed commodities, controls of some kind must be kept in effect. Those on

fixed incomes cannot survive these ever-rising costs. A ceiling must be placed on the cost per barrel of domestically produced petroleum.

A reasonable writeup along the line from crude to refined products must be set. The wholesaler as well as the retailer is entitled to a fair profit, and this will have to be set by reasonable controls so that the consumer can be protected. Unless this is done, we will soon see the day when gas could be as high as \$1 a gallon.

I firmly believe in fair trade, unrestricted so that the laws of supply and demand may apply.

As long as the energy crisis continues, I reluctantly advocate controls. The cost of living has risen faster than at any other time in our history. The farmers of the Nation must be encouraged in every way to produce a bumper crop in 1974 to alleviate the unbearable chore of the housewife.

Unless prices are stabilized within the next 30 days, the country could find itself in such a dilemma that emergency controls on the price of foodstuffs of all types would have to be put into effect.

INFLATION—THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

I have been extremely critical of the President's last three budgets. I am even more critical of this one. Again, the budget is out of balance and it creates a huge deficit. This, in itself, is inflationary and will cause the same prices that I have talked about to increase if all other things remain equal.

On the floor of the House of Representatives, I have listened to some very hypocritical remarks which is always the case when the budget message is presented. The Democrats complained in droves about the size of the budget and stressed the necessity to cut that budget. These are the same people who said the same thing last year and then added \$5½ billion worth of increases to that budget and will do at least the same all over again.

As one good Democrat said when he introduced the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last year:

No matter how much we may have in this budget, the publicity seekers to my left are straining at the reins waiting for me to end my speech so that they can take the Floor and add at least another billion to this part of the Budget.

This will happen all over again by the same people.

The President's budget for HEW appropriates more than it did last year and includes more programs than last year. Nevertheless, we will have another "Hathaway amendment"; only this time it will have another name, because HATHAWAY is now a Senator. That amendment added \$850 million to the education part of the budget, and if we did not support all of it we were against education, and the media crucified us for such a vote. So, we know that those who say that it is too high will add at least another billion dollars in that section and also in the health and welfare sections.

The rising prices that I refer to must be proof that these huge expenditures caused by these great increases are a major contributing factor. The President

argues that inflation by itself almost amounts to the entire increase in the armed section of the budget which he admits is high. It is high, because of inflation.

Now, it is time that the public spoke out against an ever-increasing budget, because if we are against the increase in the cost of living and against the increases in the cost of almost everything, then we have to be opposed to the over-expenditures in the budget.

BIG DALLAS AIRPORT HAS BIG BUGS TO WORK OUT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time proposals are made to place the St. Louis, Mo., airport at Columbia, Ill. The following article concerning the recent change in Dallas airports should be instructive. It illustrates the need to avoid spending money to build a facility that is less convenient, more expensive to build, and costlier to use.

The article follows:

BIG DALLAS AIRPORT HAS BIG BUGS TO WORK OUT

(By Dudley Lynch)

MANGLED LUGGAGE, HIGH PRICES DRAW COMPLAINTS

DALLAS, TEX.—The world's largest airport, just opened near here, already has a reputation to live down—its highly mechanized equipment has eaten baggage and stalled or misrouted passengers.

These troubles—and the high prices of airport services—have received chucking attention from television personalities, spreading the embarrassing word throughout the United States.

The new Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport is on 17,600 acres of Texas prairie 17 miles northwest of Dallas. It opened at 12:01 a.m. on Sunday, Jan. 13, and every since, it has been embroiled in controversy.

The reason is simple, says a baggage handler for Braniff International, one of eight airlines using the \$700-million facility. "The airport opened at 12:01," the Braniff employee says, "and at 12:03, it went under."

COMPUTER MISROUTED BAGS

Both Braniff and American Airlines, for example, had ordered multi-million-dollar automatic baggage handling systems.

But when airline ticket clerks began pushing buttons and sending baggage into the systems, they could only stare in disbelief at the results.

"It was terrible," said one baggage handler. "You would code the bag for a flight destination, and the computer would route the bag to the baggage claim area. It took golf clubs and bent them double. And it chewed up bags by the dozens."

Two of those chewed-up bags belonged to a national television news crew who filmed the entire event.

By the third day, with 2,000 pieces of luggage piled in a hopeless jumble, Braniff turned the automatic system off. It was still closed down a week later. "For modifications," a company spokesman explained.

TECHNICIANS ABOARD

The other major automated system for the airport is a \$34-million, computer-controlled affair called Airtrans. It was designed to carry passengers, baggage, mail, and trash between the four huge terminals and outlying areas.

Two days before the airport opened, board president Erik Johnson, a former Dallas mayor, announced that Airtrans was not ready. But when the manufacturer, LTV Aerospace Corporation, agreed to man each of the rubber-wheeled cars with one of its technicians, about half of the 13-mile system was started up.

It had bugs, too. Passengers repeatedly got on the wrong two-car trains because, it was said, the directional signs were dimly lit and high above the floor. The automatic announcing system in each car often called out the wrong stations requiring unwary passengers to circle the entire airport again at 17 miles an hour. Sometimes, cars just stopped without apparent reason.

EMPLOYEES COMPLAINED

At times, airport employees seemed near mutiny. They complained that they had been inadequately trained and briefed.

One stewardess crew arrived to board their plane and then realized that their hostess department had not given them the code needed to unlock the gate. When they got aboard, they discovered that there were no beverages or ice aboard.

The prices for food, beverages, telephone calls, and airport transportation brought many complaints from employees and passengers alike. A hot dog costs 79 cents, a soft drink 26 cents, a telephone call 25 cents, and a ride on Airtrans to catch a flight in another terminal 25 cents. There is even a 25-cent charge to drive into the airport.

A 5-CENT TIP FOR MACHINE

But the biggest indignity of all for many passengers was that the airport change machines give them back only 95 cents for a dollar bill.

This bit of free enterprise was too much for Dallas Mayor Wes Wise. He announced that the change machines had made only \$55 during the first three days, and he ordered an investigation into the nickel charge.

The word got around, and before long, people like the Tonight Show's Johnny Carson were joking, "Buddy, you ain't been gouged at all until you've been gouged by a Texan!"

AIRPORT DEFENDED

For some Dallas spokesmen, that was going too far. John C. Butler, general manager of Radio Station KRLD, took to the air to denounce those who were condemning the airport.

"I'm sick and tired of it," Mr. Butler stormed. "So it cost a nickel to change a dollar. It also costs a nickel at the Greyhound Bus Station."

Cooler heads contend that the airport will get a much better press once the bugs are worked out and the employees get acclimated. Said one pilot, who is unhappy with prices and other inconveniences himself. "Once I get to the gate where my airplane is parked, this becomes one of the finest airports in the entire system."

The segment that opened last month is just the first of three giant installments, all of which are designed to handle the North Texas region's airport needs well into the 21st century. But it may take that long for the opening-day furor to die down.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, every year for the past 27 years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary

has conducted the Voice of Democracy Scholarship program.

This year's winning essay for the State of New Mexico was written by Paul Kent Murray of Albuquerque based on the theme "My Responsibility as a Citizen" and it is my honor to submit the text of that essay for reprint in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The essay follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have offered the youth of America a chance to express their feelings about their country and what citizenship means to them.

But to me citizenship is much more than just a word. It is a constant and great responsibility. Yes, it is easy to be disappointed and discouraged. But there is something in the air about America that fills my soul with a feeling of independence and purpose. In the words of a recent immigrant—"There is no one here to lead you by the hand but also no one to order you about". Once you land in America you are left to shape your own future. To test yourself, I think these immigrants are the real soul of America—they believed in the future and the future did not disappoint them. Among some of my American born friends it is not fashionable to be enthusiastic about America. There are drugs, poverty, inflation, the Watergate affair. Undoubtedly this country faces serious problems. But what they, the new-comers or immigrants, see are not only the problems, but also democratic solutions being sought and applied. I think, we might well remember—there is much in America to be grateful for. I love America because people accept me for what I am. I love America because America trusts me.

What a joy it is to live in a free country and what a joy it should be to pick up our burden of responsibility and truly become a citizen.

My responsibility as a citizen came to me with great clarity late one December evening; in Washington, D.C. I set out for a long awaited visit to the Lincoln Memorial. I was going like any visitor—to look at the Memorial to a man whose mind and spirit had always engaged my interests not only as President but as a person. In blue winter twilight, I mounted the broad steps and as I walked between the great columns, I saw at once the heroic statue, seated, "a man of sorrows" and yet content, satisfied. I stood reassembling my scattered emotions, and slowly became aware there was a woman standing there, with a girl of seven or eight, whom I took to be her daughter. They were walking and talking quietly as one does in a church or a deep forest. They paused beside me, at the foot of the statue, and we smiled without speaking. Then, in that silent place, the little girl began to read aloud the "Gettysburg Address" on the plaque in front of her.

She read it all the way through. Her mother and I stole one glance at each other; there were tears streaming down our faces. When the child finished, we turned as if we'd rehearsed it and walked out to our respective cabs without a word. At the bottom of the steps, I turned to the child, and said, "Thank You".

"You're welcome", she replied gravely, and went our ways.

That evening at the Lincoln Memorial, I saw my country battered by racial strife and seared by assassin's bullets; denounced by some who fled it; mocked by some who remained; polluted by mixed-up thinking as well as by social and industrial waste.

A nation, like its people, will always be in one sense "unfinished work", because it, too, is alive. What Lincoln challenged us to resolve was to get on with the unending job. What is handed over to each generation is

not a past accomplishment but a present obligation to dedicate ourselves anew to living into reality the ideals we profess.

For most of us, it is seldom that we are asked to serve our country in any great matter, but it is all the more important for us the living to serve it in the daily opportunities that come our way. As one lone citizen, I can't do much about international war, but I can refuse to war with my neighbor. I can accept the painful necessity of changing my attitudes when they are shown to be unjust. I can let my representative know my views instead of sitting back cynically; I can seek to correct the law by lawful means, rather than by rioting or yammering. I can pick up after myself in public places. I can refuse to despair or to cry after a perfect society which no one living has ever had.

Citizenship is a right, but one must earn that right—it doesn't just happen. I was born in the United States, but it was on that cold night in Washington—that I became its citizen.

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is Lithuanian Independence Day—the 56th anniversary of a proud occasion in the modern day history of Lithuania. This day should be important to Americans and the free world, because Lithuania is one of those nations not yet free. In spite of the fact that the United States has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, some persons might feel it is a lost cause. However, the Lithuanians do not feel this way, in spite of Moscow's attempts to dilute their culture and heritage. The following article that appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of February 2, 1974, dramatically describes the struggle that is taking place there and I think it requires the thoughtful reading of my colleagues:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Feb. 2, 1974]

KGB ACTIVITY INTENSE, LITHUANIANS REPORT

Moscow.—Lithuanian secret police have carried out an intensive search of homes, offices and churches to ferret out dissidents responsible for both illegal publications and protest actions in Lithuania, an underground journal reports.

The police dragnet was described in the seventh and eighth issues of the "Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church" which were made available to Western newsmen in Moscow this week.

The Chronicle discloses increasing unity between nationalist and religious activities in the Baltic republic. Both groups regard Soviet authorities as the source of their problems.

The latest issues of the Chronicle, which survived a nationwide, two-year crackdown on dissent by the KGB, detail numerous cases of alleged religious repression and civil rights violations. The journal indicated that dissidents have channeled general discontent in Lithuania, manifested in the bloody riots of 1972, into a loose organization of underground centers.

The reports tell of widespread distribution of the Chronicle, secret printing of prayer books, secret construction of printing presses

and large-scale collective protests to authorities.

Dissidents in Moscow claim that the KGB headquarters has sent at least two specialists to direct a crackdown on such Lithuanian activities.

One dissident cell in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius, the Chronicle reported, lost its printing press when KGB agents searched a private home.

Publishing in the Soviet Union is strictly controlled by the state and printing houses must submit a sample of every item—from subway tickets to novels—to the censors before turning out more than one copy.

Lithuanians have complained for years about Soviet suppression of the Roman Catholic church which has 3½ million adherents there.

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J. published in the National Catholic Register of February 17, 1974:

AT HOME AND ABROAD—CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Catholic Relief Services is the strong right arm of the U.S. Catholic Church for helping the world's needy. Its vastness is difficult to describe, for CRS is by far the largest non-governmental relief organization in the world.

Since the American hierarchy created CRS in 1943, it has shipped 11.6 million tons of supplies overseas for the world's poor. How much is 11.6 million tons? Enough to make a train 400 miles long. Its value: \$2.42 billion.

Each year on Laetare Sunday, in the middle of Lent, a special collection is taken up in U.S. Catholic churches for the support of CRS. In the last three years that has totaled \$22,853,158. CRS sends \$10 worth of food, clothing and medicines overseas for every \$1 American Catholics give.

There are no big salaries at CRS. Bishop Swanstrom, its director, lives modestly in a rectory in New York, where he earns his board and room by helping out in the parish church where he is not away solving crises overseas. Monsignor Landi, his assistant, must often wonder where he lives, he is gone so often to visit the poorest places in the world. You can hardly visit any underdeveloped nation without finding that he was just there.

Best known among the lay staff at CRS are Ed Kinney and James Norris, the top assistants to Bishop Swanstrom. They are both professional and dedicated men. Yet they are just samples of the outstanding directors and staff overseas who do so much to feed, clothe and shelter the poorest of the poor.

No place is too small, no country too remote for CRS to reach. Often it can get in where governments cannot. During the worst of the war years in South Vietnam, for example, the U.S. government called on CRS constantly to get supplies into battle areas where no one else could operate. CRS is able to use native leaders and native clergy more than any other organization. What other organization is so international as the Catholic Church!

Despite exaggerated notions of "the separation of church and state" here at home, CRS and the U.S. government work together very successfully overseas. Much of the food distributed by Catholic Relief Services is provided by our federal government. It is

permitted to enter each country duty free, and the host government usually pays for storage and transportation costs, at least partially.

During its 1973 fiscal year, CRS maintained an overall relief program in 64 countries at a cost of \$139 million. More than \$6.6 million in food, medicine and other supplies was sent to Nicaragua alone, following the earthquake there a year ago. One million dollars in clothing, blankets and medical supplies was distributed by CRS in Cambodia last year. Another \$1.65 million worth of aid went to refugees in the Sudan.

During 1973, CRS conducted feeding programs in 54 countries for more than ten million needy. As Macao, Singapore and Paraguay were phased out, the Sudan, Yemen and Egypt were begun. So it goes, as Catholic Relief carries on its enormous task.

More than 2,750,000 heads of families are employed by CRS in food-for-work projects. Approximately 316 million children are helped through school feeding programs. Another 3.2 million women and children are aided by maternal and child health programs sponsored by CRS.

The Catholic Medical Mission Board is the largest contributor of medical and surgical supplies. Yet CRS is second even there, with millions of dollars in medical aid for India, the Philippines, Chile and elsewhere in the past 12 months.

Without U.S. government grants, most of the program would not be possible. It would be equally impossible without the help of U.S. Catholics, particularly those who serve as such good Samaritans by working for CRS around the world. God bless them, and all those millions for whom they work.

MRS. ANNA KOSTANSKI

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I received some sorrowful news from my district in western Massachusetts this week. One of my staunchest supporters, Mrs. Anna Kostanski, died at the age of 97 in Greenfield, Mass.

Although she devoted herself to her family, she found time for political activity. She was one of my most enthusiastic boosters. But, Mrs. Kostanski had time for more than one candidate. Her grandson, Walter Kostanski, has made a successful career of public service, first as a member of the Massachusetts State House and now as registrar of deeds in Franklin County, Mass.

Church activity also claimed Mrs. Kostanski's attention. She was a member of the NPNMP Society of the Sacred Heart Church. She also had great pride and a continuing interest in the country of her birth, Poland, and was a member of the Polish Women's Circle.

Among her survivors, Mrs. Kostanski leaves four sons, Walter Kostanski, of Millers Falls; Stephen Kostanski, of Springfield; and Joseph and William Kostanski, both of Greenfield; two daughters, Miss Blanche Kostanski, of Chelsea, and Mrs. Stefania Mathukatis, of Greenfield; nine grandchildren, 22 great-grandchildren, and one great-great-grandson.

I hope they will take some measure of solace from messages of sympathy from

Mrs. Kostanski's many friends and admirers, among whom my wife Corinne and I were proud to have been numbered.

DISCOURAGING THE INDEPENDENT OILMAN

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Houston Chronicle on January 31, 1974, discussed the important role of the independent oilman. This editorial makes the very effective point that in seeking to solve the energy crisis we need to encourage and not discourage those who are willing to take the risks in the exploration for and development of new sources of domestic energy. We need to avoid punitive legislation against those involved in the oil industry. I would like to enter this editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMEMBER THE PENNY POSTCARD?

Self-serving politicians in Washington and their allies have done a good job over the years of effectively discouraging the independent oilman, the wildcatter.

Maintaining artificially low prices, cutting the depletion allowance, harassment and continual restrictive regulations have worked to cut back drastically this segment of the oil industry. And this is the segment which has traditionally found a huge part of the nation's really new oil and gas, that which was found on a gamble in new areas and is not just an out-stepping of present proved production.

This is exactly the kind of new discovery which the country needs today in its energy shortage. Yet the only talk one can hear from Washington is partisan legislation which will even further discourage the independent wildcatter and continue to destroy his vital role.

The depletion allowance and intangible drilling expensing are both key elements in the independent oilman's operation. They enable him to generate that high-risk speculative money which it takes to find new oil. But the politicians seem determined to get rid of these provisions, regardless of the consequences.

Equally distressing is the attitude which, having done so much to devastate the independents, now seems to be determined to do the same to the major oil companies through misinformed, vindictive legislation which will serve political purposes but not the purpose of the people. That purpose, quite simply, is more domestic oil and gas and none of the punitive legislation we have seen proposed is going to furnish that.

If the oil industry's enemies prevail, there is going to be little left except for the government to take over. And then, God help us, we will be depending for our energy upon the efficiencies of the same type bureaucracy which has brought us this kind of thing, as noted by the Chase Manhattan Bank:

"Twenty years ago, a penny would move a gallon of oil from Texas to New York by tanker; and 20 years ago a penny would move a postcard from Texas to New York via the U.S. Postal Service.

"Today, private enterprise is still moving a gallon of oil from Texas to New York for a penny; but the government's postcard will cost you six cents."

As we said, God help us.

RESIGNATION TALK IMPROPER

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago 101 Members of the House stated their belief that calls for President Nixon's resignation tend to discredit the House of Representatives and do a disservice to the Nation. We made this statement in a letter to the President which we jointly signed. The letter was drafted and circulated without the knowledge of anyone in the White House. Those who signed it include a broad cross-section of the House.

The number signing, 101, is more than half the total Republican membership. At least 40 others who did not sign said the letter expressed their feelings but, for various reasons, did not wish to comment publicly on the question of resignation.

The experience of circulating this letter has convinced me that very few Republicans want the President to resign.

My personal view is that the public outcry for resignation represents a threat to our institutions actually as serious as the abuses of Watergate. It gives unjustified credibility to the notion that resignation is a practical and reasonable way to get a new Chief Executive when a President's popularity slumps. Resignation is a practical and reasonable way out in a parliamentary system, as in Britain, but not in the United States.

The Separation of Powers Doctrine, which is the cornerstone of our form of government, requires a President, a legislature, and a judiciary, each of which is equally strong and independent. Those who urge the President to resign thereby weaken one of the three pillars which have supported our Government and our Nation so well for 200 years.

Members of Congress should drop the resignation talk and focus instead on prompt settlement of the impeachment question.

Text of the letter follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1974.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Several of our colleagues have publicly and, we think, improperly, called upon you to resign.

Because two of them are prominent in House leadership, we feel it imperative to correct any misapprehension that the Congressmen have voiced feelings widely held by the rest of us. We believe substantial numbers of House Members feel, as we do, that calls for your resignation emanating from the House ill serve the nation and, in fact, damage the prestige of the House itself.

After all, we are the prospective jurors if a motion to impeach comes before us. Any pre-judgment of the question of whether you should remain in office before the Judiciary Committee brings forward its findings and recommendations premature and improper.

Our colleagues would more properly serve the nation by using their influence to bring House consideration of these proceedings to a prompt conclusion, so we can all focus more effectively on other important issues confronting the nation.

Sincerely,

COSIGNERS OF LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Alabama
 John Buchanan
 William L. Dickinson
 Jack Edwards

Alaska
 Don Young

Arizona
 John J. Rhodes
 Sam Steiger

California
 Clair W. Burgener
 Del Clawson
 Andrew J. Hinshaw
 Craig Hosmer
 William M. Ketchum
 Paul N. McCloskey
 William S. Mailliard
 Carlos J. Moorhead
 John Roussetot
 Victor V. Veysey
 Charles E. Wiggins
 Bob Wilson

Florida
 L. A. Bafalis
 J. Herbert Burke
 C. W. Bill Young

Georgia
 Ben B. Blackburn

Idaho
 Steven D. Symms

Illinois
 John B. Anderson
 Leslie C. Arends
 Harold R. Collier
 Philip M. Crane
 Edward J. Derwinski
 Paul Flindley
 Robert H. Michel
 Tom Rallsback

Indiana
 William G. Bray
 William H. Hudnut
 John T. Myers
 Roger H. Zion

Kansas
 Keith G. Sebelius

Kentucky
 Tim Lee Carter

Louisiana
 David C. Treen

Maryland
 Marjorie S. Holt

Michigan
 William S. Broomfield
 Elford A. Cederberg
 Robert J. Huber

Minnesota
 Ancher Nelson
 Albert H. Quie

Mississippi
 Thad Cochran
 Trent Lott

Missouri
 Gene Taylor

Montana
 Dick Shoup

Nebraska
 John Y. McCollister
 Dave Martin
 Charles Thone

New Hampshire
 Louis C. Wyman

New Jersey
 Edwin B. Forsythe
 John E. Hunt
 Joseph J. Maraziti

New York
 James F. Hastings
 Jack Kemp
 Carleton J. King
 Norman F. Lent

Donald J. Mitchell
 Angelo D. Roncallo
 Henry P. Smith
 John W. Wylder

North Carolina
 James T. Broyhill
 James G. Martin
 Wilmer Mizell
 Earl B. Ruth

Ohio
 Clarence J. Brown
 Donald D. Clancy
 Samuel L. Devine
 Tennyson Guyer
 Delbert Latta
 William E. Minshall
 Walter E. Powell
 Chalmers P. Wylie

Oklahoma
 John N. Happy Camp

Oregon
 John Dellenback

Pennsylvania
 Edwin D. Eshleman
 George A. Goodling
 Albert Johnson
 Herman T. Schneebell
 John H. Ware
 Lawrence G. Williams

South Carolina
 Floyd Spence
 Edward Young

Tennessee
 LaMar Baker
 Robin L. Beard
 John J. Duncan
 Dan H. Kuykendall
 James H. Quillen

Texas
 Bill Archer
 James M. Collins
 Robert D. Price
 Alan Steelman

Virginia
 Joel T. Broyhill
 J. Kenneth Robinson
 William Wampler
 G. William Whitehurst

Wisconsin
 Glenn R. Davis
 William A. Steiger
 Vernon W. Thomson

REPRESENTATIVE GROVER URGES
 EMERGENCY AID FOR LONG IS-
 LAND IN GASOLINE SHORTAGE

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day requested the President to invoke his emergency powers to bring relief to the area of the United States which has been the most severely hit by the gasoline shortage, the Nassau/Suffolk bi-county area. My telegram to the President reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1974.

THE PRESIDENT,
 The White House,
 Washington, D.C.:

Mr. President, I have withheld this action hopefully in the reliance on the earnest efforts of the understaffed Federal Energy Office at my many instances to resolve the critical gasoline shortage on Long Island in New York. The three million populated Nassau-Suffolk bi-county area is 94% de-

pendent on automotive transportation. This unique area is over 100 miles long, 12 miles wide and over 90% surrounded by water. The gasoline shortage of 30% to 40% has had a devastating effect on the economy of the area and caused a serious and dangerous potential to the health and safety of my constituents and the residents of Long Island in general. Mr. President, in my twelve years in Congress I have seen the emergency powers of your office invoked in many situations, act of God, and man made. By my personal observation and experience, conditions in Nassau and Suffolk Counties are no less serious than many of those. Accordingly, I request your immediate action to declare our counties a disaster area entitled to immediate help by appropriate action by the Federal Energy Office and other appropriate Federal agencies.

Respectfully yours,
 JAMES R. GROVER, JR.,
 Member of Congress,
 Second District, New York.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY,
 FEBRUARY 24

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, freedom is a condition that we, as Americans, accept, but often do not fully appreciate. Remembering and supporting those nations that continue to struggle to obtain the great political and economic liberties with which we are blessed, is an exercise that will most certainly bring about a greater appreciation of that freedom. To that end, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the small Baltic nation of Estonia in view of the 56th anniversary of its independence on Sunday, February 24.

The Republic of Estonia declared its independence in 1918 after years of Czarist Russian domination. Its people valiantly defended their freedom in those early years, but they were only able to preserve it for about two decades. During the nation's brief period of independence, it became a symbol of political, economic, and cultural progress, as well as a much respected spokesman for many of the smaller democratic nations. But in 1940, Estonia was forced into signing a treaty that permitted Russian troops to enter and occupy several parts of the country. This occupation led to the annexation of Estonia in August, 1940 with close to 60,000 Estonians being arrested, exiled, or murdered. With the exception of the Nazi German occupation of June, 1941 through October, 1944, Estonia has been subjected to Soviet totalitarian rule ever since. The concerted effort to destroy Estonian national spirit, undertaken in 1944 has never been successful. In the face of this oppressive tyranny, national pride and yearning for freedom still exist. As a guiding light for all the world in the search for peace, justice, and freedom, this tiny country and its valiant people deserve whatever tribute we may be able to pay them.

As a leading nation of the free world, we cannot allow ourselves to forget the

plight of this captive nation. I know, that in extending our best wishes to all those of Estonian descent as they commemorate this occasion, we can also guarantee our fervent hope and prayer that someday all Estonians everywhere will be able to celebrate a true and complete emancipation of their homeland.

1974'S BASIC PROBLEM—INFLATION

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of February 21 included a comprehensive article, "1974's Basic Problem—Inflation," by Dr. Paul W. McCracken, which I commend to my colleagues' attention. As every Member of this House realizes, this is indeed one of the major problems facing our country today.

In view of Dr. McCracken's past service as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, his timely and cogent comments are certainly deserving of broad publication and I insert his article at this point in the RECORD:

1974'S BASIC PROBLEM—INFLATION

(By Paul W. McCracken)

While energy gets the headlines, it is not the most fundamental economic problem facing the industrial nations of the world. Their most fundamental problems is an ominous acceleration in the pace of inflation to what would have been referred to not so long ago as "banana republic rates."

The basic facts do not make a reassuring picture. For the OECD nations as a whole, the speed of inflation has accelerated from a 5.5% annual rate in the second half of 1972 to 7.5% in the next six months, and on to a 10.9% annual rate in the three months ending last October. In the last of the three periods the rates for the major member countries ranged from a low of 5.5% for Germany to a high of 16.3% for Australia.

ANNUAL RATE OF INCREASE IN CONSUMER PRICES

[In percent]

Period	OECD	United States	United Kingdom	Japan
1972-2d half.....	5.5	3.4	8.9	5.9
1973-1st half.....	7.5	6.2	8.4	11.8
3 months to October..	10.9	11.4	12.0	13.0

Source: Economic Outlook, OECD, December 1973. Percentage change from previous period.

Nor is the problem simply food prices, though the explosion of food prices obviously made a major contribution to the trend. It is clear, however, that a serious acceleration in the rate of inflation was occurring in non-food prices also, to a rate approaching 8% by the latter part of 1973.

For the United States the figures are both more reassuring and more disturbing. For the entire second half of last year consumer prices as a whole rose at a 9.4% yearly rate, but the rate for prices of all commodities other than food was only 5.6%. It is, of course, a commentary on the seriousness of the problem that one finds himself grasping for reassurance from "only a 5.6% annual rate." The most disturbing aspect of our own price level problem, however, is that during the latter half of 1973 large increases in in-

dustrial prices at the wholesale level were occurring, and these will be affecting price tags confronting consumers this year. We cannot, in short, comfort ourselves with the beguiling thought that 1973 was some sort of special circumstance, and that somehow the inflation can be expected in 1974 to go away or die or slow down from sheer old age.

Is it really essential to counter the inflation? For many years many economists, perhaps even a majority, would have given that question a negative answer. The number taking that relaxed view, it seems safe to say, is probably diminishing. And for good reasons.

ALL GROUPS DISADVANTAGED

For one thing, in the American context a highly inflationary economy does not seem to perform well for any group. Average spendable weekly earnings in real terms last year declined 1.4% for those in the private nonagricultural economy, and there were actually declines in eight of the 12 months. This obviously means that for a majority of families outside agriculture the contents of the pay envelope were buying less as 1974 opened than they were a year earlier. And survey evidence is clear that the collapse of consumer confidence in 1973 had its origins largely in inflation.

This quite naturally has led to the suspicion that businesses must be profiteering, or even profiteering, from the hardships imposed by this shrinking purchasing power. Businesses do after all put the price labels on what consumers buy. Moreover, the profits figures seemed to confirm this suspicion. Corporate profits rose from \$98 billion in 1972 to an estimated \$126.5 billion in 1973, a rise of 29.1%. This was a good deal more than the 10.2% rise in total wages and salaries received.

A closer look, however, suggests that even reported profits have not done quite all that well either. If we take a longer look, for example, we would find that reported profits in real terms rose 22% from 1965, the year before inflation began to accelerate, to 1973, substantially less than the 40% gain in real after-tax incomes of consumers. Indeed for manufacturing companies, profits after taxes as a percent of stockholder equity in 1973 were if anything somewhat low relative to other years of high employment. And, as we shall see in a moment, the profits picture is considerably worse than these data seem to suggest.

Now the point of this arithmetic is not to prove the identity of the hero and the villain. That verdict seems to be remarkably immune to empirical evidence. What is clear is that our economy when it is under inflationary pressure simply performs poorly. And this poor performance has a socially divisive and disintegrating effect that sets group against group. Each, not doing well itself, plausibly assumes that others must be getting away with something.

Moreover, our experience during the last decade has to raise the question about whether even in the politically stable and economically advanced nations of the world the rate of inflation might continue to accelerate. The 1957 stabilization program had by mid-1958 set the price level on a trend rising at the gentle rate of 1½% per year (probably not much more than unmeasured gains in quality). The acceleration of the price level after 1965 was finally halted by early 1970 at about a 7% rate, which by mid-1971 had been worked down but only to about 4%. And even in the face of wage-price freezes and controls 1973 closed with something like a 10% rate. If the basic rate of inflation could go from 1½% to 4% and then (even with controls) to 10%, the possibility of even higher rates ahead if stern action is not taken cannot be ruled out as nonsense.

What would "stern action" be? One thing which obviously will not do the job is in-

comes policies—a phrase long on tone but short on solid content. In the early 1970s a "strong incomes policy" was supposed to be the way we could have full employment, price stability, vigorous growth, and a pricing system which in some mysterious way would retain fluidity and work in spite of the imposed arthritis.

In fact for two-and-a-half years now this country has had a price-wage program far tougher than anything really contemplated by incomes policies. Even so from July 1971 to December 1973 the consumer price index rose at the average rate of 5.5% per year. And there was a marked tendency toward acceleration at the end even though the controls program was stern enough to create mounting distortions in production and marketing patterns. (When The Saturday Review can get paper only by bartering propane gas, as reported in this newspaper on Feb. 13, one must assume that these distortions have become pervasive.)

The attack on this problem must be two pronged. It may be that modern societies do not have the knowledge and will to keep the price level reasonably stable. This contingency has to be assigned an uncomfortably high probability. Both government and business must, therefore, take more seriously explorations of ways to keep the impact of inflation as neutral as possible. The personal exemptions and bracket limits of the personal income tax, for example, should be adjusted automatically for changes in the consumer price index. The government should obligate itself to pay holders of savings bonds a contractual "real" rate. The present procedure by which even interest receipts that do not leave these bond holders whole in real terms are then taxed as income is morally dishonest—doubly so when we remember that the victims are those with limited alternatives for employing their savings.

The accounting profession has delayed inexcusably in facing up to the implications of a rising price level. As a result conventional procedures vastly exaggerate profits, and therefore the tax liability, for two reasons. One is a failure to charge as costs the full economic value of items used in production. (The national income experts have been far more alert to this problem than accountants generally.) Second, conventional accounting procedures do not—as they should if their figures are to be meaningful—account for the full economic value of capital expiring or used up in the current accounting period.

When the price level was edging upward at only 2% or 3% per year, a certain establishmentarian resistance by the accounting profession to new thinking was not serious. The economy has enough flexibility to adapt to displacements if they are not large.

Now the magnitudes are larger, the consequences are already serious, and the profession should give this problem intellectual leadership or court a serious backlash not so far down the way.

PROFITS AFTER TAXES OF NONFINANCIAL CORPORATIONS

[In billions]

Year	As reported	Under-statement of costs	As adjusted	Profits in 1965 prices	
				Total as adjusted	Retained earnings
1965.....	\$38.2	\$2.1	\$36.1	\$36.1	\$19.2
1966.....	41.2	3.2	38.0	37.3	19.4
1967.....	37.8	3.8	34.0	32.1	14.2
1968.....	38.3	6.9	31.4	28.8	9.6
1969.....	34.3	9.7	24.6	21.6	3.4
1970.....	28.2	11.4	16.8	14.0	-2.7
1971.....	34.4	12.5	21.9	17.5	1.3
1972.....	39.2	14.3	24.9	19.5	2.9
1973.....	50.3	25.1	25.2	18.7	2.1

Source: Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

According to a study by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, which had led the way in rigorous work on capital goods economics, the understatement of true economic costs by conventional accounting procedures in 1973 was about \$25 billion. After-tax profits last year, therefore, were actually 30% below those in the mid-1960s. And when profits, with more realistic estimates of costs, are expressed in 1965 prices throughout, the real purchasing power of after-tax profits in 1973 is found to be roughly half that in 1965.

The most dramatic aspect of these data, expressed in 1965 prices, is that earnings re-employed in businesses (retained earnings) dropped from \$19 billion in 1965 to \$2 billion last year.

Now one need not love corporations or profits, and there seems to be no modern difficulty in restraining tendencies toward such affection, to be concerned about such trends. This is the flow of purchasing power on which society relies to an important extent for improving its productive facilities. These figures take much of the mystery out of why the economy has been reeling under the heavy demands that we have placed upon it for improvements.

The only real solution to these problems is, of course, a more stable price level. Could this be achieved without a rise in unemployment? The answer is, of course, "No." And one requirement of a well-rounded stabilization program would be reasonable provision for income maintenance. It is neither necessary nor morally just to imply that those whose employment might be interrupted should "eat cake."

With such a program the social displacements even during the period of disinflation are apt to be less than the capricious displacements from inflation. That also seems to be the instinct of people generally. A Harris study for the Senate Committee on Government Operations found that 63% of the respondents thought inflation and related matters are the biggest problem confronting the country compared to 6% for unemployment. In any case the magnitude of any probable rise in the unemployment rate would not be apt to be large during the disinflationary adjustment period. The favorable effect on the economy's operating rate from the demise of price controls, as bottleneck restraints that have limited the expansion fade, would work the other way.

COUNTERING INFLATION

How then could the inflation be countered? No inflation has ever been countered except through reliance on the fundamentals of fiscal and monetary restraint. This is where we got the current inflation besetting the industrial nations of the world today. During 1972 the rate of monetary expansion, which set the stage for 1973, was 12% for the U.S. 15% for France, 14% for Germany, 16% for Canada, and 25% for Japan. And in fiscal 1973 our own budget would have shown a substantial deficit even if the economy had been at reasonably full employment.

Some prices, such as for food and fuels, did make an enormous rise, but these do not add up to generalized inflation unless there is overly expensive fiscal and monetary policies. And fiscal and monetary restraint is where the fundamental therapy is to be found.

For Federal Reserve policy in 1974 this would seem to mean monetary expansion in the 6%-7% zone, and preferably toward the low end of that range. While in the short run one can never be sure where the basic monetary track is, we seem currently to be on such a course.

As for budget policy, the fiscal plan put forward by the President earlier this month is at the outside edge of what would permit making real headway toward a more stable purchasing power of money. And the Congress has an opportunity in this session for

a major step toward a new stability by completing action on legislation to reform budget procedures.

With a policy of restraint, firmly but carefully pursued, the price level will begin to stabilize, if we are patient and realistic about the time required. It is even possible that such a commitment to the long-run good might rally a surprising amount of citizen support in the short-run.

MAKE THEIR DREAMS COME TRUE

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest letters I receive from constituents are those that reaffirm their faith in our system of Government. Many others write that they want to continue their way of life, but want assurances that the free enterprise system still works. I hope all my colleagues will consider the plight of many who are willing to put out the effort to succeed—if given the chance.

The following letter expresses this type of attitude:

DEAR SIR: This letter is written after I realized that only the silent will feel empty. I, for one, have been patient and silent for far too long.

Having been raised as a middle class Christian I have always felt, and still do, that our leaders are to be trusted and respected. I have always strived to make educated decisions at the election polls.

My wife and I, both under 30 with two young children, have owned and operated a 200-head dairy in Sparr for just under a year. The preceding eight years, since graduating with an economics degree, I have managed an export business and large dairies with extensive travel and exposure to thousands of people and have got to know them in their earthy ways. In that time I have seen slow but distinct changes.

As a people it appears that we have lost respect for other humans and their rights. A recent visit with numerous teenagers was an awakening experience to their lack of respect for others as well as their own personal self. They also seemed to have an uncanny sense of the wrongs in our world and are all too ready to indulge in escape. There can be little doubt as to the growing lack of faith in our system and the people acting as executors of the system.

As an economic state, there would appear to be many shortcomings and much lack of confidence. I am daily confronted with people who are disheartened because hard work and honesty have resulted in little, if any, gain and for some, failure. In my own industry, dairymen have killed cows at an alarming rate: 350,000 less cows in one year with a total of only 10 million. Total milk production was down 4% for the first time in seventeen years. Many dairymen across the nation have simply closed down and sold their cattle or, worse yet, butchered them—to be lost forever! American dairymen have established practically every bench mark in dairying efficiency, production, and quality of cattle. Almost every foreign country is eager to buy our breeding cattle. One American political move that bothers me greatly is our wheat sales to Russia and other countries. We lower our wheat reserves to nothing, the bakers raise bread prices, and housewives and workmen demand more pay. With wheat gone all other grains compete at high prices to produce milk, meat, eggs, etc. Our

feed costs have gone up nearly 35% in five months. In order to cover our fixed costs we have had to add more cows and work harder, with the result being we are continuing to make less return on more investment in money and labor.

I have a wish that America will continue to be the greatest of all nations; my wife and I love America. We are also proud to have the official highest producing herd in the state. We're striving to show confidence in our system of government; we publicly show that confidence by not shrinking. We want to grow, and we're putting our money where our mouth is.

I have a dream that my son, if he wishes to, will someday own our dairy and continue to serve his fellow Americans. Can my dream come true or are all the people who are down on our system right? If you dare, please answer.

I remain respectfully yours,

JAY PATRICK LANCASTER.

Too many of our small farmers, dairy-men cattlemen are selling out to the bigtime operators. Every tax break possible; every consideration necessary—should be given to the preservation of the small farmer. Never should we be in the position of having to depend on just a handful of huge farm corporations for our necessary food supplies. Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will join me in promising Mr. Lancaster and thousands like him across this country that his dream for his son will come true—that we, the the representatives of the people will allow no less.

SALUTES BRAVERY OF ESTONIAN PEOPLE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 56th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia, now under Soviet control. Let me take this opportunity to salute the bravery of the Estonian people, so long under an illegal Soviet occupation.

Although Estonia's most recent period of independence dates from this century, the history of the people is far older, occupation of the Baltic coast going back several thousand years. These years, however, have been stormy ones as Estonia and its sister republics of Latvia and Lithuania have constantly had to struggle against invasions threatening the very existence of the three nations against invasions threatening the very existence of the three nations. Long subjugation to Czarist Russian was finally broken by Estonia's declaration of independence in 1918.

This was followed by the swift creation of a modern, viable state and economy, only to have peace and prosperity again shattered by the Russian occupation of 1940.

Throughout these many onslaughts on their country the Estonians have fought bravely. What is most remarkable has been their ability to maintain their culture and national integrity against all odds.

The latest occupation, however, has produced a cultural attack of outrageous proportions. In the first year of Soviet occupation it is estimated that almost 60,000 Estonians were deported. Since then the Soviet Union has followed a systematic plan of terror and deporting aimed at destroying Estonian national identity and diffusing its people throughout the U.S.S.R. In 1939 88.2 percent of the population was Estonian, compared to only 68.2 percent in 1970.

Today I want to take this opportunity to salute the Estonian people in their determination to fight for human rights and their national identity. The Soviet Union cannot suppress Estonia's aspiration for freedom, and all free nations of the world join in support of their cause. The United States has never recognized the incorporation of any of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and continues this policy today.

CONGRESS OF THE HUNGARIAN ASSOCIATION OF CLEVELAND

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian Association of Cleveland at its 13th annual congress this year, under the able leadership of Dr. John B. Nadas, has adopted the following memorandum on domestic issues which complements their first memorandum on foreign policy entered in the RECORD of December 23, 1973:

A MEMORANDUM FOR THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Annual Congress of the Hungarian Association representing American Hungarian intellectuals from all over the United States, meeting in Cleveland on November 23-25, 1973 calls the attention of the Government, Congress and judicial branch of the United States to certain conditions and legal and social phenomena which erode the moral and religious underpinnings of the American system.

1. The Congress supports the constitutional amendment movement spearheaded by Representative Lawrence J. Hogan (R., Md.), for a restoration of public prayer in schools. Belief in God has been foremost in the minds of the founders of our country and is displayed in various ways in our patriotic exercises, including the Pledge of Allegiance. The meaning of the First Amendment is to forbid unfair advantage of one denomination over the other, and not to exclude religion and the concept of God from public education and life.

2. The Congress also recommends to expand the teaching of the principles of morality, based on our Christian traditions in public schools in view of the general decline of morality among our youth and in our society in the last decade.

3. The Congress strongly recommends also physical education courses not only on the grade school level, but in every year of high school and systematic physical education courses on college level for non-physical education majors to strengthen the interest in health and sport among the youth, aiming to be a powerful antidote to "drug culture" and "dissipation".

4. The Congress also believes that military service for youth, or some public work

equivalent of the same is contributory to their education and, despite the prevailing social climate, believes that Universal Military Training, or a modified concept of the same would help to bring our youth back to the spirit which made America great.

DR. JOHN B. NADAS,

President of the Annual Congress of the Hungarian Association.

THE UNENDING ORDEAL OF CESAR CHAVEZ

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor, an article dealing with Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers was recently brought to my attention. The article, entitled "The Unending Ordeal of Cesar Chavez," was written by Mr. Frank del Olmo, a reporter who has covered the labor disputes in the orchards of southern California, and it appeared in the January 1974 issue of Race Relations Reporter.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to insert this article into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

THE UNENDING ORDEAL OF CESAR CHAVEZ
(By Frank del Olmo)

FRESNO, CALIF.—It was in 1962 that a little-known California Chicano named Cesar Chavez began working to organize farmworkers in the state's San Joaquin Valley into what he called a National Farmworkers Association. In September of that year, he gathered about 280 of the field hands he had convinced to sign up for the association in the NFWA's first convention. It was held in a small community hall in Fresno, a substantial little city that is the heart of California's great central valley.

At the time, Fresno was still growing into one of California's major cities, and construction had not even begun on the impressive, ultra-modern convention center that would soon dominate the city's downtown area. The center is a big, distinguished-looking structure that would do many larger cities proud. It includes a large arena, theaters and meeting halls of various sizes.

It is doubtful that any of the city fathers who helped get the Fresno Convention Center built could ever foresee a day when the small farmworkers association founded by Chavez would return to Fresno to hold its convention in their handsome arena. It is even doubtful that many of the members of NFWA could have foreseen that. Except for one.

But no one had time to ask Cesar Chavez about it last September, when he brought his United Farm Workers of America back to Fresno for its first constitutional convention as full-fledged union of the AFL-CIO. He was too busy and too caught up in the excitement of the time—which must have seemed a refreshing contrast to the troubled and bitter year that had gone before.

Chavez was constantly occupied on the convention rostrum, practically from the opening gavel to the adjournment of the gathering's final all-night session. He was working, as he has almost nonstop since 1962, to keep a watchful eye on the growth and development of his farmworkers' union, whose future even after 11 hectic years was still a matter of some doubt.

Four hundred delegates attended the 1973 convention, representing UFW workers on ranches having contracts, UFW members on strike, even UFW organizing committees in which far-flung states as Washington, Arizona, Texas, and Florida.

The delegates were mostly Mexican and Mexican-American, and the convention proceedings were conducted in both Spanish and English, with simultaneous translations coming over transistor radios, which were handed out to each delegate. Other delegates were Filipinos, a key segment of the union's membership and second only to Mexicans among California's year-round farm labor force of 95,600 workers. There were also black citrus workers from Florida, Portuguese field hands from the Northern California wine country, and even a few Arab field hands, who have been immigrating to work on California farms in increasing numbers for the last few years.

They had come to revise and approve a tentative version of an official union constitution for UFW, which only a year before had been elevated from its status as an AFL-CIO organizing committee. The constitution was a detailed, 111-page document, again written in both English and Spanish.

The delegates were also to elect their officers under the new constitution, and draft resolutions that would help set the UFW policies to be carried out by those officers.

It was a working convention. One veteran labor reporter called it "the most unusual labor convention in modern American history."

For there were none of the signs of middle-American affluence that many jaded observers have come to expect of labor conventions. There was no convention hotel, for the delegates would sleep in the homes of UFW members and supporters after working all day at the Fresno Convention Centers. There were no hospitality suites or complimentary drinks, except for coffee and fruit punch. The delegates ate their lunch out of brown paper bags taken to them at their convention seats so they could eat and continue with the gathering's business at the same time. After adjournment, they would eat dinner in the convention hall.

The convention itself moved with almost excruciating detail through each section of the constitution, and through each step of parliamentary procedure. Many of the delegates were learning for the first time what it meant to have a voice in running their own union, and Chavez was apparently determined that the lesson should be complete. Even the delegate who rose to ask "Who is this Roberts, and why are we following his rules?" had Robert's Rules of Order duly explained to him from the rostrum.

For Chavez, who remained active and sprightly even when delegates, union staff members and newsmen grew weary of the long sessions, it was obviously an exhilarating time. The supreme moment had to have come just after the constitution was finally approved, and Chavez, for years the union's director, was nominated and elected the UFW's first president by acclamation.

Elected with him were nine other members of the union's executive board, including such long-time associates as Gilbert Padilla, who was voted secretary-treasurer, and Dolores Huerta, who was elected an executive vice-president. Two other executive vice presidents represented the UFW's Filipino leadership, Philip Vera Cruz and Peter Velasco. The remainder of the union's board are four vice-presidents at large—Mack Lyons, the black farmworker who heads UFW's Florida organizing effort, Eliseo Medina, a young Chicano, Chavez's brother Richard, and Marshall Ganz, a key Augie organizer for the union, a San Joaquin Valley native who is also a veteran of organizing campaigns in the Deep South with SNCC.

It should have been a time of complete triumph for UFW and Chavez. But it was not. For though the 400 delegates and the 2,000 observers in the gallery rarely showed it as they enthusiastically chered speakers and resolutions, a pall hung over the convention. Up until that time, 1973 had been a very tough year for the UFW.

In the months preceding the convention, the union had lost more than 80 of its farm labor contracts, including most of the key agreements with California's table grape growers. Those pacts had been the cornerstone of the union's membership since they were first signed in 1970.

The union had also depleted a \$1.5 million strike fund provided by the AFL-CIO, in fighting a six-month long battle against the grape and tree fruit growers, and wineries, who refused to renew their contracts. The UFW's fight against the growers, an old nemesis, was made even harder by the growers' ally, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with whom most of the growers who snubbed UFW had signed labor contracts instead.

More than 3,500 UFW members and supporters were arrested during the course of the strike, a prolonged, dramatic confrontation in which UFW was fighting "for our very life," according to Chavez. The strike ranged across a half dozen California counties, from the Southern California deserts of the Coachella Valley to the green, rolling countryside of Merced County, just east of San Francisco Bay.

The rural police officers and sheriff's deputies who policed it called it the most serious farm labor dispute in the state's history. And indeed, with thousands of UFW members and their supporters roving about in mobile caravans that moved from one field to another, to another, from this vineyard to that, almost daily, it unsettled rural California like nothing before it had.

When the UFW picketing began in April, union members often faced off against burly Teamsters who were hired at \$87 a day to act as "guards" at struck vineyards. Their picketing did not end until late August, when two UFW members died violently in the San Joaquin Valley, one of them gunned down along a picket line.

But for all the sacrifice and fury, there was no denying, when the strike ended, that UFW had won back no contracts. And it had seen its membership drop from a peak of 40,000 to less than 10,000.

It was so difficult a strike that even Chavez, who is known for his optimism, would bitterly tell a California State Assembly committee that in at least some counties the UFW's effort had been broken. He charged that it was broken by rural courts which handed down unconstitutionally strict anti-picketing injunctions, and by rural police agencies that were at best uncooperative and at worst hostile to UFW.

How did such a dismal situation for UFW come about? There are a variety of explanations offered not only by Chavez, but by his critics as well.

Chavez and many of his supporters would argue that to really get to the roots of UFW's present dilemma, you must go back into the history of California's agricultural industry, which they contend grew into a \$5 billion-a-year business on the backs of farmworkers. Until less than 10 years ago the state's growers had successfully staved off every attempt to unionize their work force, and for decades that labor force had remained compliant. Over the years it has been made up of Mexican-Americans, Mexicans, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Arabs and even, occasionally, poor whites. But regardless of its ethnic makeup, it had always been a work force which seldom complained about the long hours of hard work in sun-baked fields, or the low pay which has consistently

kept farmworkers living at or below the poverty level.

The men and corporations who made money off such a system, the Chavez argument goes, would never surrender their control easily. As a result, when the UFW first contested that control with a farm labor strike launched in Delano, in 1965, it would take the growers five years to realize finally that here indeed, was a very serious challenger.

And when they did agree to deal with UFW on an equal basis, in 1970, their "surrender" was only a temporary retreat. They were buying time to reorganize their forces to try and beat down Chavez and his union in other ways—through right-to-work-law campaigns, by creating worker discontent, and, finally, by luring in a rival union with whom they would feel more comfortable: a "company" union more amenable to gentlemen's agreements with the growers. That union, according to Chavez's scenario, proved to be the conservative, 2-million-member Teamsters organization.

However, other observers, including several labor reporters who have followed the story, give the argument a different twist, maintaining that the Teamsters, rather than the growers, are the key element in the present California farm labor situation. They would contend that UFW's dilemma grew out of a private meeting that took place in 1967, far from California's dusty farmlands, in the posh surroundings of Los Angeles' Century Plaza Hotel. That year an undetermined number of California growers met there with Teamster officials to discuss the possibility of allowing the union to organize their workers. Apparently they were beginning to realize that Chavez's union was not going to be broken as easily as some of its predecessors had been.

Details of that meeting are sketchy, but Teamster officials have confirmed that it took place. One Teamster who was there told *Los Angeles Times* labor reporter Harry Bernstein years later that no agreement was reached at the gathering "because the growers wanted a sure thing and refused to have an election to let the workers decide the issue. We dropped the whole thing then."

But they did not drop it for good, proponents of this thesis would contend. For once Teamster officials on the West Coast knew that at least some California growers were amenable to unionization by the right kind of union, they would not forget. In the future, they would no longer dismiss farm labor as an unprofitable area in which to organize.

The Teamsters had long operated on the fringes of agriculture. For years they had represented thousands of workers in the canneries, warehouses and trucking operations that handled agricultural products. All they needed to move farther into the agricultural arena was some motivation.

The impetus came early in the 1970s, in the form, ironically enough, of Chavez's first grape contracts, as well as the increasing mechanization of farm labor.

In Chavez the Teamsters saw, for the first time, a potential rival in organizing workers in agriculture and its fringe industries. He had shown that grape pickers could be molded into a union, complete with hiring halls, medical plans, paid holidays, and other benefits. He had also made it clear that UFW had every intention of expanding into other crops where semi-skilled hand labor was not as prevalent as it was in grape picking. Into citrus, for example, and lettuce, where the Teamsters had a few small contracts dating back to the early 1950s.

But even as Chavez's union might grow, farm labor was becoming increasingly mechanized—at least partly due to the prospect of unionization. The workers who lost their field jobs to machines might start looking for

work in Teamster canneries, creameries, frozen-food processing plants, warehouses and trucking operations. And if some of these workers were affiliated with UFW, Chavez might use them as a wedge into the Teamsters empire.

So the Teamsters, it is argued, reacted to protect their territory from a potential rival whom they suspected of wanting to control all of agriculture under one union.

There is a related but not similar version of this Teamster-mechanization scenario. It has Teamster officials wanting to expand into field work on the assumption that, once it becomes mechanized, the workers employed on the machines will be Anglo rather than Mexicans, Filipinos or other non-whites.

Those adhering to this view quote a private study prepared earlier this year for Safeway Market Co. executives by Jane Yett Kiely, a student intern from the Graduate Theological Union in San Francisco. That report quotes Einar Mohn, the president of the Western Conference of Teamsters, as saying in an interview that, once organized as Teamsters, the farmworkers would probably not be given full participation in the union for some time. His reasoning:

"I'm not sure how effective a union can be when it is composed of Mexicans and Mexican nationals with temporary visas. Maybe as agriculture becomes sophisticated, more mechanized, with fewer transients, fewer green carders, and as jobs become more attractive to whites, then we can build a union that can have structure and that can negotiate from strength and have membership participation."

A final explanation for UFW's present plight is offered by critics of Chavez and the union. They argue that Chavez brought on the present situation himself. That, from the time the first UFW contracts were signed in 1970, he and his fervent supporters have wrought havoc with the grape industry.

UFW critics, among whom are numbered at least a few rank-and-file farmworkers who once supported the union, contend that growers and especially workers have been plagued for the last three years with a union administration that was at best inefficient and at worst vindictive toward any worker who tried to be independent or critical.

While the growers were able to make profits under UFW contracts (both 1971 and 1972 were successful years for grape growers, according to economists with major California banks) the workers grew restless. The two main reasons, according to critics both in and outside the union, were the UFW's hiring hall and its dues system.

The hiring hall was the source of discontent because it was allegedly rife with cronyism, with ardent UFW supporters getting first call to any jobs available on a given day. Some critics, mainly growers, also insist that the halls often failed to provide all the workers the growers requested—a situation the critics attributed to the inefficient and inexperienced union members who ran the halls.

Complaints about dues stemmed from a UFW rule requiring that members pay a flat rate of \$3.50 each month, even when not working, in order to maintain their seniority and eligibility for union benefits. The dues were paid in quarterly installments of \$10.50. According to union dissidents, it was the \$10.50 that had to be paid in the winter months, when little regular farm work was available, which hurt most.

Significantly, one of the first resolutions passed at the UFW convention provided for a revision of the dues structure. Union members will now pay two per cent of whatever they earn, and the amount will be deducted from their paychecks.

However that change was far from being made in April, when the 1973 table grape harvest was due to start in the Coachella

Valley, and the first of UFW's 1970 contracts were due to be renegotiated. It was then, Chavez's critics contend, that worker discontent finally boiled over and some unhappy field hands approached the Teamsters and asked the truckers' union to represent them.

Teamster spokesmen claimed that their organizers then circulated petitions, which were signed by 2,500 workers, indicating a preference for the Teamsters over UFW. The petitions were circulated all across the state, so it has never been made clear how many Coachella Valley workers signed.

Chavez alleged that the petitions were signed under duress, by workers who were approached by company foremen as well as Teamster organizers. He countered with a poll taken by 25 religious leaders and congressmen who talked to 933 workers in 31 Coachella Valley vineyards. The workers were asked which union they preferred and the vote was 795 for UFW, 80 for the Teamsters and 78 for no union.

Grower attorneys, however, said after the petition signatures were compared with employee names on company payrolls, that they were convinced that the Teamsters represented a majority of the area's workers. They began negotiations and signed contracts the day after the UFW pacts expired. Only two growers remained with UFW, explaining that they were legally bound to do so by provisions of their 1970 contracts. Before the 1973 table grape harvest was over, they would be the only two table grape growers who would remain with UFW.

There were few differences in the wages and benefits provided by the Teamster and UFW farm contracts. The one-year UFW pact provided \$2.40 an hour plus a bonus for each box picked during harvest. The Teamsters' contract started at \$2.30 an hour, plus bonuses, going up to \$2.70 per hour during the four-year duration of the pact. Both contracts included pension plans, the first time field workers have ever had one. The Teamster contract also provided unemployment insurance coverage.

UFW officials argue, however, that the key differences are in the language of the contracts, and in the intent of the respective unions to enforce the provisions.

The Teamster contracts, they point out, allow ranchers to recruit workers through Teamster-affiliated labor contractors, the much maligned middlemen of farm labor. UFW contracts maintain the union's system of hiring halls. Teamster contracts are also not as explicit as UFW's in detailing grievance procedures or the protection of workers from harmful pesticides. In short, UFW officials argue, the workers are guaranteed more protection from the ever-exploitive grower under UFW.

Chavez called his supporters out on strike April 16, the day after the Teamsters contracts were signed in the Coachella Valley.

In June, more grape growers in the lower San Joaquin Valley also signed with the Teamsters on the grounds that the union represented the majority of the area's workers. By the end of July the Teamsters had under contract 51 growers, who had formerly been affiliated with UFW—30 in the Coachella Valley, 19 in the lower San Joaquin Valley, and two major wineries, E & J Gallo and Franzia Bros.

On July 29, the last 29 of the union's 1970 grape contracts expired without being renegotiated. They were vital contracts with the largest table grape growers in the state, all of them in the Delano area of Kern and Tulare counties, where 40 per cent of the state's table grape crop is harvested.

Days after the contracts lapsed, the Delano growers began to negotiate with the Teamsters and, more significantly, the Teamsters began to negotiate with UFW.

From the time it started, the UFW-Teamster conflict had been of concern to AFL-

CIO President George Meany. Through intermediaries, AFL-CIO officials approached Teamster President Frank Fitzsimmons about the possibility of a peace settlement. These preliminary meetings led to the start of peace negotiations in August between UFW and the Teamsters at the Teamsters' western headquarters near San Francisco.

But those first meetings collapsed on Aug. 10 when Chavez received news that a lower level Teamster official had concluded contracts with the Delano area growers. Accusing the Teamsters of "a stab in the back," Chavez stalked out of the meetings and resumed the strike with renewed intensity.

Less than two weeks later the strike reached its tragic climax when two UFW members died violently within days of each other—one in a controversial barroom altercation with a Kern County deputy sheriff, another shot from a passing truck on a UFW picket line south of Bakersfield.

Nagi Daifullah Moshin, 24, was an Arab immigrant who died of head injuries suffered in a scuffle with the deputy, Juan de la Cruz, 60, allegedly was shot by a nonunion farmworker who apparently fired his rifle in a blind rage after the truck in which he rode was pelted with rocks by pickets. The two of them became UFW martyrs and their funerals drew thousands of UFW members and supporters to the San Joaquin Valley.

In the tension that followed the deaths, the UFW board of directors voted to suspend picketing activities in the valley until the U.S. Department of Justice guaranteed the safety of UFW pickets. Except in scattered locations in northern California, the picketing was not resumed.

The deaths also provided the impetus to renew the peace negotiations between the two unions, this time in Washington, D.C., with both Meany and Fitzsimmons directly involved. They reached a tentative agreement on Sept. 29.

The agreement provided that the Teamsters would rescind most of the farm labor contracts they had signed, while the UFW agreed not to seek bargaining rights in those agricultural operations where the Teamsters already had jurisdiction (i.e. the canneries and warehouses).

As a guarantee of continued peace between the two unions, which have clashed sporadically since UFW began organizing on a large scale in 1965, Meany and Fitzsimmons agreed to act as final arbiters of any disputes arising under the treaty.

The UFW also agreed to end its boycott of non-UFW lettuce, permitting the Teamsters to retain temporary control of some lettuce contracts with Salinas Valley growers. In exchange, the Teamsters agreed not to renew those contracts when they expired in 1975.

On paper, at least, the agreement appeared to be a victory for Chavez. While granting the Teamsters some concessions, Chavez and the AFL-CIO apparently won the key point by getting the Teamsters to agree to withdraw from field labor organizing.

The biggest losers were, of course, the grape growers and other Teamster ranchers who were in a position of being rebuffed by an ally and left by themselves to deal with Chavez and the AFL-CIO. Enough of them apparently balked at this prospect with sufficient vehemence to keep the Teamsters from finalizing the agreement.

Following two months of delays, in which the Teamsters never officially repudiated the agreement, Fitzsimmons told a meeting of 34 growers last Nov. 15 in San Diego that the Teamsters had decided to "keep our moral and legal commitments to the growers." The explanation offered by Teamster spokesmen was that the growers who had signed Teamster contracts were threatening to take legal action unless the Teamsters lived up to those pacts.

The announcement made little difference to Chavez who, ever suspicious of the grow-

ers and Teamsters, had said two weeks before that the Teamsters "apparently have no intention of living up to the agreement." With the Thanksgiving and December holiday season approaching, traditionally a time of heavy wine and grape sales, Chavez announced that UFW's boycott of table grapes, iceberg lettuce and Gallo and Franzia wines would proceed at full force. He said the 50 farmworkers who had been deployed to the nation's 50 largest cities on boycott duty would soon be joined by another 1,000 UFW members.

In 1970, even the most anti-UFW growers will admit today, it was the financial pressure of the first table grape boycott which led them to finally agree to negotiate with Chavez. Now Chavez is apparently convinced the same tactic will work again, and guarantee the future of his embattled union.

"The growers invited the Teamsters in," Chavez said in making his announcement, "and the Teamsters won't leave until the growers tell them to. That's why our main target has to be the growers."

WHAT PENN CENTRAL RAILROAD MEANS

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all prone to spotlight adversity more than progress. This is particularly true of the press. The Penn Central Railroad has received brickbats because of its bankruptcy. I have been one of those who has criticized the railroad because it has meant a costly delay in starting construction on the much needed National Visitors Center at Union Station. I want to be just as objective in calling to the attention of my colleagues how much the Penn Central Transportation Co. means to the economy of Illinois during the year 1973. The railroad paid out over \$45 million in wages plus another \$41 million in annual purchases in Illinois last year. In addition, the industrial development department of the railroad located new industry last year with a total investment cost of \$32 million and provided increased employment for 1,308 individuals. Mr. Speaker, with previous unanimous consent granted me I would like to have printed for the Record the following letter I have received from Mr. William A. Lashley, vice president for public affairs for Penn Central:

PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 18, 1974.
The Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Despite the problems in the past, with which you are well acquainted, Penn Central is continuing to make a substantial contribution to the economy of the State of Illinois.

During the year 1973, Penn Central had 4,045 employees who paid state taxes on Illinois gross wages of \$45,711,388. Also, annual purchases from Illinois industries amounted to \$41,208,198.

In addition, our Industrial Development Department, working with various Illinois organizations, located new industries having an investment cost of \$32,217,000 and

providing increased employment for 1,308 individuals.

I would like to assure you that our railroad is dedicated to continuing improvement of our service and efficiency to the best of our ability.

Sincerely,

W. A. LASHLEY.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK: AN APPRECIATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on the occasion of Catholic Schools Week, to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the contributors to education in the United States made by Roman Catholic schools.

Mr. Speaker, the week of February 17 to 23 is being celebrated as Catholic Schools Week by the nearly 4 million students, their parents, and teachers of America's Catholic elementary and secondary schools. These students come from every social and economic group, and their schools are located in every corner of the country.

This is the second annual observance of Catholic Schools Week, the purpose of which is to let the country know of the role in our educational system of Catholic schools. The theme for 1974, "Different Where It Counts—Message, Community, and Service," is being celebrated in many ways by the more than 10,500 Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, although Catholic schools have experienced declining enrollments in recent years, many Catholic educators have expressed great optimism for the future of Catholic education in America. They say that in many areas Catholic school enrollments are stabilizing in a period when general enrollments are expected to decline. Parents are also accepting larger roles in the operation of these schools and in the education of their children. Innovative curricular programs and educational structures are being explored in many schools. Changes such as these, the school leaders feel, point to new forms of Catholic education and to the continuance of the services provided by these schools.

Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Catholic school community on the occasion of Catholic Schools Week, I take this opportunity to refer to a recent survey in which Catholic educators were questioned about the future of Catholic education in America. The results of this survey appeared in an article in the National Catholic Reporter of February 8, 1974, and I include at this point in the Record the text of the article:

[From the National Catholic Reporter, Feb. 8, 1974]

OFFICIALS OPTIMISTIC ABOUT SCHOOLS

Despite rising costs, declining enrollment and last June's Supreme Court decision striking down government aid to nonpublic schools, Catholic education officials surveyed last week expressed, in the words of one,

"realistic and intelligent hope" for the future of American Catholic schools.

The education officials were surveyed by NCR prior to the second annual Catholic Schools Week (Feb. 17-23), a promotional campaign sponsored by the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) and the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA).

The chief reason for optimism, officials indicated, is a revival of support for the schools from Catholic parents.

Educators cited two main reasons for this revival. First, they said, parents are pleased with the greater involvement they have had in the operation of the schools during the past few years. This involvement has come largely from participation in the rapidly growing number of parish and diocesan board of education.

A second reason for increased parental support, officials said, is the parents' acceptance of the schools' renewed emphasis on teaching religious and ethical values.

This renewed emphasis was used as the theme for schools week: "Catholic Schools, Different Where It Counts—Message, Community and Service." "Message, community and service" are the three aspects of Catholic education emphasized by the U.S. bishops' 1972 education pastoral, *To Teach as Jesus Did*.

Other reasons for optimism cited by education officials included signs of stabilizing enrollment, improved quality of education in Catholic schools and intensive curriculum revisions.

Another development mentioned by education officials is that Catholic schools are now being treated in a broader educational perspective than in the past, following the recommendations of the bishops' education pastoral.

The pastoral, while calling Catholic schools "the best expression of the educational ministry to youth," urged greater attention to other educational needs, such as religious education of Catholic children not attending Catholic schools and religious education for adults. Figures from the USCC indicate that about 30 per cent of the diocese in the U.S. now coordinate all education affairs under one department.

While there is support for this broader approach, officials said, parents are displaying a renewed enthusiasm for Catholic schools.

"There has been a shift in the attitudes of Catholic parents over the past three or four years," according to Bishop William Borders of Orlando, Fla. Borders, chairman of the bishops' education committee, said he has found much more grassroots support for the schools during the past year. He said his experience is verified by comments he has heard from other bishops and major superiors of religious men and women.

Father Olin Murdick, secretary of education for the USCC, said "people are not giving up" on Catholic schools. Chicago Auxiliary Bishop William McManus, former chairman of the bishops' education committee and member of a past presidential panel on nonpublic education, said, "Experience is confirming the research of the panel that parents will pay any amount of money for Catholic schools if they are convinced of the value of the schools."

"There is a new determination on the part of the Catholic people that they want schools," said Father C. Albert Koob, president of the NCEA. "We never asked them if they wanted the schools before. We just provided them. Now, people want value and religious education."

Murdick said the future of the Catholic schools depends on how well they deal with four questions: clarification of goals, implementation of those goals, economics, and improvements in the decision-making process.

The main goal of Catholic education officials, after a period of emphasizing the secular benefits of Catholic schools in the losing fight for government aid, is the development of schools that make a "difference" in the character of their students.

Most education officials surveyed said they were pleased with the recent report by sociologists William McCreedy and Father Andrew Greeley which indicated that Catholics who attended Catholic schools tended to be more "hopeful" and better adjusted than those who did not (story page 14).

McManus praised the renewed emphasis on religious values in the schools, and said he was pleased to see new curricula stressing the development of the concept of the church as "countercultural," and "the virtue of hope."

One diocesan superintendent of schools saw the return to an emphasis on religious values as resulting, in part, from the Supreme Court's aid riding.

The decision may have been "a blessing in disguise," according to Father Patrick Shanahan of the Rockville Centre (Long Island), N.Y., diocese. Shanahan said that because of the battle for government aid, "we've overemphasized the secular aspects of our education. Now we're going to stand up and teach the message of Christ."

All education officials surveyed cited curriculum reform and the use of new teaching methods as major means of implementing the goal of creating schools that make a "difference."

McManus said the goals were also being implemented by more contact between parents and teachers. He said that if values are to be taught at school, the same values must be taught at home.

He gave as an example a meeting between parents and teachers of second-graders at his own parish school: "We were teaching about 'turn the other cheek,' and the children were getting just the opposite at home. Their parents were telling them that it was manly to hit back. So we had the parents in to tell them what we were doing and to tell them that sometimes you don't hit back."

Because of this emphasis on parent-teacher contact, McManus said, the old notion of a "180-day, five-hour day school year" may be disappearing to allow more time for teachers to deal with parents.

Murdick said that the church, in trying to achieve the goals of its schools, must study the role of the parent and the lay teacher. He noted that the NCEA is making a study of several schools which are staffed completely by lay teachers.

Koob said the increase in lay teachers, now a majority in many areas, was "a sign of progress for Catholic education because it reflects the growth of lay leadership in the church."

The economic situation of Catholic schools has been hurt by the loss of government aid, inflation and rising costs, but education officials surveyed didn't seem pessimistic. Murdick said the schools are seeking support from three groups which "benefit" from the schools. The first, he said, is parents of children in the schools. The second is the local church, meaning the parish and diocese.

The third group which Murdick said benefits from Catholic schools is "the civic community," but, he added, this group is not now supporting the schools.

The prospects for large-scale aid from the "civic community," or government assistance, following the court decision, are at the lowest in 25 years, according to McManus.

McManus indicated that while government aid would be welcome, Catholic opposition to the court ruling is more concerned with the implications of the ruling's attack on "entanglements" between church and state. He said he sees the aid question as similar to

the situation of civil rights for blacks 20 years ago, and that he expects a long fight before civil rights for Catholics in the case of school aid are won.

The school's economic picture has also suffered as a result of a steady decline in enrollment. The decline, McManus said, is due to the declining birth rate of the past several years, and the continued "migration" of Catholics from the cities, which have Catholic schools, to the suburbs, which have few Catholic schools.

The enrollment decline for the current year was not as large as had been expected, according to Monsignor Frank Bredweg, who maintains statistics for the NCEA. The decline, he said, was about the same as in recent years, five to six per cent. Dr. Edward D'Alessio, director of elementary and secondary education for the USCC, said that some dioceses are beginning to see stabilization in school enrollment.

The suburbs are important to the future of Catholic schools, according to McManus and Borders. Borders said few, if any, new Catholic schools will be built unless they are built in the suburbs, McManus said "we may regret not building in the suburbs" to follow the Catholic population.

Consolidation of schools has been one approach dioceses have tried to make the best use of their resources as enrollment declines. D'Alessio said consolidation is seen as a "local, diocesan decision."

A major concern about consolidation is the problem of keeping inner-city Catholic schools open. Borders said that the majority of students at these schools are non-Catholic, but that they must be a priority as "a part of the church's contribution to the poor." He said the large dioceses are making these schools a priority.

Murdick said church schools must be more sophisticated in their decision-making process. He praised the development of boards of education, which brings parents and other laity into the process, as the only "rational" solution. He said the boards fit in with "other developments in the church, such as pastoral planning, parish councils and diocesan pastoral councils."

Murdick said there are three types of boards of education: diocesan boards, parish boards and boards which cover private high schools or high schools serving several parish areas.

Borders said almost all of the dioceses have diocesan boards of education. He said the boards in the Cincinnati, Baltimore and New Orleans archdioceses, and the Green Bay diocese, were "outstanding."

There are 9,000 parish and local boards, according to Dr. Mary Angela Harper, president of the National Association of Catholic Boards of Education, based at the NCEA in Washington. Murdick said that, in comparison, there were 2,100 boards in 1967 and 4,000 in 1968.

The 1973 *Official Catholic Directory* listed approximately 10,500 parish and private Catholic schools. This means that approximately 85 per cent of the Catholic schools in the U.S. have boards of education.

LOYALTY DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the first day of May has, by Presidential proclamation, been set aside as Loyalty Day. In celebration of this day, the Erie County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

will sponsor its 25th annual loyalty day parade in Hamburg, N.Y. I am proud that Erie County VFW's have once again chosen to publicly affirm their faith in the ideals and principles upon which our great Nation was founded. In an open letter to America, the Erie County council VFW chairman, John M. Dzialoski, and Cochairman M. E. Bradfuhrer, have thoughtfully addressed the subject of loyalty. I highly commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues:

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: The definition of Loyalty is quite clear and simple. It becomes complicated only when someone tries to distort it with anti-American propaganda. Loyalty means the individual's fidelity and tenacious adherence to government, principle, custom and practice. It is the absence of any subversive thought or action, such as that displayed by Communist Party members and fellow travelers, who glorify the Red philosophy, and advocate treason, sedition, and even the violent over-throw of our government.

We who would choose to call ourselves Americans must remain loyal to the four basic freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution—freedom of speech, religion, press and assembly, along with the myriad other God-given blessings we take for granted in this great land. To do less would be breaking faith with the countless thousands of those who have made the supreme sacrifice throughout our country's history, in defending these precious ideals.

The first day of May each year has been set aside by Presidential Proclamation to be known as Loyalty Day, to enable us to pause and reflect on our great heritage of freedom and to renew our faith in, and loyalty to, the great ideals upon which this nation was founded.

In celebration of this great day, Erie County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is sponsoring its 25th Annual Loyalty Day Parade in Hamburg, New York on Sunday, April 28, 1974 at 2 p.m.

Thank you, and thank God for America!
Sincerely,

JOHN M. DZIALOSKI,
Chairman.
M. E. BRADFUHRER,
Cochairman.

WHY SAVE FOR A RAINY DAY? CONSTITUENT ASKS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Americans today find that our rising cost of living and inflationary economy are hopelessly unexplainable and frustrating. I wish to share with my colleagues a letter from a constituent expressing what I have discovered to be the thinking of many citizens. I find his comments most sobering. The letter follows:

JONESBORO, ARK.,
February 15, 1974.

DEAR Mr. ALEXANDER: Things are going badly in this country and I thought you might be interested in some thoughts I have on the subject.

I was raised to work hard and save my money for a rainy day. All of a sudden last fall I realized that working hard was paying off but that saving money was not. Then I read a few books on economics and found out

why. I receive a good salary but it now becomes questionable whether I can provide what is necessary for my family. Our standard of living will have to go down and we do not mind that too much, but 15-20% inflation over a long period of time is going to be a bit rough when considered along with a 6 or 7 percent increase in income and higher taxes.

I do not want more government services. I do not want better roads or libraries or parks or schools. I do not want prices rolled back to the levels of 1973 or 1937. I don't want lower taxes. I want something which I believe is more valuable than any of these things. I want to be able to look out for my own future and I want to be able to teach my sons the virtue of thrift. I want to be able to have a savings account which provides for my future and also provides money for my neighbors to borrow at reasonable rates in order to buy a house or a car. I do not want to have to teach my two sons that they should spend whatever is left at the end of the month on a gold coin or a genuine silver dollar or a roast to tuck away in the freezer knowing that it will cost 20% more by June. Perhaps I want too much.

RICHARD L. TANGEMAN.

EXTENSION TO STATEMENT "COLLAPSE OF HIGHRISE CONDOMINIUM UNDER CONSTRUCTION," PRINTED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, NOVEMBER 16, 1973, PAGES 37546, 37547, and 37548

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of James A. Frye, and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article into the RECORD:

EXTENSION TO STATEMENT "COLLAPSE OF HIGHRISE CONDOMINIUM UNDER CONSTRUCTION," INSERTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD BY HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL AND PRINTED IN THE RECORD OF NOVEMBER 16, 1973, PAGES 37546, 37547, and 37548

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to explain in detail the following quote from my statement of November 16, 1973, page 37547 "I sincerely hope that each member of the Congress will take a stand against this enslavement by government, corruption in government, deficit spending and the general decay in the morals of our society that lead to the collapse at Skyline and will lead to many other disasters that will come in many different ways."

Introductory statement

America currently faces several critically-serious, deep-rooted problems. The problems are moral and economic, but both are inter-related. These problems have resulted from the accelerated growth in compulsory government control laws, the cost of administration thereof and the economic problems which have resulted from the problems encountered with the government control regulatory policies. These laws are arbitrarily justified on fears and needs as follows: Fear that potential dishonest men will become businessmen and take advantage of consumers and workers. And that some members of the society will not produce enough to satisfy their basic NEEDS and that the producers will not assist them voluntarily.

PART I. COMPULSORY REGULATION AND CONTROL OF THE PRODUCERS AND SELLERS OF GOODS

Compulsory control laws protect the businessmen who are weak and lack integrity. It enhances, promotes and expands the MARKET PLACE for the purchase of favorable Government actions through the contributions and payoffs to politicians and government employees. This results in great expense and sacrifice to businessmen of integrity, the labor force and the consumers.

The market value of a business is measured by its ability to make profit, therefore, reputation—"good will", is as much an asset to the business as its physical and money reserves. Therefore, businessmen must compete in the market place with honesty and excellent performance with integrity for several years to establish reputation as a financial asset. Men of integrity do not require compulsory regulation. Their efforts to establish reputation through quality products at competitive prices regulate their actions and relationships with others. What moral code of values or judgments (based on facts) do you employ to justify control (backed by the use of force—the law) over the producers and sellers of goods? Is it based on the belief or opinion that some or all men are dishonest and lack integrity? If so, then Government controls do not eliminate dishonest men from the market place, but merely makes their activities harder to detect or easier to cover up. Furthermore the issue of dishonesty applies to Government employees fully as much as to any other group of men. To infer superior judgment, knowledge and integrity of a government inspector or bureaucrat is equal to or greater than that of a businessman, motivated by competition for reputation, is pure "folly". And, when we analyze current American and World conditions, the deadly consequences of entrusting one with such arbitrary power becomes obvious.

The labor force and consumers suffer great expense and sacrifice from compulsory control of business as follows:

Corporate and business taxation

Corporations and business do not pay taxes, other than in the bookkeeping sense and this effort adds (on top of the taxes) to their costs which must be passed on to the consumers in the form of higher prices or passed to the wage earner in the form of lower earnings. Corporations must make profits in order to pay dividends and capital investments.

Summary

1. Protection of the consumer must come from himself, through prudence and integrity in his purchases. He must exercise the judgment of his own mind and demand quality for price or only purchase those necessities for survival, until he can get fair treatment in the market place.

2. The worker must be free to act upon the dictates of his own mind, therefore his protection is his own self. He must be free to negotiate with his employer or voluntarily use an agent (Union or consultant of his own choice). Compulsory control or protection introduces a high risk for collusion between businessmen and government officials that result in them taking advantage of the worker, while appearing to protect him.

3. Government control of businessmen and production kills the incentive to produce and creates shortages of goods and products. This fact should be very clear today in America and throughout the World.

PART II. COMPULSORY SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED WELFARE PROGRAMS

Compulsory social security

What is the reason or judgment used to justify compulsory social security? Is it that man is irresponsible and will not provide for himself and his family? The very fact that it

is compulsory backed by force, dictates that the answer to these questions are positive. And what guarantees that the government employees who manage the individuals money, is anymore responsible than the individual workers?

The Congress made drastic changes in the actuarial methodology in 1972, when it directed Social Security Administration to use "dynamic assumptions" in figuring the soundness of the Social Security trust fund. The basic assumptions are that the cost of living will increase by 2.75% and wages 5% annually, for the next 75 years. And now, we all know that the cost of living went up 3 times the 2.75% in 1973. President Nixon signed the latest amendment to the Social Security Act on January 3, 1974. The amendment boosts benefits 11%, for a total increase of 68.5% since January 1, 1970 (compared with an estimated 24.4% rise in the cost of living). The new benefits, which take effect in two stages, 7% in March 1974 and 4% in July 1974, involve no increase in the tax rate, just a rise in the wage base from \$10,800 to \$13,200 in 1974. Yet these benefits go to 29.3 million retirees, who have stopped contributing to the system, and others who will retire soon.

According to the Congressional Record and Newspaper articles, current members of the Congress have doubts concerning the morality and stability of the compulsory social security system. I offer the following quotes for your judgment and consideration.

"While the present actuarial soundness of the system is questionable at best, the ratio of assets to the following years benefit payment, currently under 80%, will decline to 62% under the new methodology." In the house debate—Representative JOEL T. BROXHILL.

"The entire Social Security System is in danger of collapsing. I do not think it can withstand the type of abuses we are heaping on it today." To the senate—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

"Dynamic assumptions made it possible for Congress to increase benefits 20% in 1972 without raising Social Security taxes." Minority views filed by Representative BILL ARCHER.

Social Security's greatest injustice is to young workers. "It is crucifying them."—Senator CARL T. CURTIS.

"Any individual should be able to get back from the Social Security System as much as or more than he puts in, since this is the basic concept behind insurance. . . . (otherwise) we can find ourselves in a devastating situation where the worker will not support the Social Security Program". to the House—Representative DON CLAUSEN

"One of my colleagues on the Committee stated the other day that he felt we might be on the verge of a wage earners' revolt". Comment by—Representative JOEL T. BROXHILL.

"If we can somehow bring inflation under control, then our problems with Social Security will also be brought under control". Comment by—Senator JESSE A. HELMS

However, based on the efforts to bring inflation under control during the past 8 to 10 years, there is little, if any, hope that the inflation managers will do anything about the increasing inflation rate, without causing a major depression.

Compulsory education

Should education be compulsory and tax-supported as it is today? Should the government be permitted to remove children forcibly from their homes, with or without the parents' consent, and subject the children to educational training and procedures of which the parents may or may not approve? If the answers to these questions are yes, then here again, the justification must be based on the assumption that man is irresponsible and will not provide for the children he produces.

Public education during the past 20 years has become a big money industry, with a strong big money lobby and regulations which have placed a heavy burden on the tax-payer and added tremendously to the increase in public debt.

In our efforts to educate the masses, we have created a system that gives little if any regard to the individual needs of the child. And all the children are individuals, raised in different environments, have individual minds and interests of their own. Systems and educators cannot ignore these facts, without serious consequences.

Isn't it time we evaluate the effects of these changes on our children and the increasing debt? Someone better analyze this problem and resolve it, before it is too late.

Government controlled welfare programs

I call to your attention the expenditures (not including the social security benefit payments) of the U.S. Health, Education and Welfare Department.

Year	Non-soc. security expenditures (billions)	Percent of increases for 3 years
1970	\$29.0	
1971	34.5	
1972	38.6	49.6
1973	47.4	

Source: 1. Office of Research and Statistics, Social Security Administration—Department of Health, Education and Welfare

2. Treasury Department, each year ends June 30 (data preliminary)
Published in "THE WORLD ALMANAC and book of facts" 1972 and 1974 editions.

Published Annually by
NEWSPAPER ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION

The above expenditures do not include State, Local and other Federal expenditures for welfare which are increasing more rapidly than Federal expenditures (Figure 2, page 7, State and Local Debt).

Conclusions

Welfare cost are increasing at a tremendously rapid pace. Based on current minimum wage levels, often times it is more advantageous to join the welfare rolls, rather than work for or below the minimum wage rate. In 1973, a Congressional bill to raise the minimum wage to \$2.20 an hour by July 1, 1974 was vetoed. This action is in contradiction to the poverty levels as established by several government agencies.

Laws that favor one man or group of men at the expense or sacrifice of another man or group of men are self destructive. It may appear to work through the use of force, but it is temporary for you cannot control the minds of men and it is evil to try and do so. The sure way to promote evil is to take from a man by force that which he produced by the rational use of his own mind and not through the use of force or at the expense or sacrifice of another man and give it to one who did nothing to produce it. These laws promote the value code "FROM EACH ACCORDING TO HIS ABILITY—TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS NEEDS". Under this value code eventually everyone is creating NEEDS and there are no producers for the Government to control by force and, therefore nothing to distribute to satisfy the NEEDS.

These big increases in government expenditures are a heavy burden on current and future tax payers.

PART III. DEFICIT SPENDING

Government deficit spending is a mortgage on production that does not exist, backed by government control—the use of force against those who are expected to produce it. The fiat paper money (printed as a result of deficit spending) is like a check written upon an account which does not exist. The day is drawing near when these

checks will no longer be honored and chaos will be the end result.

Government control of business and the production of the individual kills the incentive and initiative to produce and creates shortages of goods and products. This is very clear today in America and throughout the world. As a matter of fact the only thing that is plentiful and in overabundance today is debt. And this has resulted from the practice of an immoral economic policy in America for the past forty years. The greatest evil or sin a generation of people commit is to pass the debt of "folly credit" on to the next generation. The young people of today and their children must look forward to the repayment of an enormous debt heaped upon it by the current generation. *The Congress and the People better wake up, "and now", to what is taking place and restore the economic policy to a moral base.* Time is running out, as a matter of fact it might be too late now. The Government tells the people of the enormous gross national product, yet any economic "common sense" dictates, that it's not the gross that counts. . . . Its the net. If our economic policy is sound and moral . . . then why can't we live within our net and discontinue the tremendous increase in the debt (federal, state, county, municipal and private) every year.

As a matter of moral ethics, we have an obligation to the creditors, the children and future children to repay the current debt now. America and the World are living on borrowed time . . . debt always has to be liquidated, one way or the other. America has practiced Keynesian "push-pull" Government control, deficit spending economics for the past forty years. We have increased our money supply, to the point, that it has overflowed into countries which have a much smaller money supply than ours, and have generally created an economic crisis throughout the World. John Maynard Keynes when pressed for moral justification of his economic theories would only answer, *"what difference does it make about the debt . . . in the end we are all dead anyway", but this is not true . . . there is the next generation and the generation after it, and more to come.* Eventually someone has to pay.

The continuing increase in the debt has created problems in the management of it. In our efforts to manage the debt, we have created Governmental Regulatory Control Agencies (at the federal, state and local levels of government) which have resulted in the perpetuation of the problem, therefore, we go from one crisis to another.

PART IV. CONCLUSIONS

For many years we have recognized the problems but have failed to recognize the cause. The problems have been compounded by the people calling for more Government controls and the Congress and the Executive branches of the Government have responded to the demands of the masses. I sincerely hope that enough of the people and the Congress will use their individual minds and think past "desire" and thoroughly analyze consequences and end results before a "complete collapse and a madness takes place in the streets and buildings of the cities and the suburbs".

The Congress should thoroughly analyze the "so called" energy crisis before it acts hastily and further compounds the problem. What about the current debt?, the rapid increase in the money supply?, the rapid increase in the cost of food and other necessities? And what about the non-convertibility which is a necessitate for foreign trade—we are in a trade war, believe it or not . . . which, if not solved soon, will lead to a world war or world depression or both. . . . Men of vision are fleeing out of paper fiat money—Just look and analyze the money markets? The energy crisis is just a result of current

and past economic policies and government controls.

What can the government and the people expect to gain by coercive threats of control by force upon the men who have produced and must continue to produce the oil and other natural resources necessary for the energy markets? Where will the energy come from when you destroy the incentive and initiative of the men who produce the energy?

Another fact of economic control is as follows: When you control prices, especially during a runaway inflation, the end result is that you curb production and availability of goods and prices move up faster. "Men nor Governments cannot control the forces of a free market". This has been proven again and again throughout the history of man.

In conclusion, I recall the words of two great Americans of the past. . . .

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves"—Abraham Lincoln

"Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth and listen to the song of that siren, 'til she transforms us into beasts. . . . Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst and to provide for it." Patrick Henry, Liberty or Death speech, Convention of Delegates, March 28, 1775.

In a final conclusion, I paraphrase, somewhat, these two great Americans and offer to you my own words.

"My eyes are open, and I can see, my ears are open, and I can hear . . . for now I know the painful truth, the death of my son, MICHAEL, resulted from a Government Controlled-Political Corrupt society, and those directly responsible have not shown nor displayed any remorse for their great injustice to MICHAEL, his family or the future of America. How many, before and after, MICHAEL must die . . . before American eyes and ears are opened, so their minds can know this terrible truth and provide for its resolution. Let us all resolve 'to open our minds' to the truth and dedicate ourselves to the resolution, that MICHAEL and all the others shall not have died in vain." James H. Frye.

TO INSURE THAT IRS MAKES PROMPT REFUNDS AND PAYS PROPER INTEREST

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in cosponsoring a bill which would require the Internal Revenue Service to pay refunds within 30 days to those who file their income tax returns prior to March 1 or pay interest on any refund due a taxpayer.

Under present law, the IRS has until June 1 to pay a tax refund regardless of when the tax return is filed. After June 1, the IRS is required to pay 6 percent interest if the refund has not been paid by that date.

The bill I have cosponsored would encourage taxpayers to file tax returns early and it would encourage IRS to make refunds early. Taxpayers are properly impatient when they file their returns very early in the year and then find themselves waiting by the mailbox for days and weeks until the refund comes. Those who file early should be able to have their returns processed at once and refunds paid promptly.

This bill also would enact a safeguard to the taxpayer against the possibility IRS would, in error, pay him a refund when none is due. Under present law, IRS can and does, frequently erroneously, pay a taxpayer a refund. The taxpayer, thinking the refund is properly his, will cash the check. Not until later does he learn that IRS made an error and that he owes the Government, not only the amount of the refund, but interest on the refund. This is wrong.

This bill would require IRS to state in writing why a refund is being made and why that refund is being paid in an amount different from the taxpayers figures. With this information, the taxpayer will be able to judge whether or not IRS is at error. This warning will enable him to contact IRS before cashing the check, thus avoiding paying interest on a government mistake.

I believe these provisions of this bill will help protect the taxpayer from having to pay for someone else's errors and it will give him his proper tax refund at the earliest possible moment.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 188, H.R. 9783, H.R. 12574 AND H.R. 12575

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H.R. 188, H.R. 9783, H.R. 12574, and H.R. 12575, bills to protect the constitutional rights and privacy of individuals in the dissemination of criminal justice information.

My subcommittee began work in this area more than 2 years ago, and I am well aware of the urgent need for legislation in this area. Hopefully, from these hearings the necessary legislation will emerge.

Thus, hearings on this vital subject matter will commence on February 26, 1974, at 10 a.m., in room 2141 of the Rayburn House Office Building. Attorney General William B. Saxbe has been invited to testify on this date.

Additional hearings will be held at which time we will receive testimony

from: FBI Director Clarence Kelley; Donald Santarelli, Administrator of LEAA, Department of Justice; and O. J. Hawkins, Director, Project Search.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their request to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

NEVADA WINNER IN ESSAY
CONTEST

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a speech made by Miss Wende J. Wilkins of Zephyr Cove, Nev., in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest. Miss Wilkins' speech is the winning entry for the State of Nevada:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Wende J. Wilkins)

A few years ago a construction worker, fighting his way home on the Los Angeles freeway, noticed a Cadillac pulled off on the side with the hood raised and a lone woman standing beside it. The man passed, but suddenly on an impulse he pulled off the freeway and backed up. Tears of relief filled her eyes when he agreed to drive the woman to the hospital. The next week when a new color television set was delivered to him, the construction worker protested because he had neither ordered nor could afford one, but the delivery men suggested he read the attached note: "Thank you for giving me a few minutes of your life, so I could be with my husband the last minutes of his life." It was signed, Mrs. Nat King Cole.

Here is the sense of responsibility that I profess. Shakespeare said it, too, when he wrote: "To thine own self be true and thou canst not then be false to any man."

My task can be put briefly and simply: It is to clarify the principles I really mean to live by and then live by them. This task, my responsibility as a citizen, can be summed up in one word—Integrity. Four aspects of my responsibility are to accept my obligations, to live by my standards, to love my fellow citizens, and to believe in my country.

Accepting my obligations includes my responsibility to enrich my mind to its fullest by remaining well-informed and by educating my self to my best ability. Growing as a good citizen is creating a responsible adult.

Living by my standards requires the personal qualities of moral strength to establish and strive for my own goals. Developing a strong character entails more than just living by my personal values; it is also the ability to make the right choice.

Loving my neighbor is an attitude of respect for the opinions and lifestyles of my contemporaries. To respect my fellow men, I must first respect myself. By concentrating on correcting my own faults, rather than those of others, by maintaining a charitable attitude toward all, and by assessing and understanding the needs of friends, I am better able to assist in my community and to work successfully with my fellow man.

Believing in the government revolves around the principles of keeping abreast of the issues on all levels, comprehending facts, and serving my country as a voter to create a better country, a nation to be proud of and in which to believe.

Integrity—maintaining my obligations, living by my personal goals, loving my neighbors, and believing in my country—my responsibility.

What I have been saying is that my responsibility as a citizen all boils down to being a worthwhile person. I may not end our nation's problems; I don't expect to; but I can begin, and we all must begin somewhere.

CAREY OF NEW YORK DISCUSSES
HEMOPHILIA LEGISLATION

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, which I have the honor of chairing, will be conducting hearings this year on the development of a national blood policy—a policy that will be designed to facilitate the more complete and efficient utilization of this extremely vital national resource.

Fascination with developing a responsible and responsive oil production, pricing, taxing, and allocation policy seems to be pervasive today. Certainly focusing our attention and efforts on establishing a national policy to collect, process, and distribute our very life's blood, deserves the most serious and careful consideration of the Congress and the Nation.

During committee deliberations on this policy we will be receiving testimony from congressional and other witnesses, who are particularly concerned with providing hemophiliacs with chemical therapy—self-administered treatment that permits hemophiliacs to live productive and virtually normal lives.

Certain features of hemophilia legislation introduced by Representative Carey, and other Members, could very well be of substantial assistance to the committee in visualizing a treatment and distribution structure that could be applied to making operational a national blood program and policy.

Mr. Speaker, on January 21 of this year, Representative CAREY addressed a symposium sponsored by the National Hemophilia Foundation. Mr. CAREY's remarks contribute to the national discussion I believe essential in eliciting public and professional interest, comment and commitment in developing this vitally needed national blood policy. I commend Representative CAREY's remarks to the House and include them in the RECORD at this point:

STRAIGHTEN THE CHILD BEFORE HE IS BENT

I read those words the same day on which I visited with Andrew, Stephen, Suzanna, and Mr. and Mrs. Thorne. They joined me for lunch in the Capitol in mid-November of last year—the same day, incidentally, on which I introduced H.R. 11479, the House companion bill to Senator Williams' "Hemophilia Act of 1973." I trust that Dr. Gilbert, your distinguished medical director, forgives me if I use his poignant words as the *leit-motif* of my remarks to you this evening.

This audience represents not only the vanguard of our Nation's fight against the needless pain, and crippling of hemophilia; you

represent, in many ways, the very best America boasts in the fields to which you have devoted your professional lives—whether in medicine, industry, banking, communications, administration, government, education, and enlightened philanthropy. Indeed, all of you here tonight are philanthropists in the very root meaning of that composite Greek work, meaning love of one's fellow man.

But, I just remembered I'm one of your trustees-at-large, so perhaps I should cut short this tribute to us, for fear of having this talk termed political.

But, indeed, in a very real sense this talk is meant to be political. We are discussing, quite frankly, the politics of hemophilia—the politics of suffering children, broken homes, shattered futures, hopes unrealized, despair personified—and how to bring them to an end.

Our political cause is one in which we permanently remove our charges from that category, and erase from their lives the refrain, "for of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'it might have been.'"

First let's discuss the politics of the National Hemophilia Act, the legislation introduced by Senator Williams and myself. Hearings have been held on this specific legislation by the Senate health subcommittee. Many of you here tonight were present, testified, and observed the welcoming and optimistic atmosphere. Your statements were realistic, to the point, and progressive. I've read them all carefully, and seldom have I ever studied a body of inter-related testimony on one subject so well organized, delivered by the most appropriate witness, and meshed with particulars of the legislation under discussion. You hit all the points, produced your evidence and case histories, outlined the practicality and, indeed, necessity of the treatment center concept, and wound it all up with self-infusion demonstrations that showed clearly and unequivocally that preventive treatment with factor VIII is medical, humane, and economic common sense.

Further hearings before this same subcommittee are planned in the near future. I understand that the administration would like to testify, along with certain representatives of the pharmaceutical industry. Senate action on this bill could depend on the administration's attitude, and with their previous track-record in withholding funds in this and other vital health care and research areas, I hesitate to place much stock in anything positive or even neutral the administration says. I'll be surprised if we receive support and commitment. Frankly, I don't count on any. And incidentally, let me separate the sheep from the goats here.

When I speak critically of administration spokesmen in health, I do not mean the dedicated and talented men and women at N.I.H.—you who are working under very difficult administrative and budget constraints to continue the vital research and program efforts that have made the public health service and the National Institutes of Health what John Gardner called the "jewels" in the crown of H.E.W. I know what is going on out at N.I.H. I go there week in and week out for my wife, Helen's, chemotherapy treatments for cancer.

In the Congress I have spoken out on the floor, and before committees during hearings, against this administration's health care policy of "no-care" and this administration's health research policy of bold words and promises, followed by behind-the-scenes debacle. But I know the good those below the secretarial level are trying to achieve—with some success.

Here this evening are some of the magnificent health professionals from N.I.H. Keep up the good work! We in Congress are continuing the fight. And we have been able to continue funding for many vital pro-

grams like M.I.C. Pry funds loose for some new ones like H.M.O.'s, and make clear to the administration policy makers that they are unworthy of the name.

I understand how Dr. Sherman the Deputy Director of N.I.H. could resign in disgust; but urge you remaining at N.I.H. to please stick it out for all our sakes. I have a feeling that something good for health programs will be happening sometime between now and inauguration day, January 20, 1977.

Hopefully, even before that date, the Congress can turn from heading-off Mr. Weinberger's latest deprecation, and devote more time to helping develop and pass into law, new health care and research programs and making those programs we have increasingly effective and efficient.

The legislative picture in the House is also somewhat unclear. The National Hemophilia Act has been introduced now by a total of eight Members. Hearings have not yet been scheduled by Congressman Roger's Subcommittee on Public Health & Environment. The subcommittee will continue hearings on national health insurance in these next several weeks. During these hearings I hope to present testimony urging the inclusion of hemophilia coverage in whatever plan both this committee and my own committee on Ways & Means devise. Exactly what the President is thinking with regard to national health care will be presented during the upcoming state of the Union message on Tuesday, January 29th.

I am hopeful that the Health Subcommittee in the House will not wait until final Senate consideration of the bill before scheduling hearings. Chairman Rogers has indicated he will hold hearings on a national blood policy this year, during which he would receive testimony on hemophilia legislation introduced by myself and other Members.

Right now, frankly, any kind of specific prognostication on when hearings may be held, and on what subjects, is difficult. Administration plans for both a blood policy and a national health care system have been promised again and again and have not been forthcoming. I hope that we will get a preview of the administration's health care proposals. I also hope that the policy-makers meeting now on a blood policy do come up with some contributions in this vital area. But if not, the Congress can and shall move ahead. Clearly, whatever Federal leadership and recent program progress we have seen in the health care and research fields, have come from the Congress—and we shall continue with or without the cooperation of the administration.

That is the scheduling and political picture right now with regard to both hemophilia legislation and national health care. It's vague at best. But the uncertain political picture here should not deter us from pushing ahead as firmly and as effectively as we can. We can work and lobby for hearings in the House. We can urge timely Senate consideration of S. 1326. We can and must remain active in this effort.

Certainly a symposium of this stature, with such distinguished participants, serves to refocus public and congressional attention on this, our political cause. Meetings in Washington; to which you invite Health Care leaders in the Congress, can also serve as effective vehicles to get our message across. Surely, men like Doctor Tim Lee Carter and Doctor William Roy, both members of the Rogers' health subcommittee, can be enlisted in this cause—to very good effect.

This can be done. You have chapters in both their States, and have treatment centers in cities directly adjoining their congressional districts.

The best way to dramatize the problems of the disease itself is to have hemophiliacs give public witness. The best way to personalize politics is to have a respected constitu-

ent plead our case to key health care leaders in Congress. Find out who can best discuss support for the bill with these leaders. Get them to Washington, or have them meet with Congressmen when Members return to their districts. Most of us do so at least twice a month, on weekends, or during short recesses.

Getting the bill passed in the Senate will, quite frankly, be somewhat easier than in the House. But you need both and you need both this year, if we hope to have this act in operation by 1975.

The health care legislative picture is admittedly murky, but we are one organization that has a sensible, workable bill before the Congress. We know what is needed and we have it within our grasp. Let the National Hemophilia Foundation show the administration what can be done in securing health care legislation. Let the operation of the centers we envision provide both a means of alleviating the needless suffering and twisting of our children, and a demonstration of how comprehensive health care can be provided—a prototype of the structures we need and must have in order to see not only hemophiliacs receive the care which is their right; but to see that all Americans enjoy their common birthright of healthy and productive lives.

UPPER ECHELON PAYRAISES SLATED

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, numerous Members of the House have addressed the subject of salary increases for Federal judges, upper echelon, certain bureaucrats, and executive branch officials, and Members of Congress.

Recent press reports on this subject have concentrated upon the congressional aspect of the payraise, creating the impression that the Congress is eager to see this proposal pass. On the contrary, the pressures have come from the Federal judiciary and spokesmen from the bureaucracy. To demonstrate this point, I conclude my remarks with a letter from a group of U.S. District Court judges which is a good example of the communications that we have received from the Federal judiciary.

The letter follows:

UPPER ECHELON PAYRAISES SLATED

Federal judges, now slated (along with members of Congress and others) for a 7.5% pay increase in each of three successive years, have had no increases in five years. Anyone who deserves to be on the bench in this area could earn at least three or four times his current salary in private practice. While it is not suggested that judicial salaries should be comparable, the modest adjustment now proposed (still leaving us below the earnings of junior partners in law firms) seems minimal.

In these circumstances, we, the undersigned district judges, respectfully suggest that those opposing the increase do not adequately appreciate the problem as it affects the judges of the lower federal courts. If members of the Congress mean this opposition for themselves alone, the position may be different. As to judges, however, whose freedom to earn extra money is (as it should be) sharply circumscribed, there is no justification whatever for withholding the long

overdue adjustment. Salaries of judges have been frozen at 1969 levels while most federal employees have enjoyed cost-of-living increases almost annually with the result that their current compensation is approximately 30% above 1969 rates.

We take the liberty of urging, earnestly and respectfully, that you resist the efforts to veto the increase as it applies to judges.

Very truly yours,

CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITY

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the 1973-74 annual Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy Contest" in Missouri was won by a constituent of mine, Miss Sarah Seay, a student at Lebanon High School in Lebanon, Mo.

I was particularly impressed with Miss Seay's admonition to all citizens; live up to citizenship responsibilities instead of just sliding through.

I am delighted to offer Miss Seay's speech for the consideration of my colleagues. Her winning speech follows:

RIGHTS FOR RESPONSIBILITIES

Citizenship is the relation between me and the people in my home, community, nation, and world. I owe my fellow citizens allegiance in return for protection and the other advantages and privileges which come from living with them. We exchange responsibilities for rights, loyalty for liberty. For instance, I have the right to vote, and at the same time the responsibility of registering and voting. I have the right to a free education in the public schools but also the responsibility of doing my best to learn. Citizens have the right to fire and police protection and the responsibility of supporting these services by paying taxes.

Citizenship is a two-way proposition. It may apply in any group, large or small. Each of us is a citizen of our home, school, church, community, nation, and the world. With each of these we exchange responsibilities for rights, obligations for privileges.

Responsible citizenship includes more than just believing in the same ideals or principles. It is more a case of doing, putting our ideals into practice.

As an example of this I'd like to introduce you to Mr. Model Citizen. He may seem a bit extraordinary, but good citizenship, practiced every day, becomes a habit, an attitude.

Mr. Citizen obeys the law himself and helps enforce it by reporting violations. A man who hunts out of season or dumps trash along the highway is undermining the democratic idea that ordinary citizens are intelligent enough to govern themselves.

Mr. Citizen pays taxes honestly to his government, or fees to his organization, and watches whether these funds are spent wisely or not. He makes himself self-supporting to the limit of his ability. He contributes work as well as money to his home, church, and other groups to which he belongs.

Mr. Citizen protects public property and conserves natural resources, realizing that conservation means wise use as well as saving.

Mr. Citizen gets along with other people. He keeps an open mind, considering the minority opinion on a question carefully and cooperating with the majority opinion, once it is decided upon.

Mr. Citizen "promotes the general welfare"

through participation in civic, welfare, and religious groups. If every citizen would do his share in community projects, we could avoid inefficiency due to a few people doing everything.

Mr. Citizen supports the judicial system by serving on a jury when called. Not only does he vote in elections, but he votes intelligently by informing himself on issues and on the duties of the office and the qualifications of the candidate, whether the ballot is for city councilman or President.

Mr. Citizen volunteers for office when he feels he is capable of fulfilling the duties entailed; and, if elected, he serves in as full a capacity as possible. He makes constructive criticism of public affairs, avoiding idle criticisms that don't suggest any improvements.

Here it might be wise to insert a word of caution to today's Mr. Citizen. With so many avenues of participation open to us, we tend to over-involve and over-burden ourselves. Thus, instead of living up to our responsibilities, we end up sliding through them. The citizen of today and tomorrow must restrict himself to quality participation so that the standards of democracy will remain unyielding and high.

Most of all, Mr. Citizen and all responsible citizens of the world works for peace among nations and faces the future with courage and confidence in himself and his nation.

PANAMA CANAL—PART II: THE THOMSON-URRUTIA TREATY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1974, I spoke to some of the major issues confronting the United States in its current relations with the Republic of Panama. With such a complicated subject, it is impossible to cover all aspects of the problem in one floor statement and I intend, in the weeks ahead, to point to more of the issues that must be taken into consideration by our Government as it wrestles with the prospect of handling an increasingly militant and demanding military regime in Panama.

An issue neglected in my February 7 speech revolves around the treaties the United States has that involve the Panama Canal other than the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty. I did mention the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 under which the United States undertook to construct and operate the canal, and which has been accepted by all nations that use it.

Members will recall that under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between the United States and Great Britain, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for operation, regulation, and management of the canal.

The resolution I introduced on the 7th, which is in support of continued undivided U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama contained a reference to another important treaty—the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914. The pertinent portion of the resolution reads:

The Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922 between the Republic of Colombia and the United States, under which the Republic of Colombia recognized that the title to the Canal and the Panama Railroad is vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States which treaty granted important rights in the use of the Canal and Railroad to Colombia . . .

Now, I have not heard much about this treaty from the elements in the United States who are trying to steamroll the executive branch and the Congress into giving the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone away.

Perhaps they do not even know about it.

I suspect if they do, they do not even care.

In any event, if the members of this conspiracy are so concerned about "justice" as it relates to United States-Latin American relations, why are they not concerned about justice being done to Colombia, as equally as they profess to be concerned that justice be meted out to Panama?

The answer is obvious.

The real concern of these people is not justice for the Panamanians, but the wresting of the Panama Canal from the control of the United States of America—and law and justice in this case be damned.

Happily, there is one group—in addition to those of us in Congress who have bothered to review all of our treaty obligations—that has finally spoken out for the rights of the Colombians.

It is the Republic of Colombia.

And so I insert, at this point in the RECORD, for the enlightenment of those who are aware of the treaty, for the education of those who are not, and for the irritation of the canal giveaway "conspirators" who do not care, a UPI wire story out of Bogota, Colombia, which appeared in the February 13, Miami Herald entitled "Must United States-Panama Treaty Consider Colombia?":

MUST UNITED STATES-PANAMA TREATY CONSIDER COLOMBIA?

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA.—Colombian experts in international law contend that any new Panama Canal treaty between the United States and Panama will be illegal if it doesn't take into account Colombia's Canal rights.

The legal experts, many of them present or former government officials have urged the Colombian administration to lodge a formal protest with U.S. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger at the Western Hemisphere foreign ministers meeting in Mexico City that starts Feb. 21.

In a declaration of principles Kissinger last week signed in Panama City, the United States promised to turn the canal and the rights to charge tolls over to Panama eventually.

Colombia, however, enjoys permanent free passage through the canal and free transport on the Panamanian railroad passing through the Canal Zone under a separate treaty—the Urrutia-Thompson treaty—with the United States signed in 1914.

Construction of the Panama Canal began early in the 20th century when Panama was not yet an independent country. The area was then part of Colombia.

A former Colombian foreign minister said that Colombia will not be "judicially or morally" bound by any new U.S.-Panama Canal treaty which does not recognize Colombian rights to Canal passage.

Diego Uribe Vargas, a Colombian interna-

tional law professor, said, "The United States cannot give away what does not belong to it."

Carlos Holguin, former Colombian ambassador to the Organization of American States, said Colombia's position is "perfectly clear because it has a perfect treaty with the United States, ratified by both countries, which is an obligatory norm under international law and gives Colombia rights which are not limited by time.

"Colombia has repeatedly expressed its opinion that Colombian rights must be taken into account in any negotiations between the United States and Panama," Holguin said.

AMERICA, HOME AND COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, today, when we hear the complaint that our youth are forgetting our great heritage as Americans, it was most refreshing to visit the Immaculate Heart of Mary School in Indianapolis on Monday, February 18 when the Exchange Club of Indianapolis presented the Freedom Shrine to the school.

I had the honor of presenting the awards for the winning speeches given by these eighth grade pupils, entitled: "America, Home and Country."

The attitude and bearing of these pupils was in inspiring sight. I include in the RECORD the speeches given by Kristin Miller who won first place and John Dillon who won second place:

AMERICA, HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Kristin Miller)

America as a country is quite a place to live. It's a great country. An English visitor when asked what she thought of America replied, "Super."

What are the reasons for this? The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights have a lot to do with it. After all, we needed something to base our country on and these were the best efforts of the best men of our young country.

These are important documents. They all give us, the people, rights and liberty in this country. They keep us from the hazards of a dictatorship or a monarchy. They explain our democratic government.

But documents can't make and run a country. That's where the people come in. They make a country what it is and what it isn't, in the way of ecology, wealth, industry and government.

After all, "a people depend on their country and a country depends on its people."

Now I would like to express my thoughts in an original poem entitled, "America, My Home and My Country":

"AMERICA, MY HOME AND MY COUNTRY"

I want to see ink on my fingers
I want to have writers cramps in every
knuckle.

I want to hear the presses rolling
I want to close my eyes and see well informed
people and to say I helped make this
home of mine a great country.

I want smell the sweet, wet earth
I want to feel the sweat running down my
face

I want to have blisters on every finger.
I want to feel the hard kernels of corn in my
hands.

I want to close my eyes and see well fed people and to say,
I helped make this home of mine a great country.

AMERICA, HOME AND COUNTRY
(By John Dillon, Second Place)

America the land of plenty. Endless forests for wood. Sparkling lakes for fish. Rich ground for crops. This is America. No, this was America.

This was the America my father and his father studied in their history books. Our class is not so sure it is endless.

The forests have been cut. The lakes are polluted. The land once used for farms now is covered with houses.

We now talk not of the land of plenty, but the land of shortages! Shortages of gasoline. Shortages of oil. Shortages of wheat.

I want our country to become the land of plenty again. Is this possible? I say it is.

We must plant new forests. We must clean up our lakes. We must save our food.

I prefer sending our wheat to Indianapolis, not to Russia. Our first duty is to our home, America. We have tried too long to solve the problems of the world. In doing this we have neglected the problems of our homes.

America will soon celebrate its two hundredth birthday. I think we should have a new "Spirit of '76." The Spirit of 1976, for America, for home, for country.

ACCEPTING A BIT OF
UNPOPULARITY

HON. DEL CLAWSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star-News of February 18 contained a column by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick dealing with an issue of vital importance to U.S. security. As always, Mr. Kilpatrick approaches the problem with sound commonsense. At this point in the RECORD, I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

ACCEPTING A BIT OF UNPOPULARITY
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Formal negotiations will get under way in the next few weeks or months between the United States and Panama, looking to the drafting of a new treaty that would put an end to U.S. possession and control of the Panama Canal. By the end of this year, a State Department spokesman has said, an agreement should be ready to present to the Senate.

But if the Nixon administration succeeds in marching this treaty to ratification, it will be over the dead body, metaphorically speaking, of Pennsylvania, Congressman Daniel J. Flood. The gentleman from Wilkes-Barre has been sounding Catonian warnings on this matter for the last 15 years. He has a couple of hundred allies in the House and a substantial number of senators who agree with his view: Abrogation of the treaty of 1903 would be folly.

In my own view, Flood and his cohort are precisely right. A dozen sound reasons can be advanced for leaving the treaty undisturbed. The only argument in favor of abrogation was put forward by Sen. Edward Kennedy in a recent speech. The present treaty, he said, has embittered our relations with Panama and been an affront to every developing nation around the world. Kennedy describes the treaty of 1903 as "an embarrassing anachronism."

The senator embarrasses easily. Under the treaty of 1903, by which the United States acquired rights "in perpetuity" to the Canal Zone, our nation has poured billions of dollars into Panama. Since the canal was opened to traffic in 1914, it has been operated and maintained with scrupulous fidelity as an international waterway, freely available to the ships of the world. Doubtless a new treaty would have some advantage for Panama. What possible advantage would it have for us?

The eight principles that would underlie a new treaty were set forward in the agreement signed in Panama Feb. 7 by Secretary Kissinger. These begin with outright abrogation of the 1903 treaty. The concept of perpetuity would be eliminated. At the end of some fixed period of years, all United States jurisdiction would be terminated, and Panama would assume total responsibility for operation of the canal. Meanwhile, Panama would participate in administration of the canal, and the United States now and hereafter would continue to pay the expenses of maintenance and operation.

These are principles—for what? In Flood's view, they spell sellout and surrender. In return for its enormous investment, the United States gets nothing. In place of the canal's stable and orderly administration over these past 60 years, the United States wins the prospect of Communist domination.

To be sure, if the proposed new treaty were ratified, Panama no longer would be embarrassed. That is delightful, is it not? The people of Panama would be happy. Their leftist dictatorship would be pleased. The Soviet Union, now the first naval power in the world, would be ecstatic. But how in the name of common sense did these felicitous objectives come to policies of the Nixon administration?

Great powers, if they would remain great powers, have to accept a measure of unpopularity. They cannot survive as everybody's chum. Senator Kennedy imagines that in today's world "nations relate to each other on a basis of equality." It is not so. Such equality may exist in the kindergartens of the United Nations, where everyone plays make-believe, but it is no part of the real world.

It seems highly unlikely that two-thirds of the Senate could be mustered to consent to a treaty of sellout. The House itself may have to be reckoned with; it shares with the Senate the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

It will be some time before the canal changes hands. Meanwhile, suppose we look to the canal's defenses and keep the old powder dry.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 56th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. On that date in 1918, at the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence and formed a free government. For the next 20 years, Lithuania knew peace and freedom. It was a prosperous time for the Lithuanian people and there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture.

During World War II, Lithuania suf-

fered the aggression of both Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. In August 1940, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. formally incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Union in 1944. But once under the Communist regime, Lithuania was subjected to continuing foreign domination. It is a credit to our Government that the United States has not, and will not, recognize this subjugation by the Soviet Union.

Although the area of *détente* is here, we can ill afford to forget the millions of people around the world deprived of personal freedom and national independence. On the 56th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is appropriate that we renew our support for the Lithuanian people and their right to self-government and individual freedom.

HEARINGS ON THE PROBLEM OF
COURT-ORDERED BUSING OF
SCHOOLCHILDREN

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 20, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT J. HUBER

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate having the opportunity to testify here today. I commend the Committee for holding hearings on the controversial issue of busing and hope that some good will result from it.

The real issue behind the busing furor is not, as some of its advocates would have us believe, busing per se. The issue at hand is actually who is going to control the education of the child, the parents or the State? And if you think this is far fetched, let me assure you that it is not. Last year, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission put out a booklet entitled "Your Child And Busing". In the pamphlet, the Commission goes to some lengths to reassure parents that forced busing is actually beneficial to their children and that any fears the parents have are misguided. One of the arguments made in favor of forced busing is:

Clearly, parents cannot on their own make the final decision about where to send their children for public schooling.

I, for one, do not find it particularly reassuring to know that one government agency doesn't think the American parent has the native intelligence to decide what is in their own child's best interest. It is precisely this elitist and condescending attitude by the Federal government that has brought about the current widespread hostility and distrust of the U.S. Congress, and all government in general. If we are to regain the public's confidence, we must do all that we can to return as much power as possible to the people. And one giant step forward would be for Congress to propose a Constitutional Amendment that would put an end to this travesty of forced busing.

I would hope that most Members of Congress are aware of the Gallup Poll released last September (1973). In that poll, it was shown that 95% of the American public opposes forced busing. Additionally, the President and countless Members of Congress have taken a stand against forced busing. So the

question remains, why do we still have forced busing? I cannot answer, but I do know that I am extremely disappointed that the Executive branch has not given much more than lip service to the problem. And I am also disappointed that the two bodies of Congress cannot seem to reach any mutual agreement on this subject. The result of this reluctance is that more and more courts are usurping our authority as legislators and thus breaking down our Constitutional separation of powers.

It is a further tragedy that these courts are acting in a manner that is directly contrary to the law of the land. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 says that "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." It further states that "... nothing herein shall empower an official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve racial balance." Obviously, the courts are clearly ignoring the intent of Congress with respect to the forced transportation of students. And yet, we refuse to act. I am, however, greatly encouraged by this Committee's decision to hold hearings on this matter. It gives me hope that this Congress may yet take some action to resolve the forced busing controversy.

There is only one action, though, that can put an end to this chaos, and that is for Congress to vote out a proposed Constitutional Amendment that would have the effect of banning forced busing. This is the best and most feasible method of stopping the court's constant subversion of our intent with respect to the busing issue.

Many of those who promote forced busing say they are doing so in order to insure that students are receiving "equal educational opportunities" because everyone is entitled, under the 14th Amendment, to "equal protection of the law." This thinking ignores a 1973 ruling by the Supreme Court wherein they stated that "education is not within the limited category of rights recognized by this Court as guaranteed by the Constitution." If that is the case, then I sincerely believe that new laws abolishing forced busing could be passed by the Congress and found Constitutional by the courts. Nevertheless, there is some risk in that approach for it has become exceedingly difficult to judge just exactly what the courts are going to hold Constitutional. The safest route is, obviously, the Constitutional Amendment.

Further, many sociologists argued that giving minorities the same "equal educational opportunities" as others would improve the minority's learning skills and improve their educational achievements. There are two problems with this type of thinking. First, saying that members of a minority race can only benefit by associating with members of a majority race is blatantly racist and I do not condone such thinking. Of course, I do recognize that many of these sociologists are sincerely trying to promote a common "good" rather than foster further racial antagonisms. What people often overlook in our society is that there is often more evil done in the name of good than one imagines. In other words, the ends justify the means—a philosophy to which I do not subscribe—for there is no justification, ever, to imposing something that is wrong in order to achieve what one thinks is a worthwhile goal.

The second problem with the sociologists' and the courts' thinking is their absolute refusal to look at the results now that we have had several years of busing in some areas. I think it is worth noting what has happened in these communities. Jeffery J. Leech, writing in Volume 6, Number 4 (1973) of the Indiana Law Review, points out that,

"In every city studied, busing failed to reduce the gap between black and white achievement. In fact, most cities reported that the achievement gap had grown even larger after busing. Scholars who have reviewed the evidence, including Armor, Bell, Edmonds, Glazer, and St. John, have concluded that busing has little, if any, effect on the academic achievement of either black or white children. Thus, the most recent sociological evidence fails to confirm a basic premise underlying the rationale for court ordered busing; i.e. that it will positively affect the academic performance of minority children."

So, since the hoped for goals of forced busing have not been achieved, I cannot comprehend why some persist in clinging to the myth that forced busing of students will bring about an "equal education."

The noted professor of Education and Social Structure at Harvard, Nathan Glazer, hit the nail on the head when he wrote in an article entitled, "Is Busing Necessary?": "The crucial point is: do Federal courts have the right to impose a school policy that would deprive local communities and groups, white and black, of power over their schools?"

And the truth of the matter is that there is, via court imposed forced busing, a dangerous trend towards taking more and more power away from the people and centralizing it in the ever burgeoning bureaucracy. The tragedy of the situation is that we, the Congress, will now have to amend the Constitution to insure that the people retain their constitutional rights. I urge you to move as swiftly and prudently as possible, for time is of the essence. In the meantime, forced busing is rapidly chipping away at one of our most precious freedoms; the freedom of choice.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to your attention the problem involving the school district of Ferndale, Michigan. HEW investigated this school to determine whether or not to continue certain aid programs. The hearings which were conducted were of the kangaroo court type. It is unbelievable to imagine a situation in which bureaucrats take upon themselves powers never intended by the Congress. The investigating team of HEW violated all of the ethical procedures present in normal courtroom hearings. I am submitting for your further consideration a report in the local Ferndale paper giving a little information on this despicable situation. I hope that you and your Committee, or possibly a staff representative, would investigate firsthand this Ferndale situation. The bill you have described which would make it illegal for HEW to use its funding powers to intimidate school districts until they are brought to their knees would have adequate book, chapter and verse facts from the Ferndale situation to secure necessary support in both Houses of Congress. I hope you will read this article carefully and closely:

A COWARD'S WAY OUT

(By Mary Klemanski)

It is still possible to fight City Hall. But fighting a National Government determined to "make an example" of a specific northern school system looks like a doomed—and crippling battle.

It has been more than a week since we received word that Federal Examiner Horace Robbins found the School District of the City of Ferndale guilty of racial discrimination—in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI.

Bluntly, the School Board was ordered to desegregate Grant School's all black pupil population.

Actually, both the junior and senior high schools have always been integrated; and several elementary schools are integrated, where neighborhoods are integrated.

To members of the community who con-

sistently attended hearings, the adverse disposition came as no surprise. It seemed to many of us that the Government of the United States of America—through its Department of Health, Education and Welfare—had condescended to grant us the mechanics of a hearing, immediately prior to finding us guilty.

Like the western sheriff, HEW assured Ferndale Schools we would not be hanged until after the trial.

The approach used during testimony was a "scattergun" method of hitting the entire community with as many accusations as possible. Apparently, Chief HEW attorneys Roderrick Potter and Edward P. Levy hoped at least some accusations would remain in the record.

Final briefs on the hearings, totaled 57 pages—mute testimony to the success of this scattergun attack. Included in the record were such matters as zoning practices in the cities of Oak Park and Ferndale; restrictive covenants in land titles; and land annexation by the City of Ferndale from Royal Oak Township (the Ethyl Corporation property on Eight Mile and Pinecrest). Perhaps HEW's contention that these things point to a "Pattern of discrimination" is true. It is generally agreed that there was some discrimination 40 years ago. There still is—on both sides.

However, the main body of HEW testimony regarded civic matters over which members of the School Board—past or present—had no control. It was, and is, irrelevant to the issue. Yet it stands in the record.

School Board Attorney Burton R. Shifman—an able lawyer, engaged in a battle with as many as seven government counselors during the course of a day—repeatedly reminded them it was HEW's job to prove its allegations.

"I'm making these charges," Potter once said. "You will have your chance to prove the district is innocent—if you can."

"This," exploded Shifman, "is still the United States of America. The district is to be presumed innocent unless you can prove it guilty."

Several times Examiner Robbins said he would allow the HEW some "latitude." He would make a determination later as to whether or not the testimony would be allowed to remain in the record.

"This is not only latitude," Shifman stormed—"but longitude as well—encompassing the boundaries of the entire United States of America, and based on this man's opinion. The School District of the City of Ferndale has been charged. Can we not confine our testimony to the activities in that area?"

"The goddess of justice is blind," he expounded. "When we allow the opinions of many to be entered in evidence as fact, then her blindfold is removed. I am interested in the truth. Truth is fact—not opinion."

The testimony of Mrs. Anna Eaton Thomas, who had stated she never objected to Royal Oak Township children attending Jefferson School was refuted with documentation.

Shifman produced a Circuit Court document asking for an injunction to prevent the 1925 School Board from sending Royal Oak Township children to Jefferson School, "which . . . is at least one and one half miles from . . . the homes of (the) petitioners," Mrs. Thomas complained.

Circuit Court Judge Glenn C. Gillespie dismissed the suit, but the point is, Mrs. Thomas, and others in the Township expressed dissatisfaction with Jefferson School, and asked their children either be sent to Ridgewood School (vastly overcrowded) or for construction of a school of their own in the Township. Yet, her testimony was that Township residents resented the construction of Grant School. Shifman's request to have her testimony stricken from the record was denied.

So it went.

It would be pointless—and false—to deny that bias existed 40 years ago. The United States of America—and hopefully, Ferndale is still part of it—is the only nation in the world's history that has attempted to encompass every race, religion, and culture in one unit. It is a monumental experiment in human understanding, and hasn't always succeeded. It may yet fail. Racial bias—and all bias—is something we must fight, constantly.

At this point, Mrs. John Hambrick is suggesting a vote of the electorate to determine a means of integration of all schools. She may be right. We may have to comply with HEW orders to integrate Grant School—even though we know it won't improve education, nor race relations.

It may seem like the cowardly way out—but how long is this small School District supposed to fight the kind of power we have seen brought to bear against it?

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE FISHING INDUSTRIES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our Nation's fishing industries is indeed critical. Productivity in the industry has declined, while, at the same time, consumption of seafood has increased. As a result, there is a serious impending shortage of seafood.

The National Commission on Productivity published a pamphlet which points out the gravity of this problem and the immediate need to establish research and development projects.

I insert that publication in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Man has harvested the fruits of the sea almost since the very beginning of mankind itself. Since that time we have considered the wealth of the seas to be free and inexhaustible resources—just there for the taking. The sea was a limitless "farm" from which we could reap many crops without ever having to sow or even cultivate them. As the world's population increased so did the amount of fish, shellfish and crustaceans which were harvested. Indeed, the total world catch of seafood more than doubled between 1950 and 1970, expanding from 18.1 million metric tons to 42.8 million metric tons. During the same period the world's population increased by only 46 percent. There has seemed to be no limit to the bounty of the sea.

However, it is increasingly apparent that this rate of increase cannot continue. The maximum sustainable yield, i.e., the most fish which can be harvested without depleting the breeding stock, is being reached or even surpassed for the desirable and even some of the less desirable species. We are rapidly approaching a time when we will have to make conscious decisions to increase the supplies of seafood or else be prepared to accept limited consumption. This problem has already confronted the fisheries industry in the United States. During the same period in which the world catch of fish was increasing, our domestic catch of edible seafood has actually been decreasing. The total domestic catch of edible seafood in 1950 was 1.5 million metric tons; the figure for 1972 was 1.0 million metric tons.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRODUCTIVITY

In light of this problem of decreasing domestic catches of seafood, productivity in the fisheries industry assumes an importance it has never held before. Productivity for this industry can be defined in three basic ways. First, the amount of seafood harvested by an average fisherman during a year's work gives a major indication of how productive this industry is. For example, if he now harvests less fish than he did 20 years ago, for the same amount of effort, then his productivity has decreased.

The second measure of productivity in this industry is the amount of capital which it is necessary to invest to harvest a given amount of seafood. If the average fishing vessel operator used to be able to harvest 27 tons of seafood per year with an investment of \$50,000, but now must invest \$100,000 simply to maintain the 27 ton harvest, then the productivity of his capital has been halved. Third, we can consider the productivity of a given area of the sea. For example, the number of pounds of blue crabs harvested annually per acre of the Chesapeake Bay is an important measure of how well we are utilizing that area.

These then are the three major ways of measuring the productivity of the fisheries industry. And if the available data and information are examined, it quickly becomes apparent that our fisheries performance by all three measures has been declining at a time when such performance can be least afforded.

The figures for man-year productivity accurately reflect the overall decline in production of seafood which the U.S. has experienced. Following a period of steady improvement in the 1950's and early 1960's, man-year productivity decreased by 20.2 percent between 1962 and 1971. In other words, in 1971 it took six man-years of work to harvest the same amount of fish brought in with five man-years of work in 1962. Maine lobsterman, for example, now use three times as many lobster traps to catch the same number of lobsters as before. These extra traps mean more time and money expended.

Although similar hard data on the productivity of capital in this industry are not available, some observations can be made. While the annual catch of seafood has remained fairly stable during the past 7 years, the costs for many types of fishing vessels have doubled during that period. In 1965 an average-sized tuna vessel cost approximately \$1 million; a tuna fishing vessel operator can now expect to pay about \$2 million. In addition the introduction of such technological advances as sonar and other fish locating devices, as well as improved nets and other harvesting improvements, have substantially increased the capital investment which our commercial fishing vessel operators must make. The productivity of the capital employed in this industry has declined.

It is even more difficult to try to assess the productivity of a given area of the sea. However, weekend fishermen from Sheephead Bay on Long Island, to Panama City, Florida, to San Diego, California, know that they now travel farther from shore to catch the same amount, or less, of fish. Commercial fishermen have also experienced this. New England ground, or bottom, fish fisherman must now fish a larger area for longer periods, and they still have trouble maintaining their catch of the desirable ground fish such as cod, haddock and flounder. The productivity of the closer-in areas has declined.

THE U.S. BITE OUT OF WORLD SEAFOOD PRODUCTION

While the productivity and production of the U.S. fishing industry has declined, the consumption of seafood has increased steadily. In 1960 we ate 1.94 million metric tons of seafood; in 1970 we consumed 2.82 million

metric tons—an increase of almost 45 percent. Because our production of seafood was only 1.15 million metric tons in 1970, it is obvious that we had to buy the rest from other countries.

In fact we imported 59.9 percent of our seafood in 1971. In 1950 we imported only 23.4 percent of it. Although the U.S. is less than 6 percent of the world's population and catches about 2.5 percent of the total world catch of seafood, we consume about 7 percent of the world's seafood production. The American appetite for seafood is further illustrated by looking at our consumption of the more desirable species. In 1970 we ate: 66 percent of the world lobster catch, 60 percent of the clam, 79 percent of the scallop and 43 percent of the world tuna catch.

We like our seafood and have been willing to pay the prices for it in the world market. This willingness to pay, however, led to a seafood trade deficit of approximately \$1.1 billion in 1972. That is, we imported \$1.1 billion more of seafood than we exported. This area alone accounted for one-fifth of our total balance of trade deficit in 1972. While not a new situation—in 1950 we had a seafood trade deficit of \$139 million—it is a worsening one. Improvements in our fishing industry could have a positive effect on our trade balance.

PRICES

Another result of the rising demand in the face of a fixed supply has been rapid price increase for fish, especially since 1960. Fish used to be an inexpensive meat substitute, but in the last several years many species of fish have increased in price so rapidly that they have risen above beef prices. For example, in 1960 chuck roast sold for around \$.62 per pound and frozen haddock fillets were about \$.56 per pound. By 1973 the price per pound for the chuck roast had risen to \$1.01 while the price per pound for the haddock had more than doubled, reaching \$1.21.

As we have become more affluent and populous, our demand for all types of food has increased rapidly. And, although the prices of all foods have risen substantially in the last several years (19.2 percent between 1968 and 1972) the prices of seafood have risen twice as fast (39.7 percent during the same period). While farm foods have benefited from the steady increase of agricultural productivity which has helped offset the rapid increase in demand, the productivity of the fisheries industry has not performed as well. On an annual average, productivity in agriculture increased by about 7 percent a year between 1960 and 1971. In the fisheries industry, productivity declined by about 2 percent a year during that time.

But the rest of the food industry is not faced with the problem of trying to meet soaring demand from a fixed supply base. If demand for wheat goes up, the farmers can always plant more wheat (though it may take a while for this supply increase to have an effect on the market). Fishermen, at least at this time, have no such option.

Thus, our fishermen are working harder, investing more and producing less. The results have been ever-increasing reliance on imports and rapidly increasing prices. One major problem is supply. It is harder to harvest fish because there is less to harvest—less, that is, of the species we like and less in our coastal waters. There are two basic approaches to solving this problem of increasing the supplies of seafood: first, there is the exciting potential of mariculture, the cultivating of shrimp, lobster, salmon and other species in controlled environments in order to increase their survival rates; second, we can begin to explore ways of expanding consumer acceptance through market development for other species which are currently underutilized.

The second major problem is the existence of inefficient practices in the fishing indus-

try, most of which are forced upon it by government regulation. A new look is needed at all regulations which promote such inefficiency.

BARRIERS

Standing between us and the solutions of the productivity problems of the fishing industry there are at least 4 barriers:

1. Anyone can fish the seas, and there are no requirements that those who deplete the supplies of fish make any contribution toward replenishing those supplies. Under such conditions, it makes little sense for private individuals to invest their time and/or money in increasing the supply of something which everyone has an equal right to harvest.

2. The fishing industry consists, for the most part, of small independent fishing vessel operators, more than 90 percent of whom employ less than five people. This means that there is little opportunity for capital accumulation and that achieving coordination among these operators is extremely difficult.

3. Some states have laws discouraging or prohibiting the use of equipment, which could increase the efficiency of fishing operations. These laws were enacted to prevent overfishing certain species, and this concern is shared by many fishermen themselves.

4. There are Federal import barriers which substantially increase the costs of the necessary equipment of our domestic commercial fishing vessel operators.

The first two barriers are closely related because the existence of a large number of small fishing vessel operators is due to the fact that the fish or the sea are basically a free resource. Thus, there can be no real resolution of the second barrier until the first has been overcome. In fact, only by overcoming the first barrier will we be able to achieve a final, long-term solution to all the productivity problems of the fisheries industry. These other three barriers, however, stand between us and many important, short-term productivity improvements, and are, therefore, deserving of attention.

The first barrier means that it is impossible to obtain a commensurate return on an investment in the development of seafood supplies.

For example, suppose that all the fishermen in Gloucester, Massachusetts banded together and pooled their resources in a common effort to increase the supply of cod fish off their shore; they could not expect to benefit more from this effort than others who fish in their area. The fruits of their efforts might well be harvested by the fishermen from another port along the coast or even from another country.

It is idle to expect the industry to invest in projects such as those to improve the supply of fish when there is little hope that there will be a fair return on their investment. But even if a reasonable chance for a fair return did exist, the second barrier, the low amount of capital available to this industry, due to its fragmented nature, means that few, if any, of the members of the fishing industry could make the necessary investments. This also applies to some portions of the processing and marketing segments of the industry. And it is they who will have to develop the new product forms and consumer acceptance necessary to bring about more use of underutilized species.

The fragmented nature of the industry also hinders increasing our supplies by exploiting these underutilized species. Because few fishing vessel operators could make the necessary investments to develop the locating and harvesting techniques for these species, industry-wide cooperation amongst them is necessary. The fragmentation of this industry into very small companies mitigates against this. Even more important, however, it would be necessary for product form development and significant consumer acceptance to be achieved before it would

make sense to develop the locating and harvesting techniques. Thus, industry-wide coordination is required, and the mechanisms to induce such coordination do not now exist.

The third and fourth barriers affect costs rather than supplies, but the additional costs incurred by fishing vessel operators due to them are substantial. There is never any guarantee that lower operating costs will be passed on to the consumer in the form of lower prices. Lower operating costs will, however, allow the fishing industry to employ its capital more productively, and this could help alleviate part of the problem in barrier 2, the low degree of capital accumulation in the fishing industry.

Barrier 3 concerns cost savings which are impeded by laws regulating the type of equipment which can be utilized. These cost savings are substantial and would have a positive effect on the industry. For example, one mid-Atlantic state permits oysters to be harvested only by sail boats. The state's concern that oysters might be over-harvested if more modern equipment were permitted is shared by many of the oystermen.

This joint concern demonstrates that the possibility of over-harvesting is real, but the means of dealing with it should not be to encourage inefficiency. If it is determined that the catch should be limited, then the fishermen should be allowed to harvest only a certain amount of fish in restricted areas. They could then be as efficient as possible under those limitations and thus reduce operating costs.

But this is simply a temporary measure which avoids the central problem—supply. Because of our Nation's increasing population and affluence, most seafoods will be in constantly greater demand. The ultimate answer cannot be to protect the supplies by fostering inefficient harvesting methods which increase costs. The answer will have to be a positive one—a conscious, all-out effort to increase our supplies of seafood. And in the meantime the emphasis should be on allocating the resources intelligently and not on fostering inefficiency.

The fourth barrier, that of import restrictions, also has a substantial negative effect on operating costs. One example is the tariff on foreign-made nets and netting, which is often 50 percent of their value. Because nets constitute about 8 percent of the operating costs of a vessel, a 50 percent reduction would be significant. Elimination of these tariffs could cut fishing costs by 3 to 4 percent.

Another example is the cost of the fishing vessels themselves. A U.S. fisherman may not land his catch in a U.S. port if his vessel was purchased in a foreign country. This regulation dates back to a 1793 law which was passed to protect the domestic shipbuilding industry. The costs of many types of domestically built fishing vessels have increased dramatically in the last few years. In 1965 a good sized average shrimp vessel cost around \$75,000. In 1972 that vessel cost about \$125,000. The cost differential between U.S. and foreign built vessels varies depending upon the type, but some foreign built vessels are as much as 50 percent lower in cost than a comparable vessel built in the U.S. If U.S. fishermen could purchase foreign built vessels, considerable savings would accrue to them, and this would again mean a more productive use of their capital. In addition, lower costs would encourage replacement of obsolete and inefficient vessels with more modern boats equipped with the latest sophisticated fishing gear and equipment. Until supplies are increased catches will have to be limited, but at least the fishermen will be able to harvest their quotas of fish as efficiently as possible.

A GOOD START

Some initiatives have been taken in the area of increasing the supply base. In the

United States we have had salmon hatcheries for one hundred years, and we are making significant headway in increasing the supply of salmon, especially the coho and Chinook species, which are important both to sport as well as to commercial fishing. Attempts with other species of salmon have not yet been successful, but the feasibility of such efforts has now been demonstrated and hopefully will lead to further attempts.

There have been attempts in this country to increase our lobster supplies. The State of Maine is trying to develop feasible ways of raising young lobsters to a size which will increase their chances of survival. The major problem is that lobsters are basically cannibals—a larger lobster will usually eat a smaller one, and this applies even to the very young ones. Therefore, it is necessary when trying to raise lobsters to keep them as isolated from each other as possible. Scientists are now working on the possibility of developing a less aggressive lobster, which would also grow to market weight more quickly. If these attempts are successful and lobster supplies can be increased, then perhaps the supply of this much-desired crustacean can be expanded. And then we might see the price for them, which has more than doubled between 1960 and 1970, begin to stabilize.

A full-scale commercial shrimp-farming operation was begun in 1972 by Sea Farms Inc. of Key West, Florida. After catching pregnant female shrimp, the eggs are hatched in special tanks and raised in those tanks to a pre-determined post-larval stage. When the shrimp have reached that stage, they are placed in man-made, in-land lakes which are filled with tidal water. The ponds average 25 acres in size and are stocked with several million shrimp. These shrimp are fed a high-protein diet and are harvested when they reach a marketable size (approximately 1/2 ounce). If this operation proves to be commercially successful, it could signal the beginning of a new era in mariculture.

There are also some interesting mariculture developments in other countries. Japan has been conducting experiments in estuary development which indicate a great potential in this field. An example of this is "three dimensional" oyster culture, something with which the Japanese began to experiment in the early 1930's. "Three dimensional" oyster culture consists of attaching seed oysters to long strings and hanging the strings vertically in the water. The best yields of oyster meats grown under conventional conditions—that is, on the flat sea bottom—are approximately two tons per acre per year. The Japanese, using their "3-D" method have achieved yields of up to 23.3 tons of oyster meat per acre per year.

The Soviet Union, which saw its annual catch of sturgeon drop from 24,000 tons in 1938 to 13,500 tons in 1960, now has in operation 18 hatcheries, most of which were started in 1960, along the Volga River. These hatcheries produce 50 million fingerlings each year. The Soviets are not sure of the survival rate of these fingerlings, but the annual catch of sturgeon has been growing steadily since 1960.

With regard to taking advantage of the under-utilized species in our waters, preliminary investigations show a fantastic potential. It has been estimated that there is a potential annual catch of 500 million pounds of various types of crabs which have never been fully utilized. If ways could be developed to harvest and process these red, Jonah and cancer crabs, we could practically triple our annual crab catch. And if consumer acceptance can be developed for jack mackerel, we could increase our annual catch by 1.5 billion pounds, up 20 times! If new product forms and market acceptance of quohog clams could be developed, we could double our annual catch of clams.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

All of these examples serve to show the potential which exists for expanding our seafood supplies. The surface has only just been scratched, and as yet there are no ongoing projects which have as yet materially affected our supplies. Before we can expect the fishing industry to attack this problem on a large scale, ways must be found to make it possible for an investor to receive a commensurate return on his investment.

The allocations of rights is one possible approach to this problem. If a system could be developed under which one fishing vessel operator or group of operators could be granted exclusive fishing rights to an area of the sea, then they would have an opportunity to recapture any investment made to improve the supply in that area.

It will also be necessary to encourage research and development projects jointly sponsored by several components of the industry. This will help this capital poor industry assemble the necessary capital to develop the potential of mariculture. More importantly, however, joint research and development will enable the entire industry to coordinate all facets of the development of the use of the underutilized species: locating and harvesting techniques, new product forms, and market development.

The National Marine Fisheries Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the National Science Foundation can be of great help in both areas by leading the way in research and development. Real progress, however, will only be made when the industry itself tackles these problems and to this end industry associations would be the best mechanisms for coordinating the efforts of individual segments of the industry.

Efforts are now being made to reach agreements with the rest of the world community on limiting the annual catches of those species which are currently being overfished. These agreements will be necessary until we can begin to make significant headway in replenishing the supplies of those species. An example of such an agreement is the seven-nation Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, of which the United States is a member. A total quota of yellow-fin tuna is set each year, and all harvesting of it must cease when the quota is reached. Similar rational approaches to the problem of over-fishing must be applied on a worldwide basis.

Finally, productivity improvements in this industry will require a new era of labor-management cooperation. Large oceangoing trawlers and factory ships offer the potential for significant productivity agreements. The long sea-duty which such ships require is arduous, and the U.S. fishing industry has not utilized this technique to the degree of other nations. If, through cooperative planning, new approaches can be found, then our fishing industry could afford to venture farther out in its search for new supplies.

CONCLUSION

The world is rapidly approaching a point at which it will have to make conscious decisions to increase the supply of seafood. Now is the time to make the necessary commitment to cultivate thoughtfully and carefully the fisheries of the world in general and the fisheries of the United States in particular. If we want to provide fish to our domestic consumers at a lower cost and to recapture our previous share of the market (thus lowering our trade deficit), then there has to be a marked increase in our efforts to increase seafood supplies and the efficiency with which they are harvested. Productivity must become the byword of all segments of the U.S. fisheries industry, management and labor, and of government, Federal, state and local.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, some persons who call themselves consumers with a capital "C" have arrogated to themselves power over bona fide consumers, the people of this Nation. The consumerist mystique holds that such consumers are not subject to the rules consumers and citizens must abide by. This double standard for consumers and citizens is ably illustrated in the following editorial by Mr. William K. Mollenhour which appeared recently in the *Warsaw, Ind., Times-Union*:

DOUBLE STANDARD

A discredited Spiro Agnew raised a ruckus in his heyday by calling attention to bias by the national press, paying particular attention to television commentators. Although he was attacking members of our profession, we had to agree that he had something. The fact that Agnew was less than perfect did not make his colorful denunciations any less true. You don't have to be an angel to sing "Silent Night."

One Ralph Nader and zealous members of Nader's Raiders have been in full cry after all segments of the establishment as we know it and Nader's piteous bleatings have been faithfully reported nationally whether backed by fact or not. The slightest misstep or hint of impropriety on the part of any well-known figure who could be used to make a headline, was trumpeted by the liberal intelligentsia to sell us on how decadent our society and its established leaders had become.

Oh, they had fun with the ethics of John Mitchell, the President, Erlichman, Dean and Haldeman. Night after night we have been told what unscrupulous people they were, including representatives of big business, farm and milk lobbies, the banks and just about any successful person or group. Tear them down and eat them up has been the battle cry of these 20th Century knights in shining armor. Sow distrust and disunity. Keep hammering at the same theme until government is immobilized and private enterprise shackled.

Watergate and the tapes provided fertile ground to plow. Dig, turn over the soil of America and expose the worms. To hear Nader tell it, he is about the only honest, ethical character left around to do battle for the common man. The President, as he rightfully points out, must assume responsibility for his appointees. So it follows that Nader must assume responsibility for his.

The Raiders went to court. They got their angelic hands on one of the President's tapes. It was an empty bag, containing nothing sinister, so Washington attorney William Dobrovir used the tape as an amusing bit of entertainment at a cocktail party—took a piece of evidence he had secured by court order and played it publicly to the gin-mill crowd. He then had the gall to criticize ABC reporter, David Schoumacher, for reporting his indiscretion. Reporter Schoumacher did his job. But there it ended. The commentators played it lightly once over as if it were a boyish prank. They did not hammer away, night after night, at such a breach of ethics.

Nader, who can be so holy vocal about others, didn't have much to say. He kept his head down and said almost nothing about

February 21, 1974

the incident. No one suggested attorney Dobrovir be disbarred or even censured for making a plaything out of what he had previously claimed to be a vital piece of evidence. No one dragged Nader before any committee or issued any subpoenas to try to prove culpability on Nader's part for the action of his appointee. Is there a double standard at work here?

We just wanted to set the record straight!
—W.K.M.

AUTISM AND THE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ACT

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the attached copy of the testimony I gave today before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee concerning the extension of the Developmental Disabilities Act. I believe that millions of our children who are severely handicapped need the help and attention provided under this act.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear this afternoon and present some brief remarks on H.R. 11511, a bill to revise and extend various health laws, including the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1970. I wish to talk today about Title IV of H.R. 11511, dealing with developmental disabilities.

One of my most recent exposures to some of the severe early childhood disorders was a visit to some of the private diagnostic and treatment centers in my home state of California. At one of these facilities, I had an opportunity to observe the real progress being made with the use of private funds to treat a limited number of autistic children. I thought to myself, "If only we could expand and share some of these efforts, we might change a lot of useless, unproductive lives into more hopeful and meaningful ones."

It was in this spirit that I introduced a bill last session, H.R. 8861, with nearly 70 co-sponsors, to include autism as one of the specifically named childhood disorders which would receive federal funds under the Developmental Disabilities Act. I wish to share with you some of my reasons why I believe very strongly that autism should be treated in the same way under the law as mental retardation, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy.

There seems to be little disagreement that autism is a severe disorder that manifests itself in severe disturbances in functioning and behavior. An autistic child most often looks normal—even exceptionally beautiful—but for anyone who has been around autistic children, they know looks are deceiving. These children are unable to relate to others, they treat parents as strangers, they delay in acquiring speech ability, they show severe anxiety and tension, they exhibit inappropriate emotional attitudes, feeling sad when normal people will feel happy. Many have language difficulties lasting their whole lives. Some are even mute. Moreover, many of the symptoms of autism will last throughout life, although observable almost from birth. These then are the general behavioral consequences

of the condition which we described as autism.

In the past, the debate on whether to include autism under the Act has centered around whether it is in fact a neurological disorder. I do not—and cannot—pretend that I am professionally qualified to review the medical evidence and determine that autism is a neurological condition. But I have discussed this matter with a number of very eminent and experienced child psychiatrists and neurologists all over the country, and it is their unanimous professional opinion that autism does, in fact, derive from a neurological disorder.

One of the professionals whom I contacted, Dr. Peter Tanguay of the Department of Psychiatry at U.C.L.A., put the question of neurological basis in prospective when he said:

"Ten years ago there may still have been room for doubt that autism was primarily an organic condition, but it is inconceivable today that anyone who is thoroughly familiar with the literature on autism (literature which has appeared largely in the past five or six years) could conclude other than that autism is primarily an organic syndrome. I know of almost no expert in the field of autism today who thinks otherwise. Of course, as you may be aware, it has been estimated that in Medicine it may take approximately five to ten years for newly acquired information to become common knowledge among doctors, and because of this there may be many psychiatrists, even child psychiatrists, who are not aware of the somewhat revolutionary changes which have taken place in our understanding of the nature of early infantile autism within the past half-dozen or so years."

Dr. Donald Cohen, a child psychiatrist and Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine, one of the men with whom I have consulted, was going to be here today to answer any questions the Members might have concerning the medical side of autism. Because he will not be here, I would like permission to submit his statement and some additional articles for the record on this issue.

The definition of developmental disabilities in section 408(a)(7) of the proposed bill, H.R. 11511 in effect concedes that autism is neurological in nature. However, under this definition, the Secretary is still required to make a finding that autism is "closely related to mental retardation or to require treatment similar to that required for mentally retarded individuals."

I believe on this score there is little disagreement. Objective studies by numerous investigators have clearly indicated that autistic children suffer specific language and cognitive handicaps which are essentially similar in nature to the handicaps found in other developmental disabilities. The major differences between autistic children and non-autistic retarded individuals is not that the autistic suffer from fundamentally different handicaps but that the profile of handicaps and abilities shown by the autistic child set him apart. Mental retardation is a descriptive term we use to describe those individuals who show sub-average intellectual and adaptive function originating during their developmental period. As such, well over half of all autistic children are mentally retarded and the remainder are so handicapped in certain functions as to require similar services as the retarded.

In many ways, autism is even closer to mental retardation than is epilepsy or cerebral palsy. Autistic children, for example, require the same close care and attention over a long period of time as do mentally retarded children. Autism, like mental retardation, arises on the basis of a developmental perceptual disorder, in particular, a disorder of language involving defects in comprehension and motor coordination. Fur-

ther, both autism and retardation are evident from infancy, but autism generally lasts longer, and is more common in boys. In addition, there are many similarities between them in their diagnosis and treatment. Children suffering from mental retardation or autism are presently given the same "workup" to determine the extent of their handicap. This included many biological and EEG tests, checking for epilepsy, the same IQ tests to determine their basic intellectual abilities.

Secretary Weinberger, in testifying before this Committee on March 29, 1973, declared that there was insufficient reason to exclude autism from coverage under the Act. He said:

"As you are aware, some states have wished to include services for autistic individuals. We believe that coverage should not be denied to those autistic persons who require services similar or identical to those presently provided under the Developmental Disabilities Act. Thus, we recommend that the word autism be included in the definition . . . We believe that this definitional change is consistent with the original intent of the law to deal with disabilities related to the retardation of mental development."

And last week before this Committee, Acting Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, affirmed this position when he testified that:

"Currently, autistic children, despite the fact that their disability requires treatment similar to that provided individuals with neurologically caused disabilities, are not eligible for services under the Act because authorities in the field disagree as to whether autism is neurological in character. We agree that autistic children should be covered under the Act and therefore that autism should be expressly included within the definition of 'developmental disability'."

But the most significant testimony on this question of whether to include autism came from this nation's highest mental health expert, Dr. Bertram S. Brown, Director of the National Institutes of Mental Health. In a question and answer exchange between Mr. Freyer and Dr. Brown, Dr. Brown states clearly and unequivocally that there is no rational basis for treating autism differently under the law than mental retardation, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. This was the dialogue:

Q. Mr. Freyer. "As a professional, Dr. Brown, and one experienced in the treatment of disorders of childhood, do you believe that autism should, under the proposed legislation, be afforded the same attention and treatment as mental retardation, epilepsy and cerebral palsy? Specifically, is autism similar in the complexity of health resources that is needed to treat it, the expenses, and its chronicity to warrant its being considered along with mental retardation, epilepsy and cerebral palsy?"

A. Dr. Brown. "The question is long and the answer is short. Yes."

Thus, there appears little justification under the proposed law not to include it as a specifically named condition and thereby eliminate the need for the Secretary to make a finding.

Although the Administration has recognized that autism meets the intent of the Developmental Disabilities Act, there is no indication that it is moving forcefully to define which other serious childhood disorders in addition to autism should also be included under the Act.

At the time the Administration published the proposed regulations to implement the Developmental Disabilities Act, approximately 28 of the 31 or so comments received urged the inclusion of autism and other disabilities. But the regulations as finally published deferred the question of whether or not to include autism and other disorders to "a study group for the purpose of mak-

ing a recommendation to the Department on the proposals submitted for inclusion of other conditions under the State plan."

Well, what happened to the study group's recommendation? The answer is short—nothing. Why? Because the study group was never formed. In a letter I received recently from the Secretary of H.E.W. regarding the Department's position on including autism, the Secretary stated that "the National Academy of Sciences and the National Advisory Committee of the Classification of Exceptional Children have indicated to us that the definition of 'other neurological conditions' requires more time for study." It seems that the Secretary here is trying to give the impression at least that the National Academy and the Advisory Committee made such a study and that they were uncertain of what the definition should be. But in a subsequent letter I received from Mr. Handler, the President of the National Academy of Sciences, in response to my question about the Academy's activity in this area, he revealed that no such study was ever conducted. Mr. Handler states in his letter of December 4, 1973 as follows:

"The Academy has not formally considered nor taken a position with respect to this question. In 1972 the Division of Medical Sciences of the National Research Council did discuss with staff of the Social and Rehabilitation Service (S.R.S.) of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare the possibilities of a study to be undertaken by the Academy to define "the other neurological conditions" covered by the above referred Act. At their request a proposal was submitted to S.R.S. in November of 1972 to establish a Planning Committee on Developmental Disabilities Guidelines and Policy. This proposal did not receive the approval of the Agency and we are currently not aware of further initiatives that may have been taken to resolve this matter."

Nor has the National Advisory Committee of the Classification of Exceptional Children undertaken a study of this question in relation to the Developmental Disabilities Act. Rather, it is focusing on the effects of labeling on state and Federal programs under a separate mandate. And today, there is still no study—and no finding of what other neurological disorders should be included.

Let me say that I believe this Committee has brought this country a long way towards recognizing its responsibility and opportunities to provide a full range of services to severely handicapped children. In this regard, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 marked the beginning of a national commitment toward helping handicapped children maximize the extent to which they can participate in the benefits and responsibilities of our society. This law gave us research and clinical facilities at a time when we were not even sure what services could accomplish what goals.

Then this Committee developed the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1970 which added the concept of services and training to the 1963 Act. This Federal policy shifted the public debate to talking about treating people who could not help themselves but who had a fundamental right to the benefits of our society. We also developed a great deal of understanding of the type of services needed and the way to deliver them. We were able to show that the services we can offer can significantly improve the lives of the handicapped and their families, and reduce the long-range burden on the society of having to institutionalize them.

But we are now at a crossroads. We can continue to build upon our past experiences and knowledge and insights, and to articulate a Federal policy which is coherent, rational and non-discriminatory in its treatment of the severely handicapped children of our nation.

It is understandable why groups supporting mental retardation wanted to give primary legislative attention to mental retardation in the 1970 Developmental Disabilities Act. The existing definition of other developmental disabilities is centered around the mental retardation disorder, as is the proposed definition under H.R. 11511. Concern for mental retardation was the force which gave us the 1963 mental health legislation, and it is understandable why this group wants to limit the scope of any new definition of developmental disabilities: they say there isn't enough money in the Developmental Disabilities Act as it is now to treat the mentally retarded population.

But these reasons are no basis for excluding the other groups which are trying to get included under the definition. After all, aren't these other groups trying to use some of the same intensity of purpose which the existing groups used originally to fight for their own inclusion under the Federal law? And didn't we hear ten years ago the same arguments from those who criticized any mental retardation bill, namely "that there isn't enough money to provide for a normal child and mentally retarded children must wait?"

We cannot have a Federal policy which says that severely handicapped children with one label cannot be admitted to a treatment facility while another is turned away. We cannot continue to have a Federal policy which forces a doctor to place a label on a easy to grab onto specific categorical labels child so that he can receive services. It is so as a basis for providing care to some children when, in fact, we use these categories as a justification for exclusion.

Is it proper for the Federal government to adopt a policy that says that two children propped up next to one another, both without control in their arms or legs. "This one with cerebral palsy, because his handicap comes from brain damage, gets treatment, but the other, suffering from spina bifida, because his handicap happens to result from damaged spine, doesn't qualify." The same is true for an autistic child who might get treatment, but not the one with severe developmental aphasia or some other severe learning disability.

It is for these reasons, that I believe this Committee must develop a definition of developmental disabilities which all groups, those in and those now out, including autism—feel is premised on a policy which has a rational, coherent and fair basis. If this is done, and I believe it can be, we can continue to make progress in educating the public, in promoting legislation, in obtaining the necessary appropriations, and in providing the best treatment possible for severely handicapped children.

Many groups, including the National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled, have suggested drafts of a new definition which eliminates all categorical references and focuses on a functional definition related to a medically determinable physical or mental impairment. A similar approach has been used in the definition of disability under the Social Security Amendments of 1972. The common thread running through these definitions are three criteria: (1) the severity of the handicap; (2) the chronicity, and (3) the origination of it before the individual attains the age of 18. I strongly favor such an approach as a viable substitute to the present definition.

If, however, the Committee deems it appropriate to stay with the present categorical definition, I would then recommend that it include autism after the word "epilepsy" in the definition so that it is treated by the states in the same way and given the same attention as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy. In addition, I believe past

experience has shown that it would be wise for the Committee to require by legislation the Secretary to make a study within one year to determine the feasibility of a totally non-categorical definition. This study should be done by a recognized institution—a University, the National Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Medicine, or other impartial body. In this way, when this Act expires, the Committee will have a factual basis upon which to make a decision.

SPACE ACCOMPLISHMENTS GREATLY UNAPPRECIATED

HON. JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the February 8, editorial column of Budd Boyer about Skylab III.

Mr. Boyer points out the advantages of the Space program and mentions the apathy of the major television networks which was displayed by the refusal to provide live television broadcasts of the return of the astronauts.

Mr. Boyer's column appeared in the Pompano Beach, Fla., Sun Sentinel:

SPACE ACCOMPLISHMENTS GREATLY UNAPPRECIATED

The crew of Skylab is due home today after a record-breaking 84 days in space, and with them will come much of the vast accumulation of scientific knowledge gathered during their stay.

This is the third and last of the trios to occupy the orbiting laboratory, which will be left to continue in its travels until eventually it is drawn back into the atmosphere to self-destruct.

The culmination of this great space achievement will not be seen by the public as so many have been in the past. At the time of this writing, the major television networks have opted against providing live coverage of the splashdown. At least one official was quoted as blaming public apathy for the decision, saying people have indicated in a survey that they prefer to watch soap operas.

Rep. Lou Frey, R-Fla., urged the networks through letters to the respective presidents to reconsider. As of yesterday afternoon, only one had responded affirmatively to the extent that radio coverage would be afforded.

It seems almost impossible to believe that in the short period of time since Alan Shepard rode his Freedom 7 vehicle into space in May, 1961, Americans have become so disinterested in our space program that they would place it below soap operas in priority.

There is no way to accurately calculate the assets that are regarded as spinoffs from the national space effort. From such mundane things as a no-stick liner for cooking utensils to advances in the most intricate of medical determinations, the list of space-related products for public use is virtually endless.

As one cartographer put it, "it would take me five years to calculate what can be derived in seconds from one of the pictures made by a satellite."

It will take scientists years to sort out and evaluate the data collected by the last crew of Skylab on the elusive Comet Kohoutek. None of this information could ever have been collected by Earthbound instruments. Here again, the value cannot even be estimated. If what is learned unlocks secrets

astronomers hope they will solve, benefits to mankind may flow for centuries.

By using special instruments and applying new techniques, the astronauts have greatly advanced the ability to aid agriculture through the detection of diseases that can afflict crops.

In the field of assisting in criminal investigations, space photography has located illegal drug sources and has even participated in the search for the graves of murder victims in Brevard County.

Laymen cannot, of course, fully appreciate all of the complex experiments conducted by the Skylab crews. Even the trips that landed men on the moon have been less than understood by others than scientists.

By examining material and data produced by these trips and by the probes into outer space, science may well end up with answers to questions on energy sources and find the key to predicting earthquakes, just for two examples of real potential for helping our own and other peoples.

Gerald P. Carr, commander of the mission, William R. Pogue and Edward G. Gibson will leave the space laboratory at 6:34 a.m., and with all going well are due to splash down in the Pacific Ocean at 11:17 a.m.

Prior to the departure, they will put the Skylab into a slightly higher orbit than it has followed, thus ensuring a longer orbital life.

These men will have spent 84 days in space and will have orbited Earth more than 3,300 times. It is just short of 12 years ago that the very first American manned orbital mission was completed. On Feb. 20, 1962, John Glenn took Liberty Belle 7 around Earth three times in four hours and 55 minutes.

Our prayers and wishes are with these spacemen on the homecoming this morning. They have overcome adversity and difficulty to accomplish a most demanding mission and their successful return merits major concern this morning.

THE ELECTION IN MICHIGAN HAD ITS ROOTS IN BOSTON

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Boston had much to do with the development of our basic political liberties. I am proud that she is also playing such a vital role in their restoration.

John Marttila is a constituent of mine and his firm is in my district. I am also pleased to report that other constituents of mine also contributed to the "Monday night massacre" including Becky Crawford, Charlie Kenney, Tom Kiley, Dan Payne, Dave Thorne, Tom Vallely, Janet Wadsworth, Harriet Yellen, Doug Frost, and Curt Meade.

It was a great victory.

I offer the following New York Times article for the record:

THE ELECTION IN MICHIGAN HAD ITS ROOTS IN BOSTON

(By John Kifner)

BOSTON, February 20—"An unbelievable upset," John P. Marttila was saying, with a great deal of relish, over and over again. Outside his sparsely furnished office, a pile of suitcases and a garment bag were topped by a headline in The Detroit Free Press: "The Democrat Wins Ford Seat and Calls for Nixon to Quit."

The victory Monday in one of the staunchest Republican Congressional districts in the country is the latest in a series of upsets by liberal Democrats who are managed by his consulting firm. These victories are making Mr. Marttila and his associates one of the hottest properties among the new breed of campaign technicians for hire.

The 33-year-old political consultant and his associates—young, fresh-faced, slightly long of hair—luxuriated in reviewing the campaign in which Richard F. Vander Veen, the Democrat, defeated Robert Vander Laan, the politically powerful State Senator who had never lost an election in Michigan.

The lesson from the campaign, Mr. Marttila said, is that "no Republican is going to win this year as a 'company man.'"

The victory made the track record of the consulting firm—known formally as Marttila, Payne, Kiley & Thorne—17 victories and three defeats over the last four years. Several were noble upsets, including the election in 1970 of the Rev. Robert F. Drinan, an anti-war candidate, as the first Roman Catholic priest in Congress, and the election in 1972 of Joseph R. Biden, 29 years old, as United States Senator from Delaware, the youngest member of the Senate since Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Marttila calls his organization's political technique "management-oriented." He employs specialists in polling (one of the group's strong points), fund-raising and media.

A REPUBLICAN DISTRICT

"We hit as a team, with experts in each field," he said. "It's not deceptive, it's very fundamental. Managing a campaign is making rational decisions."

Then, acknowledging that his firm was also ideological, he added with a smile: "We're sort of left-corporate."

With only six weeks until the election the firm went to work for Mr. VanderVeen for \$12,500, regarding it as an impossible longshot.

The district, centering on Grand Rapids, had been Republican property since 1910. Vice President Ford, who had held the seat for 25 years, was immensely popular, polling 62 per cent in the face of the 1964 Johnson landslide. And the district is a bastion of traditional Republicanism that is almost a cultural inheritance; Mr. Vander Veen's two law partners contributed to his opponent.

The consultants' first poll, taken the week of Jan. 17, showed Mr. Vander Veen leading their candidate, 60 per cent to 28. Their last survey, the week before election, showed Mr. Vander Veen within 4 per centage points of his opponent, an almost incredible gain of 28 points in 30 days.

Thomas Valley, a fast-talking, 24-year-old former Marine who is a student at the University of Massachusetts was the full-time campaign coordinator. He broke into politics as a driver in Father Drinan's campaign. Other members of the firm researched their opponent's record, wrote all of the literature and advised on campaign organization and techniques.

The sole thrust of the campaign was to link the Republican candidate with President Nixon. Indeed, one of their ads carried their opponent's name with the slogan "Richard Nixon's Choice for Congress."

V.A.W. LISTS USED

The campaign's first task, Mr. Valley said, was to "nail down" a solid Democratic vote of perhaps 40 per cent, largely with mailings to lists developed by the United Automobile Workers. About \$60,000 was raised, mostly from within the district and an organization was built.

"We talked Nixon, we only used Watergate once, but we talked about Nixon and unemployment, the energy crisis, the whole thing," Mr. Valley said. "We had radio spots with one of the biggest businessmen, a stockbroker,

a Christian reform minister, a widow, all talking about Nixon.

"We had to make the idea of the President's resignation—a scary thing in itself—respectable, and Dick really helped there—a corporate lawyer, a part of the established community. It worked. There were Republican doctors at that rally screaming 'Nixon must go.' It was quite an emotional experience," Mr. Valley said.

Mr. Marttila was on the staff of the Republican National Committee, working with the liberal wing of the party, until 1970 when he decided, he said, "I just couldn't live with myself."

And as the afternoon ended, Mr. Marttila and the others began putting on their coats, grabbing sheafs of paper and picking up suit cases. There was a meeting that night in Washington to plan the campaign of Senator Thomas E. Eagleton of Missouri.

THE McCORMACK NUCLEAR SITING BILL

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, last, our colleague from Washington (Mr. McCORMACK) addressed the Atomic Industrial Forum Seminar on Nuclear Power Plant Siting under the title, "Nuclear Power Plant Siting: A Congressional Viewpoint." The address outlined procedures for accelerating the reactor licensing process and bringing the States into that process. Subsequently the ideas discussed by Representative McCORMACK were incorporated in his bill, H.R. 12823, which Representatives PRICE of Illinois, HOLIFIELD, and myself were pleased to cosponsor. Much thought and effort have gone into this legislative proposal and I am pleased to have been granted permission to have reproduced below as a matter of legislative prehistory as well as for the information and sound insights it contains:

NUCLEAR POWER PLANT SITING: A CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT

(By the Honorable Mike McCORMACK)

What I would like to do today is to discuss with you some concepts for a new federal nuclear power plant siting bill. As many of you are aware, I was deeply involved with the preparation, sponsorship, and enactment of the Washington State Thermal Power Plant Siting Law in the Washington State Senate in 1970. I'm particularly proud of that law, especially because it appears to be working. One new nuclear reactor in Washington State is under construction; another is under consideration, and I'm sure it will be approved; a third application has been submitted.

As I have perused the field of siting legislation from other states, and of proposed federal legislation for thermal power plant siting, I have attempted to discern what I consider to be the strong and the weak points of each law or proposal. In particular, I have tried to come to understand what it is that federal legislation must provide in order to work, and, indeed, in order to be enacted into law. The challenge, it seems to me, is to write a bill that will be attractive to the utility industry as well as to responsible environmental groups, while providing the maximum degree of freedom for each individual state. Of course, it must be acceptable

to the Administration and the AEC in order to obtain Congressional approval.

In attempting to sort out the various strong and weak points of previous proposals, several thoughts have crystallized in my mind. The first is that, with the apparent impending enactment of federal land use legislation, it may be advisable to limit the scope of power plant siting legislation to nuclear power plants exclusively. These are the only thermal power plant facilities that require federal approval in all instances, through the Regulatory authority of the Atomic Energy Commission. It seems to me that it will be a significant accomplishment to enact legislation for nuclear power plants alone that will eliminate confusion and duplication, and simplify the procedures associated with siting, while assuring at least the same degree of environmental concern and protection as by any other method; and while leaving the location of other major industrial facilities to either federal or state land use laws, or to state laws not related to federal approval.

Of course, one may legitimately question whether or not federal nuclear power plant siting legislation is necessary or even desirable at all.

I am convinced that it is, and I would like to suggest that it may be possible to save from one to two years of the present eight to ten years lead time associated with getting a nuclear power plant from commitment to "power on the line." It may be possible to avoid duplication in the preparation of environmental impact statements, and it may be possible to provide incentives so that nuclear power plant sites for each region in the country are determined in advance and the debates surrounding them resolved before they delay construction.

In addition, I believe that it may be possible to provide an avenue for deeper state involvement with a greater state autonomy, and deeper involvement by the average citizen with or without a special environmental concern, and to do this even while meeting the schedule I have set out above.

I believe that these incentives are compelling upon every segment of our society and, in sum total, they provide an opportunity for the Congress to take definitive action to help resolve one of the major problems contributing to today's energy crisis. Let me describe several examples. The next presentation by Mr. Knecht will inform you that states will soon be submitting coastal zone management plans that will include consideration of power plant siting needs. The state agencies that will draw up and administer those programs will have to approve any proposed power plant site within its jurisdiction in that state. As Mr. Marston will tell you, if the federal land use legislation which finally emerges includes a "key facilities" provision, as it now appears that it will, a state land use agency will have to identify and sign-off on proposed power plant sites. And I can see the real possibility that these two emerging new entities at the state level may not be incorporated into existing or evolving state siting agencies, without incentive.

Thus, we could end up with a three-stop system, rather than the one-stop system we expected to have, with the resultant delay in the licensing of needed facilities. I sincerely hope that this will not happen, but agency brinkmanship and independence are strong and ubiquitous characteristics; and the assurance of maintaining one-stop siting should not be taken for granted.

Meaningful federal legislation could also serve another very useful purpose. I am sure that many utilities are concerned with the prospect of separate hearings—one to satisfy AEC and one to satisfy a state siting agency. The prospect of joint hearings, and possibly even joint environmental statements, must,

I am sure, be attractive, and I would advocate that one means of accomplishing this end is through properly designed federal siting legislation. For example, the new Arkansas siting law establishes that the state may act as an agent for the AEC. I suggest that this be a uniform provision in all state laws. Thus, an environmental impact statement prepared by a state for a specific site would fully satisfy NEPA requirements.

We are presently drafting a nuclear power plant siting bill which would, if enacted into law, provide each state with the opportunity to enter into a formal agreement for continuing compatibility with the Atomic Energy Commission, under which each state would assume full responsibility for review and approval of sites for its nuclear power reactors. This legislation will strengthen the state role in the overall review and acceptance of nuclear power plant sites, and preserve the independence and flexibility of state jurisdictions. The proposed legislation goes beyond existing law or previously proposed siting acts in that it provides that all non-nuclear safety-related aspects for any site will lie within the authority of agreement states in their overall site review procedure.

This, then, would allow the AEC to concentrate its attention solely on the reactor and its internal systems, while the qualified states are involved in the site review. We envision a much more efficient use of manpower and technical expertise by this new division of responsibility.

Under the provisions of this act, the states, to be qualified for an Agreement, must establish an agency, or some other administrative unit, with clear legal authority to review nuclear power plant sites, and to issue a binding certification as to its acceptance. The state siting agency must include input from all state or local agencies having any legitimate interests, responsibilities, authority, or jurisdiction in any subject area related to the siting of a nuclear reactor. Obviously, this would include such agencies as those involved with water quality control, air quality control, fish and game, parks and recreation, and others. Such individual disciplines as geology, meteorology, hydrology, and seismology must be available to the siting council as is deemed necessary to perform the safety-related site review. Each state's siting council must individually be tailored according to the existing site situation and laws and agencies of the state that it is to serve.

The siting organization procedures must provide for public hearings, establishment of a timetable for completion of the review process, reasonable fee schedule, and one-stop certification. The state siting law must commit all state agencies to the support of the council's findings.

It should be clearly understood that the state siting agency would prepare the environmental impact statement pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA, and circulate it in compliance with CEQ guidelines (section 6(g)). That statement would fulfill the responsibilities of all participating federal agencies under section of 102(2)(c) of NEPA with respect to the proposed facilities.

Under the provisions of this act, the AEC would be required to establish criteria, with guidance from the CEQ and Council of State Governments, to qualify a state for siting agreement. Insofar as possible, the criteria should preserve the quality of environmental and site safety reviews currently being conducted by AEC, and yet remain flexible to provide latitude of program and procedure within the states.

The AEC would also be required to establish criteria providing the states with clear guides to follow when assessing the many disciplines involved in the site safety review. Developing such criteria may be a significant challenge to the AEC staff, but as I under-

stand it, this problem is not an insurmountable task. (In fact, the Regulatory staff is already working on the project.)

I want to make it clear that if the state does not pick up its option to become a participating partner in nuclear power plant site licensing, the present status quo would be maintained. There would be no federal pre-emption of any authority now held by state government. I believe that the desire for the exercising of states' rights, along with pressure from utilities to eliminate confusion and delay, would constitute an adequate incentive for each state to enact such legislation.

The state law should require a final decision to be made within twelve months for any application from a utility with respect to a requested site, except in a case of mutual agreement between the applicant utility and the siting council that a modest extension would be in order. In addition, and as a major incentive to both the utilities and the states, I propose that AEC Regulatory be required to make a decision on a construction permit within the same twelve-month period, provided, of course, that application for construction permit is made to the AEC by the utility at the same time it applies for approval of its proposed site from the state. In short, under this law, we would be telescoping all of the time required at present to obtain approval for a site and a construction permit into a single twelve-month period. I recognize that this will put considerable pressure on AEC Regulatory, but I understand that this agency is working towards this goal, and expects to reach it by late next Spring. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate AEC Chairman Dixy Lee Ray, and Director of Regulation Manning Muntzing, for this successful effort, while maintaining the traditionally high standards of safety that have been the rule with this organization.

I suggest that we take advantage of this legislation to strengthen and add new dimensions to the responsibilities of the nine existing regional electric reliability councils into which this nation is divided. I believe that these councils should be set up as data centers into which the member utilities feed demographic information regarding population centers, growth, current loads, etc. Each council could then process all the data and prepare information and recommendations related to future needs such as recommended areas for power plant location. When this information is available, the state and the involved utility can take the steps necessary to select the specific location of the site, and begin the necessary reviews leading to site licensing. The council should obtain and process the load and growth data in as much detail as possible, so that specific sites are identified well in advance of need.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment that the term "nuclear power plant" includes the transmission lines associated with it, and that siting transmission lines in an environmentally satisfactory manner must be included in all consideration of siting nuclear power plants. In addition, while I have referred only to individual states throughout my comments, there is the possibility that interstate compacts may be created for the specific purpose of establishing regional nuclear power plant siting councils.

It is conceivable that such interstate compacts might embrace geographic areas identical to those covered by the regional electric reliability councils. While this may be a rather advanced concept, and while the legislation should not be hung up because of it, I consider it advisable to prepare the legislation to allow for the creation of such interstate compacts, and to treat them exactly as the law would treat an individual state, insofar as the authority discussed with respect to nuclear power plant siting is concerned.

This leads us to one additional concept

which may have dramatically increasing importance in the near future. This is the possibility that nuclear power parks may be created within the geographic area served by a regional electric reliability council.

Nuclear power parks have the great potential advantage of combining a number of nuclear reactors in one environmentally acceptable site, and establishing a completely closed fuel cycle on the site in association with the power reactors. Thus, fuel fabrication and fuel reprocessing facilities would be included in a nuclear power park, and, most importantly, the radioactive wastes would be stored and managed on the site, avoiding transportation of radioactive fuel elements or radioactive wastes outside the boundaries of the nuclear power park.

An outstanding example of such a facility is developing in my District at Hanford, Washington, and may serve as a model for most of the country, and indeed the world. I would suggest that this trend be encouraged through this nuclear power plant siting legislation, and that one incentive be that the Atomic Energy Commission will assume full authority over and responsibility for the management of all radioactive wastes.

I recognize that, within the utility industry, there exists a divergence of opinion regarding the amount and type of authority to be granted to the reliability councils, and I realize that some of the councils may at present be limited in staff. However, the potential value of the information and recommendations that they may produce, and the potential value of nuclear power parks, warrants our serious consideration of this approach at this time.

Finally, we must keep several goals in mind as we work out the details of this proposed legislation.

1. The national need for a continued availability of electrical energy.
2. The need to maintain the basic provisions of NEPA, regarding the impact upon the environment, including the need to perform a rigorous cost/benefit analysis in considering alternatives to the site, plant, and associated systems.
3. The need to assure a true one-stop siting concept.
4. The need to promote orderly growth in generating capacity and transmission networks through long-term open planning.
5. The need to assure the rights of the public to have an active role in the planning process.
6. Finally, the need to conserve the resources of this nation through the wise use of nuclear energy.

This, then, is a summary of most of the major points which I expect to be included in the nuclear power plant siting bill which I will introduce in the near future. I am deliberately presenting them at this time to run up a trial balloon before this assembly, and interested individuals in the nuclear and environmental community throughout the country. Certainly, we will welcome any constructive suggestion with respect to what I have presented here today, and indeed, with respect to critical points which we may have omitted.

Above everything else, I think it is imperative that we start moving on nuclear power plant siting legislation at the earliest reasonable moment. One of the steps that I have been advocating for two years is the attempt to obtain rational reconciliation between our need to produce energy, on the one hand, and our need to protect the environment on the other. Obviously, a perfect world is not possible, and what we, as leaders in this society, must undertake to do is to help develop and enunciate policies through federal and state laws which will allow us to construct nuclear power plants on sites that are both economically feasible and environmentally acceptable; and to do this without any further unnecessary delay.

I believe that the incentives that are proposed in this legislation should attract broad support. It provides:

1. For industry—an opportunity to save substantial amounts of time and considerable sums of money in getting nuclear power plants on the line; and the opportunity to increase reliability in the expansion of utility systems.

2. For the states—a preservation of states' rights; an opportunity for responsible and constructive involvement with maximum autonomy; and an orderly process for handling problems that have to date, in many cases, seemed insurmountable.

3. For all responsible environmentalists—an opportunity for local participation in working out the environmental factors involved in siting nuclear reactors, without the expense of hiring legal counsel; a built-in assurance of continued high quality environmental protection; an opportunity to help develop and plan integrated regional power programs, including the thoughtful consideration of all alternate sites, fuels, and transmission corridors.

4. For the public—a vast savings of money through lower electric rates; a significant economy in time in getting needed electricity on the line; local participation in siting plants, and protecting the environment; an increased reliability in utility systems; and an increased assurance that electric energy will be available on schedule.

5. For the Congress—a clean and simple bill, unencumbered by endless involvement in nonnuclear industrial siting decisions; an opportunity to offer the states a partnership plan in solving their problems, rather than the threat of coercion; a greater efficiency in the use of technical manpower; a guarantee of environmental protection; and, above all, action now to help solve the energy crisis.

This is where we begin: in the Congress, but we will need the support of all of you; of industry, the states, environmentalists, and the lay public. There is no more time to lose. I invite you to join me in supporting these legislative concepts.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 24, marks the 56th anniversary the Republic of Estonia successfully achieved its independence from the Soviet Union. This freedom was a new experience for Estonia which has been under the rule of various powers for 700 years, the largest segment of time being under Czarist Russian bondage.

When Estonia declared its independence on February 24, 1918, World War I was still going on and it was not until November 11, when the armistice took effect, that the Germans began to withdraw from its territory. Eleven days later the Bolsheviks began to invade Estonia. The brave resistance of its people, together with support from a British naval squadron in the Baltic, enabled them to clear their land of these latest invaders by the end of January 1919. The Soviet Union, which had recognized the independence of Estonia when it signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918, granted final recognition on Febru-

CXX—249—Part 3

ary 2, 1920, when it agreed to the Treaty of Tartu.

Two decades later, freedom for Estonia came to an end after the Communists and the Nazis divided Poland between them. Estonia was forced to sign a treaty with the Soviet Union permitting establishment of military bases and stationing of Russian troops on its soil when the Soviet Union threatened to invade. Annexation soon followed and on August 6, 1940, the tiny Republic was absorbed by the Soviet Empire.

It is pertinent to point out that the United States refuses to recognize the Soviet occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and I am confident that this will continue to be the policy of our country. Estonians throughout the free world will continue their activities to keep alive their traditions. Even though they are a small group, they are a very vital force in the various countries throughout which they have been scattered by the fortunes of war.

While the end of World War II eliminated nazism, it also restored communism to Estonia. Consequently, it did not share in the victory that brought the liberation of many other lands.

Instead of freedom, Estonia experienced the collectivization of its farms, the nationalization of its industries, the communizing of its schools, and the suppression of its churches. The tyrants in the Kremlin deported 120,000 of its people and replaced them with people from other areas of the vast Soviet Empire.

Mr. Speaker, justice certainly will be served on the day of the emancipation of the Estonian people from their present bondage. In the meantime, let us pay homage to the brave people of that tiny nation on the anniversary of their independence.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXIII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week a 28-year-old man was sentenced to 10 years in prison for manslaughter in the 1972 shooting of a teenage boy. In sentencing the defendant, the judge said that if he had not had that gun the boy would be alive today. He also suggested that, in order to put a halt to such killings, the legislature should make it a crime to sell handguns.

The attached article appeared in the February 21 edition of the Washington Post:

KEN-GAR KILLER GETS 10 YEARS

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

A Montgomery County judge sentenced Gene P. Hopkins a 28-year-old trash collector, to 10 years in prison yesterday for manslaughter in the slaying of a white teenager in Ken-Gar, a small black community within the town of Kensington 18 months ago.

In handling down the sentence, Circuit Judge Walter H. Moorman pleaded for stronger gun control laws, noting that Hopkins

had also been convicted at his trial last November of carrying a dangerous weapon, the pistol with which Hopkins shot 18-year-old Mark S. Murray of Wheaton.

The judge also denied that his sentencing of Hopkins, who is black, was racially motivated or vindictive. The sentencing followed a hearing in which Hopkins' attorney, Joseph Forer, presented a petition for leniency signed by 95 adult resident of Ken-Gar, asserting that Murray and some friends had committed a "racist aggression against the peace and security of our community." Through their actions preceding the shooting.

After sentencing Hopkins, Moorman said he has sent the state corrections department letters praising Hopkins' character and his own recommendation "that they give you every consideration in relation to parole."

Prisoners generally become eligible for parole after serving one-fourth of their sentences but parole may be granted after 90 days at the discretion of the parole board.

Murray was shot once in the back after he and two white friends drove into Ken-Gar on the night of Aug. 18, 1972. During the trial, witnesses said that Murray threw a firecracker at a group of people who included Hopkins' 4-year-old daughter.

Richard Dorsey, one of four other men awaiting trial in the slaying, testified for the prosecution that Murray apologized to Hopkins, saying, "I'm sorry, man. We can talk it over." According to Dorsey, Hopkins answered, "We can talk with this." The shooting followed, although he never saw Hopkins with a gun.

Moorman cited the testimony yesterday, adding, "During the trial—I hope I'm wrong—I couldn't see any bit of remorse that you showed over the commission of this act."

Moorman assured Hopkins that there was "no racism, no malice, no hate, no vindictiveness . . ." in his action. "If for one moment I saw any Ku Klux Klan mentality in the circumstances in which this episode occurred, I would do different from what I'm about to do," Moorman told Hopkins before imposing sentence.

The judge said that in his neighborhood there are similar incidents. "I think every resident in this county has to put up with this type of thing," he said. Moorman lives in Bethesda a predominantly white, relatively affluent section of the county.

The actions of Murray and his friends was "bad judgment, in fact a very stupid thing. . . ." Moorman said. But, he added, "by the wildest stretch of the imagination the poor judgment of the teenagers did not justify the taking of the life of Mark Murray."

"It is the court's opinion," Moorman said, "that the legislature should go further and put teeth in Gov. (Marvin) Mandel's (gun control) legislation by making it a crime to sell handguns."

Maryland's gun control law, enacted in 1972 with Mandel's backing, requires state permits for carrying a handgun outside the home.

"If you'd not had the gun, Mark S. Murray would be with us today and you would not be standing in front of us for sentencing," Moorman told Hopkins.

Moorman also sentenced Hopkins to two years in prison for assault and three years on the gun charge in connection with the shooting. The sentences will run concurrently with the 10-year sentence for manslaughter, which is defined as wrongful killing without malice or premeditation.

Forer, Hopkins' attorney, said he plans to appeal.

The petition from the Ken-Gar residents also asked State's Attorney Andrew L. Sonner to drop charges against four other Ken-Gar men who are charged with first-degree murder, attempted murder, assault and assault and battery in the case.

THE NATIONAL ANTHEM

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, when patriotic sensibilities are often assailed and challenged, the national anthem remains a stirring reminder of our heritage and future hopes, and lends dignity to every occasion. I would like to acquaint my colleagues with a resolution introduced by Senator Albert P. Vaslet and passed in the Senate of the State of Rhode Island on the fifth day of February 1974, which requests that the national anthem be played prior to public sporting events and exhibitions.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, We, as elected representatives of the people of the State of Rhode Island do find these times especially trying to our nation; and

Whereas, The current political and social upheaval both domestic and foreign is testing and will continue to test the strength of our fiber as a republic; and

Whereas, There appears to be a growing disrespect for the fundamental beliefs founded in our constitution, our laws, our freedom and our heritage; and

Whereas, This disrespect for the freedoms and laws which protect the strength and integrity of our democracy affects not only the present generation of Americans but also the future of our children who will one day assume leadership; and

Whereas, As elected representatives as well as parents, we believe that instilling respect of our heritage and understanding of the real and difficult responsibilities and duties of each citizen is vital to the welfare and well-being of this our nation; and

Whereas, Instilling respect and pride in our country although the ultimate responsibility of each citizen is also the clear responsibility of elected officials and representatives of all the people; and

Whereas, In view of this need we find that ceremonies in which the national anthem is played have the effect of instilling in our people and in particular our children, some understanding and belief in our national heritage; and

Whereas, Public exhibits, ceremonies, sporting events, concerts and other forms of a social and recreational nature do provide a unique and important opportunity to perform our national anthem; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Senators of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations urge responsible citizens and officials to afford, as they have in the past, the opportunity to hear our national anthem at such events and to recall with dignity the responsibilities we owe to our heritage and to our future; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is requested and directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to all managers of places in which sporting and social events are held; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is requested and directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to the secretary of state of each of our forty-nine (49) sister states with an accompanying letter urging the passage of similar resolutions; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is requested and directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolu-

tion to our elected representatives in the Congress of the United States with an accompanying letter urging inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MESSAGE TO MICRONESIA

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a statement issued recently by Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton.

Secretary Morton outlined several matters of interest in our administration of the trust territory of Micronesia which will be helpful to the Congress in considering related legislation, as follows:

MESSAGE TO MICRONESIA

(By Rogers C. B. Morton)

To my friends, the people of Micronesia: This year of 1974 brings Micronesia to the threshold of a bright new future.

You and your Congress, working together with the United States, have taken great strides toward self-government in the past few years.

In 1969, the first year of his administration, President Nixon directed that a program be initiated to give you an increased voice in the determination of policies affecting your future.

As we approach the end of the trusteeship we believe even greater responsibility for Micronesia must be assumed by the people of Micronesia. There will remain many areas which will be shared with you. But for the larger part, the future of Micronesia is a Micronesian matter. The responsibility for determination of your future government is yours. The obligation to promote your own social, economic and political welfare is yours. The right to self-determination is yours.

The first goal of this administration was to gain additional financial support to get vital projects underway.

Working together, we have launched an accelerated program which succeeded in raising the annual authorization to the current \$60 million a year level.

In addition, other federal grant programs—once practically non-existent—now account for \$9.5 million annually. These funds have measurably assisted in bringing about needed improvements in raising your standard of living.

Local revenues have jumped from about \$850,000 to \$4.5 million in the past five years.

Recent developments hold considerable promise for the future. Among these are Micronesia's entry into ECAFE as an associate member, possible assistance from the Asian Development Bank, and the establishment of a permanent economic development loan fund.

Tourism has grown. Only five short years ago the territory had a dozen small hotels with less than 200 rooms, able to accommodate only 15,000 visitors a year. Today, you have 1100 rooms, either available, in construction, or on the drawing board.

Last year alone, about 48,000 visitors came to Micronesia and added over \$3.5 million to your economy. As in the past, our policy continues to be to encourage each district to develop tourism in accord with its own desires, traditions and customs.

Since 1969, new airports have been constructed, others planned.

Jet service to every district and consequent

gains in tourism are facts and no longer dreams.

Public utility projects for power, water and sewer systems have been funded and constructed in all districts.

We have a new hospital in Truk, and planning is completed for another in Ponape. Other new hospitals and major improvements to existing ones are in the preliminary planning stage.

The long-sought Renrak Bridge connecting Babelthup with Koror has been funded and will soon be a reality.

Many new schools have been completed and additional classrooms have been added to existing schools. More are scheduled.

The Micronesian occupational center and the Micronesian Community College are helping to prepare you for growing opportunities in your own society and economy.

When this administration began in 1969, there was only one Micronesian District Administrator. Today five of these positions are held by Micronesians.

In 1969, no Micronesians served in the High Commissioner's cabinet. Today Micronesians hold the Directorships in health services, education and public affairs, other headquarters departments have Micronesian Deputy Directors preparing themselves to assume higher positions.

The past five years have shown that by coupling the human resources of Micronesia with American financial and technical assistance we can meet the aspirations of the Micronesian people. But we must now begin to focus on the future.

I believe that the next three years will see a decisive turning point in your history. In this period we can expect to see Micronesia move decisively toward self-government, bringing to you, the citizens of these Islands, all of the rights and privileges that go with it. At the same time you will have to assume many of the responsibilities of a self-governing people. You must be ready to make important fundamental decisions of your own which will have a lasting effect on your lives and the lives of your children and your children's children.

Decisions about your political future, your economic future, the future disposition of your lands all must be made in the immediate years ahead. I know from my travels among your Islands as a Congressman and from the conversations with Micronesian leaders in Washington that your elected representatives are most concerned with these basic questions.

The United States will help in every way possible to make the issues clear, but we cannot make the basic decisions. This is your responsibility.

To accelerate the turnover of responsibility to you for your own internal affairs, action is being taken in four important areas. First, the United States Congress has approved funds for a Micronesian Constitutional Convention. This Convention will provide the Micronesian people with the responsibility to draw up the blueprint of their future government and society. Second, the United States has authorized the return of public lands to the control of the District Legislatures for final distribution. Third, instructions are being issued for new arrangements to improve economic conditions. Finally, the Trust Territory Administration has begun a greatly expanded program of education for self-government.

The United States Government is giving whole-hearted support to the organization of a Constitutional Convention. I believe the development of this fundamental instrument is an essential part of the efforts toward self-government.

I am confident that the Congress of Micronesia will act rapidly to make the Constitutional Convention a reality. Your new Constitution will be the blueprint for your future. It will be the cornerstone for important

programs during the period of your transition from trusteeship to self-government. I have asked the High Commissioner to make available any and all technical and staff support as requested by the Congress to assist in this historic step.

With regard to the disposition of public lands, let me say that the U.S. policy represents the fulfillment of a promise made years ago by the United States to hold these lands in trust for the people. The decision to return control over public land to those Districts requesting it is full of meaning for the people of Micronesia. Acting through your elected and territorial government and traditional leadership you are now to assume responsibility for matters pertaining to land, culturally the most prized, and socially and economically the most significant commodity in Micronesia. This constitutes an enormous step in transition toward self-government. I am hopeful that the Congress will act quickly to pass the necessary legislation to put the new policy on the return of public lands into effect.

Looking forward to future progress toward economic self-sufficiency for Micronesia, we are striving to complete the basic facilities needed by the territory. Hopefully within a few years you will have more adequate airports, more power, water, sewage systems, better hospitals, more classrooms and better roads. I have asked the High Commissioner to prepare a revised five-year plan for this construction with emphasis on the initial three-year period. He is to work with both the Congress of Micronesia and the leadership of the Districts to develop the necessary set of priorities. I have instructed my Director of Territorial Affairs, Stanley Carpenter, to make available the full resources of his staff work with you to meet this objective. Only with a sound physical plant can we begin to produce a strong economy.

To promote further control by Micronesians over their own economic affairs, I have ordered the lifting of restrictions on foreign investment in the Trust Territory effective April 1, 1974. From that date, individuals and commercial investors from any of the world's community of Nations will be permitted to apply for business permits in Micronesia. More specifically, each District Economic Development Board will be able to consider business applications from any nation within the guidelines of your own foreign investors Business Permit Act. Under the terms of that Act the High Commissioner will have final authority to review each recommendation of the District Economic Development Boards. I have instructed the High Commissioner to base his review on the security of the area and the general welfare and development of the Micronesian people.

I would ask the Congress of Micronesia to review carefully the ramifications of this new policy on foreign investment. As the keepers of the trust of the Micronesian people, Congress may decide that additional controls or safeguards are necessary to protect Micronesian private enterprise.

I have instructed the High Commissioner to proceed rapidly in fully implementing his new comprehensive, objective program of education for self-government, so that it will reach all areas and all levels of society. I hold high expectations for this program. A good understanding of government and its functions is a necessary step to increased government at all levels.

We shall also continue to review our other programs aimed toward a greater measure of self-government and general political development. We will continue the policy of elevating qualified Micronesians into more responsible positions in the Administration. I have asked the High Commissioner to submit to me his best forecast of manpower needs

over the next three years, so we might determine how more Micronesians can be placed in key positions.

Final agreement on the future political status of Micronesia has not yet been reached. Nevertheless, I am confident that present negotiations will soon lead to arrangements which will prove to be in the best interests of both the American people and the people of the Trust Territory. You may be sure that in future negotiations the U.S. will be guided by its commitment to the principle of self-determination and by the obligations it assumed under the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement. In short, the final decision on your future will be yours to make. Our main interest is to ensure that the choices are well understood and that whatever agreement is reached will serve the best interests of all.

I would like to leave you with this thought. You, the people of Micronesia, are moving toward a new era of political self-reliance and increased economic self-sufficiency. You must be ready to accept the responsibilities that will come with these developments. At the same time, the government of the United States must and will do everything possible to provide you with the tools and skills that will help you in assuming these responsibilities and in charting a new course of a self-governing people.

With continued bold, imaginative leadership, we can reach the goals of our shared dreams over the next few years. By then it is my hope, and the hope of all of us in Washington, that the people of Micronesia will have completed the process of self-determination that is the right of all the peoples of the world.

SURRENDER AT PANAMA, THE PRICE OF PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a statement in the January 21, 1974, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 198, entitled, "What Is the Price of Dr. Kissinger's Personal Diplomacy?", I listed a number of the Secretary of State's "triumphs" which have received rave reviews in the mass news media. One of them was his February 7, 1974, signing in Panama, without the prior authorization of the Congress, a "statement of principles" to serve as a guideline for a new canal treaty. The agreement, drawn between Dr. Kissinger and Panama's Foreign Minister Juan A. Tack was a blatant example of his "personal diplomacy."

In his address on that occasion, Secretary Kissinger made this significant assertion:

In the President's name, I hereby commit the United States to complete this (treaty) negotiation successfully and as quickly as possible.

And that—

We are now fully committed to a major effort to build a vital Western Hemisphere community.

The principles to which he agreed call for the abrogation of the 1903 Canal Treaty and the eventual surrender of the U.S. sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama, an unstable

country of endemic revolution which, since 1904, has had 59 Presidents, some of them serving only a few days.

Mr. Speaker, I would again invite attention to the fact that the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal are U.S. territory and property acquired through grant and purchase by the United States, pursuant to a treaty authorized by the Congress. Under the U.S. Constitution only the Congress is vested with the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States. It should be remembered, despite Mr. Kissinger's "personal" agreement with Tack, the Congress has not authorized the surrender of either the zone territory or the canal.

Mr. Kissinger is obviously well aware of the battle he faces in the House if he continues on his course of giving away the multibillion dollar Canal Zone complex. Both Houses of Congress must vote on any move to dispose of "surplus government property." The new "line" emanating from the Department of State is that the negotiations are aimed at "modification" of the 1903 treaty, which only the Senate could vote on, rather than a surrender of U.S. property rights, which would require the consent of both Houses. The Secretary apparently feels that he has enough votes in the Senate to bulldoze his "personal" agreements through.

This unwarranted action at Panama City by the Secretary is not only irresponsible, but also constitutes an outrageous assault on the United States' treaty-based sovereign rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone. It is a challenge to this Congress. It raises questions as to the process of reasoning by which this public servant was led to this attempt at usurpation.

Moreover, his action ignores U.S. treaty obligations to Great Britain and Colombia, as well as the interests of the major users of the Canal, such as Japan and Norway.

The next round in Dr. Kissinger's "personal surrender" of the Panama Canal began today in Mexico City, where he is meeting with Latin American foreign ministers.

The question I raised earlier, "What is the price of Dr. Kissinger's personal diplomacy?" remains one to which the American people deserve an immediate answer.

I ask that excerpts from the related news clipping follow my remarks.

The excerpts follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1974]

PROPOSAL OUTLINED FOR NEW TREATY ON

PANAMA CANAL

(By Dan Morgan)

The State Department yesterday disclosed more details of its proposal for a new treaty governing the Panama Canal and linked these to Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's hopes for a "dialogue" with other South American countries.

A senior State Department official said that the American proposals "clarified the parameters" under which the United States and Panama will negotiate a new Panama Canal treaty to replace the 1903 document that is still in force.

Kissinger will fly to Panama Thursday for six hours to initial a joint "statement of principles" to guide the treaty negotiators.

Though the nature of the trip is ceremonial, it marks the start of hemispheric diplomacy for the Secretary of State. The next round will occur on Feb. 21 to 23 in Mexico City, when he meets with Latin American foreign ministers.

American sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone is still viewed by many in South America as a vestige of Yankee colonialism. Thus, some forward motion on the issue is viewed here as essential in removing it as an emotional topic that could mar the new dialogue proposed by Kissinger at the United Nations last fall.

The main American concessions to long-standing Panamanian demands include the following, according to a State Department paper made public yesterday.

Abandonment of the permanent sovereignty assigned to the United States in the 1903 treaty and substitution of American rights to control and defend the present canal for a specified time period.

Assumption by Panama of jurisdiction over the Canal Zone, "in some areas immediately and in others over a period of years."

Panamanian participation in the defense of the canal for the first time, although both countries have agreed that the United States will continue to control and defend the territory for an extended period.

Increased annual payments to Panama, from the present figure of about \$2 million to an estimated \$25 million.

Relinquishing to Panama of some lands and facilities in the Canal Zone which are not needed for canal operations and defense. The new treaty would also spell out the terms under which the U.S.-owned part of the zone would be open to Panamanian governmental and private activities. This area would be "integrated into the jurisdiction, culture and economy of Panama."

The senior State Department official said yesterday that the approach of both Panama and of the United States is "more flexible" than it has been in the past. The breakthroughs leading to the statement of principles occurred rapidly last fall, when Ambassador-at-large Ellsworth Bunker took over the negotiations.

The official said he hoped that a new treaty could be completed this year.

However, a number of areas of substantial disagreement remain, officials indicated. One is the period of American sovereignty and the time period for phasing out U.S. jurisdiction.

Another unresolved question is the extent of U.S. defense rights. The senior official said it was possible that some status-of-forces agreement might be drawn up to cover the 11,000 American troops in the Canal Zone.

Any new treaty would face opposition on Capitol Hill, as well as from other groups.

REINSTATEMENT OF EFFECTIVE OIL-PRICE CONTROLS: REPEAL OF STRIPPER WELL EXEMPTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, 30 of my colleagues have joined me in reintroducing H.R. 12160, a bill to repeal the decontrol of prices for "stripper well" oil—oil from wells pumping under 10 barrels a day.

Congress exempted stripper well oil from price controls last November, first in the Alaskan Pipeline Act—Public Law 93-153—and then in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act—Public Law

93-159. The objective was to increase domestic production by freeing from price restraints small wells that were only marginally profitable and that might otherwise have soon been shut down.

The price of stripper well oil has more than doubled since that time, from \$4.25 to \$10.35 a barrel. But instead of encouraging production, there is every reason to believe that the stripper well exemption has had the opposite effect.

The incentives are now on the side of keeping production down. Why should a producer increase his output to 12 to 15 barrels a day when he can get more money for 9 or 10 barrels?

Although the law should prohibit misuse of the exemption, in practice—as the Federal Energy Office statement quoted below indicates—the wide disparity between the controlled price and the price for stripper-well production encourages circumvention of the regulations and serves as a disincentive to increased output.

There are almost half a million oil wells in the United States, pumping, on an average, 18 barrels of crude oil a day. Three-fourths of these wells are stripper wells—wells that literally "strip" from the earth 10 barrels or less a day. Thirteen percent of domestic supply comes from these small wells, and much of this production is under contract to the major oil companies.

The cost of living has risen inordinately in the past month while, at the same time, real income has dropped. A large part of this rise in prices has been due to increased fuel costs. In January the wholesale price index rose at a seasonally adjusted rate of 3.1 percent. The category with the biggest spurt—the energy index—rose 6.8 percent, and the single biggest factor in the energy index was a 22-percent increase in the price of crude oil. With thousands of auto and airline workers out of jobs and real family income dropping drastically because of increased fuel prices, it is neither fair nor reasonable to permit oil industry prices to soar.

The decontrolling of prices for stripper well oil has been a costly mistake. Contrary to the intent of Congress, this exemption has been a disincentive to increased production. The windfall profits generated in the past 2 months from this act of misguided congressional generosity are staggering to contemplate. Thirteen percent of domestic production is a significant quantity. A reduction in price from \$10 a barrel to \$5.25 a barrel for this oil alone could mean a reduction of as much as 2 cents a gallon for gasoline at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the conference report on the National Energy Emergency Act has reinstated effective controls on prices for domestic crude oil. Included in the price roll-back provision in this act is repeal of the decontrol of prices for stripper well oil.

If the price roll-back provision of the National Energy Emergency Act is enacted into law, our bill will prove unnecessary. I hope this will be the case.

But if the House does not approve the conference report on the National Energy Emergency Act, or if Congress

fails to override the threatened Presidential veto, I hope that Members of both Houses will join us in supporting this needed change in pricing policy for domestic crude oil.

I call the attention of my colleagues to testimony of Mr. Gerald L. Parsky, Executive Assistant to the Federal Energy Administrator, before the Senate Interior Committee on February 1, 1974. The relevant portions of Mr. Parsky's prepared statement follow:

PORTIONS OF MR. PARSKY'S STATEMENT

TWO-TIER SYSTEM

Under the two-tier pricing system for domestic crude petroleum, most of the crude produced in the U.S. is subject to a ceiling price which averages \$5.25 per barrel. New production—that is, production above 1972 levels—is not subject to the pricing ceilings and may be sold at free market prices. Crude produced from stripper wells also has been exempt from pricing controls by Congress. Because of these actions, a total of about 25% of the crude produced in the U.S. is not subject to pricing ceilings. The remaining 75% is subject to price ceilings.

The two-tier pricing system is designed to stimulate additional domestic crude production through qualified price incentives, while at the same time slowing the rise of domestic crude prices toward world price levels. The prospect of a higher free market price for "new" oil has sharply increased oil and gas exploration and development.

STRIPPER WELL EXEMPTION

Congress adopted much the same price incentive approach when it voted almost unanimously in November, 1973, to increase long-term domestic crude supply by exempting from pricing ceilings crude produced by stripper wells. The effect was to allow an immediate price increase in anticipation of increased supplies in years ahead.

The intent of Congress was to extend the productive life of economically marginal stripper wells. As the Conference Committee report stated: "The purpose of exempting small stripper wells—wells whose average production does not exceed ten barrels per day—from price restraints of the Economic Stabilization Act and from any system of mandatory allocation is to insure that direct or indirect price ceilings do not have the effect of resulting in any loss of domestic crude oil production from the premature shutting down of stripper wells for economic reasons."

Congress gave stripper well operators a broad incentive by exempting not just those wells in immediate economic jeopardy, those which produce only 3 or 4 barrels per day, but by also exempting wells with production of up to 10 barrels per day. Possibly the additional revenues will be plowed back into further exploration or secondary and tertiary recovery efforts. Nevertheless, stripper wells which produce 10 barrels per day or less account for a minimum of 13% of domestic crude oil production and in the two months since Congress acted to exempt stripper well production in November from price controls, the price of stripper well oil has risen by an average of \$5.25 per barrel. The Cost of Living Council, on the other hand, has allowed the rest of the "old" oil to rise by \$1.00 per barrel in the same period.

DOLLAR INCREASE

When the two-tier system was promulgated in August, 1973, by the Cost of Living Council, the Council stated that it would continually monitor the ceiling prices of domestic crude petroleum and would periodically raise the ceiling price toward achieving parity with world prices. Between August, 1973 and December, 1973 world prices for crude increased sharply, creating a very wide spread

between new and stripper crude prices and "old" crude prices under the two-tier system also widened. "New" oil prices moved from an average of \$1.00 per barrel above posted old oil prices to a premium of \$2.00 and to \$4.00 per barrel by early December.

Spreads of that magnitude are potentially de-stabilizing and cannot long be maintained. For this and other reasons, the Cost of Living Council raised ceiling prices for domestic crude by \$1.00 per barrel to reduce the spread and move domestic old crude prices somewhat closer to world prices.

The \$1.00 per barrel crude increase granted in December does not place an onerous burden on the consumer when balanced against the objectives of increased supply and additional recovery. The potential increased and sustained production achieved will represent supplies which will not have to be imported at higher prices. The dollar increase in the price of crude translates into a 2.3¢ a gallon increase for gasoline and other petroleum products. The 2.3¢ means a weekly increase of 23¢ to a motorist using 10 gallons of gasoline a week.

STRIPPER DISINCENTIVE

Another reason for the Council's action is the supply depressing potential of the stripper well exemption. The wide spread between the price for exempt stripper well production and the controlled price of old oil was—and continues to be—an inducement to non-stripper well operators to reduce their production of old crude from wells that are only marginally above the stripper level of production.

For example, a producer operating a well producing 12 or 15 barrels of crude per day could cut back production to qualify under the 10 barrel per day stripper well exemption and receive a far greater financial return for the reduced production than he would receive under the ceiling price. There is a large potential for this kind of gamesmanship because the average well in the U.S. produces only 18 barrels of crude oil per day. Increasing the value of ceiling priced crude lessens the temptation to circumvent Congressional intent and reduce the nation's total supply of crude at a time of greatest need.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would emphasize that we cannot impose a price ceiling on new oil production without concurrently imposing a price ceiling on stripper well production because it would undoubtedly lead to efforts to reduce production, to attempt gerrymandering of leases, or to otherwise circumvent the regulations so as to qualify for the stripper exemption. Further, if both new oil and old oil were subject to ceiling prices, continuation of the exemption of stripper wells would result in the creation of a three-tier pricing system, with two types of crude production under price ceilings and the third (stripper crude) free to sell without price constraints.

Therefore, we suggest that the Congress provide the President with the authority to impose price ceilings on production from stripper wells. Once this is done, we would be glad to work with your Committee to establish price levels which will continue to encourage increased production and at the same time not subject the American consumer to the emotional price levels of foreign supply.

Mr. Speaker, the cosponsors of H.R. 12160 are listed below:

COSPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug, Les Aspin, Herman Badillo, Bob Bergland, Edward P. Boland, Shirley Chisholm, John Conyers, Jr., and Ronald V. Dellums.

Robert F. Drinan, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Dante B. Fascell, Walter E. Fauntroy, William D. Ford, Donald M. Fraser, and Gilbert Gude.

Bill Gunter, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Elizabeth Holtzman, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Peter N. Kyros, John Moakley, and Lucien N. Nedzi.

Robert N. C. Nix, Bertram L. Podell, Robert A. Roe, Edward R. Roybal, John F. Selberling, Fortney H. Stark, and Antonio Borja Won Pat.

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recent economic indicators have demonstrated that wage and price controls are a policy whose time is past. I have never viewed controls as a viable economic option. Our recent experience with controls lends support to this viewpoint. Controls have exacerbated shortages in many areas. Controls also have negligible effect on the demand-pull inflation with which our economy is currently confronted.

It is time to develop an economic policy which strengthens the private competitive marketplace. We must continue to reform the congressional decision making process for fiscal and monetary policies. Finally, we must adapt our attitudes and aspirations to the economic realities of the 1970's.

The Minneapolis Tribune describes the pitfalls of controls in a recent editorial. I have included this editorial for my colleagues benefit:

AN END TO WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS?

The newest phase of the Nixon-administration economic policy is to be what many predicted—the toothless jawbone. Except in health-care and petroleum, wages and prices still subject to control will be decontrolled between now and April 30, when present legislative authority expires. The policy planned to be in effect after that was evident in Wednesday's announcement: the Cost of Living Council will "monitor," "watch over" and "coordinate," rather than regulate as before. In other words, the "jawboning" of earlier years will replace controls, but those bitten by federal remonstrance for their price or wage increases will probably be unscarred.

The first is simply that other options have been exhausted. Phase I—the wage-price freeze of August 1971—was effective in part because it was so severe and so unexpected from an administration that, until then, had lectured the public on the evils of controls. The longer, carefully modulated controls of Phase II won surprising public acceptance during 1972. When Phase III was announced in January 1973, the premise of its substantial relenting on price control was the threat that controls would be reimposed if prices rose too sharply. An ill-starred experiment in clamping a ceiling on meat prices did more harm than good. Phase IV has been a further move toward decontrol.

Second is the economic wisdom of giving market forces the free play they will have after April 30. This is the most debatable issue. An opposition view could be put this way: Inflation is already the highest since 1947, and wage-price escalation will make it worse. Nearly everyone stands to lose, but especially the least vocal—people whose low wages are unlikely to increase proportionately, and those living on fixed incomes.

Supporting decontrol are the arguments that artificial distortions have appeared in the economy, that profit restraints discour-

age production, that scarcities are better met by business competition than government allocation, that wage controls unfairly penalize wage-earners and that inflation only became worse under controls.

In the circumstances of 1974, we think the stronger arguments are against controls. They were needed in 1971 as a counter to inflation caused mainly by excessive wage settlements. That is not the dominant factor today, and the merits of controls as a restraint against inflation caused by a variety of factors, including commodity shortages, is dubious. The problem of equity for those on low incomes faced by price increases is better met by income supplements than by direct controls. The problem of scarcities in many areas—food, for example—is better met by production incentives through price than by price ceilings, which are production disincentives.

Finally, there is the question of public acceptance. When the 1971 freeze was announced, labor and business expressed relief that something decisive had been done after President Nixon's ineffective economic game plans. Public concerns now center not only on inflation, but on the threat of recession, rising unemployment and the fact that these adverse trends are taking place in spite of—some would say because of—the control apparatus. Moreover, the president, the Treasury secretary and the director of the Cost of Living Council have made no secret of their wish to lift controls.

Having pointed economic policy in that direction for months, the administration did not create much surprise by its announcement. Even so, there will—and should—be debate in Congress over whether the Economic Stabilization Act should expire or be renewed. It would be wise to defer that decision until close to the deadline of April 30. By then the first-quarter figures will be well enough in hand to give a better indication of whether decontrol is still the better choice.

SUPPORTS GOALS OF PRESIDENT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the interminable and acrimonious debate over the Watergate scandal has obscured the many accomplishments of the Nixon administration. I am pleased that my constituent, Mrs. Donald Spicer of Coronado, Calif., a charming lady who is also the president general, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, took the time to let the President know her support of the goals outlined in his state of the Union message. Mrs. Spicer's observations are very pertinent to the issues of the day and I commend her letter to the attention of my House colleagues.

Mrs. Spicer's letter to the President reads as follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY DAUGHTERS
OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1974.
The PRESIDENT of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Board of Management of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, which represents every State of our Nation, was in session this past week in Washington. Your "State of the Union" address, delivered to the Congress on January 30, was a topic of much favor-

orable comment by those assembled for our meetings. We are indeed proud of the accomplishments of your Administration over these past five years, even though there have been attempts to obscure them. Many of those you outlined and many of your proposed programs have long had the official support of DAR, especially your statement, "We must never allow America to become the second strongest nation in the world." This is the established, traditional stand of our Society—a strong national defense.

We commend you for your successes in controlling crime, eliminating riots and reducing the rate of drug abuse in the United States; your determination to return, through revenue sharing, money and authority to the States and cities which know their problems best; your aid to improve health care while preserving the private system of medical treatment and health insurance; your proposal to eliminate wasteful welfare practices and thus establish a beneficial program for all, including welfare recipients; and, your continuing struggle to control inflation while achieving a stable and growing free economy.

Be assured that the Daughters of the American Revolution enthusiastically support your expressed hope for this Nation's "Project Independence", a Bicentennial goal indeed worthy of the consideration of every citizen of the United States of America. A people as determined for independence as our patriots in 1776 were can achieve a new and more secure independence, relying on our own resources, talents and knowledge.

For these remaining three years of your Administration, as you lead us—free people in a free system, may you be successful in your continuing efforts for "historic progress" at home and for peace throughout the world.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DONALD SPICER,
President General.

From: National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D.C., (Miss Jean Jacobs).

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution today praised President Nixon for the accomplishments of his Administration "despite attempts to obscure them."

In a letter to the President signed by Mrs. Donald Spicer, President General of the 197,000 member organization, the DAR complimented him especially for his strong support of national defense, and on programs proposed in his State of the Union address.

"Many of those (accomplishments) you outlined and many of your proposed programs have long had the official support of the DAR, especially your statement, 'We must never allow America to become the second strongest nation in the world.'" Mrs. Spicer wrote.

She said the Board of Management of the DAR, which represents every state in the union, was in session in Washington during the week of the State of the Union address, which was a "topic of much favorable comment" among the board.

"For these remaining three years of your Administration, as you lead us—free people in a free system, may you be successful in your continuing efforts for 'historic progress' at home and for peace throughout the world," the letter said.

Mrs. Spicer said the DAR members commend the President "for your successes in controlling crime, eliminating riots and reducing the rate of drug abuse in the United States; your determination to return, through revenue sharing, money and authority to the states and cities which know their problems best; your aim to improve health care while preserving the private system of medical treatment and health insurance; your proposal to eliminate wasteful welfare practices and thus establish a beneficial pro-

gram for all, including welfare recipients; and, your continuing struggle to control inflation while achieving a stable and growing free economy . . ."

"Project Independence" to end reliance on foreign products also was praised by the DAR as a Bicentennial goal worthy of every citizen.

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN DEFENDS THE RIGHT OF PERSONS AGED 62 TO 72 TO WORK WITHOUT BEING DEPRIVED OF THEIR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the burden of continued inflation falls most heavily upon those individuals who are retired and living on a fixed income. This unfortunate situation is magnified by the restriction imposed on earnings by the Social Security Act. The earnings limitation which discourages and moreover penalizes individuals between 62 and 72 who would otherwise remain in the work force, is unfair and discriminatory as it particularly affects the blue-collar worker while other retirees of professional occupations are in many instances able to live on income from investments or a full pension without penalty. The individual deprived of benefits is the individual who most needs employment to maintain a decent standard of living. In testimony before the Senate Special Committee on Aging a spokesman of the Seniors for Adequate Social Security summed up the present situation of those living on fixed incomes by commenting that it reflects "a creeping increase trying to catch up with galloping inflation."

No logical argument has ever been advanced to dissipate the fact that the earnings limitation violates the work ethic, on which this Nation has long stood, in favoring idleness by discouraging productive work. One of the main defenses for inaction in challenging the restriction has been the small number of people who are affected. The fact is that this minority consists of 1.5 million people. Proponents of retaining the earnings limitation also argue that a change is in violation of the intent of the social security program. Yet in 1935 when the social security program was first reported by the Committee on Ways and Means there was no earnings limitation included and moreover it was clearly established that benefits were a matter of right regardless of earned income.

I have sponsored legislation to abolish the income limitation in both the 92d and 93d Congress. This issue has been one of my main concerns since my election to the House in 1970. At the present time there are some 20 measures before the Committee on Ways and Means that would accomplish a removal of this restriction. I remain hopeful that the committee will respond and give its attention to these proposals. I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorial by Senator BARRY GOLD-

WATER which recently appeared in the American Association of Retired Persons Bulletin on the subject of the income limitation.

REPEAL THE EARNINGS LIMITATION

(By Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER)

The earnings limitation of Social Security benefits should be repealed. By "earnings ceiling," I mean the outrageous penalty which the law imposes on the person otherwise eligible for Social Security who earns more than \$2,400 per year. As the law now stands, an individual receiving Social Security is denied one dollar for every two dollars he earns over this \$2,400 exempt amount, until his benefits are cut off completely. The only exclusion is for persons 72 and older.

This restriction is wrong. It is wrong logically, and it is wrong morally. It is an outrage against millions of citizens who have made years of contribution out of their hard-earned salaries. It is an affront to the working man who has lived faithfully by the best rules of the American system. Let us remember that these citizens have not been a burden on the welfare rolls. They have not been out tearing up the flag, blocking traffic, or shouting obscenities in the streets. If there are any individuals in society who should deserve the top priority attention of their government, it is these law-abiding, working persons.

I have charged that the earnings limitation is wrong morally. This is because Social Security should not be a contract to quit work. It is also wrong morally because each citizen should be able to earn an income, without unfair restrictions, to the full limit of his ability and initiative.

I further condemn the earnings ceiling as being wrong logically. This is because a person who is penalized is usually the one with the greatest need for more income than his Social Security benefits could provide. Did you know that income from investments—stocks, bonds, rentals, and so forth—is not counted in determining whose benefits shall be reduced? No, it is only the individual who continues to work who is penalized.

Here we have the utterly illogical situation where a really wealthy person might draw tens of thousands of dollars a year from his investments and still, at the same time, receive his full Social Security check. Yet the man who has worked for a salary all of his life and who might need to continue working as a matter of his economic survival can not do so under the law without being penalized. To this, I should add that a person who does lose his Social Security benefits on account of working suffers a reduction in his disposable income larger than the amount of the benefits he is losing. This occurs because for each dollar in tax-free Social Security benefits which the person loses, he exchanges for its shrunken dollar earned which is reduced by Federal, state and local taxes and by all the expenses incidental to his work, including ironically continued payroll contributions for the Social Security which he is not receiving.

According to the best estimates I can get from the Social Security Administration, there are at least 2.5 million Americans aged 65 to 72 or their dependents who are directly affected by the earnings ceiling. About half of these individuals earn enough so that they receive no benefits at all, and most of the rest earn enough so that their benefits are reduced. Another category of about 500,000 persons may be receiving their full benefits, but are intentionally holding their earnings down because of the limitation.

It is time this statutory shackle was removed—completely. It is true that some progress has been made in liberalizing the restriction. In 1972, for example, an amendment passed which lifted the ceiling from \$1,680 to \$2,100. This followed a motion by

me to abolish the ceiling entirely, which was defeated on a voice vote. Then in June of 1973, Congress raised the ceiling higher to \$2,400. I am disappointed to report that an amendment boosting the ceiling of \$3,000 and lowering the exempt age to 70 was dropped in conference in late 1973, after originally having passed the Senate by a vote of 83 to 1.

But, even if the amendment had prevailed, it would not be enough. In my opinion, workers who have contributed from their earnings over a lifetime of work are entitled, as a matter of right, to receive benefits when they reach the annuity age. I repeat, Social Security beneficiaries are not wards of the government. They are not on relief. They are not objects of charity. They are respecting Americans who have paid for the benefits which they will receive in old age.

Social Security payments are not gratuities from a benevolent government. They are a repayment of our own earnings, which we have deposited in trust as a regular contribution deducted from our salaries and from our employers on our behalf. This method was designed from the start as a guarantee that benefits would be paid as a matter of right, not of charity.

In fact, not too many people know this, but as the program was first reported by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1935, there was no earnings test at all. Thus, a total repeal of the test today would restore the program to its original form.

The first Advisory Council on Social Security in 1938 also described the contributory program as one in which payments would be "afforded as a matter of right." When Congress acted on the council's report by passing the Social Security Amendments of 1939, both the Ways and Means and Finance Committees reaffirmed this concept by declaring that "by granting benefits as a matter of right it preserved individual dignity."

The concept of an individual earning a right to his benefit was restated approvingly by the Advisory Councils of 1948, 1958, and 1965. Finally, we have the assurance of Dean J. Douglas Brown, who has worked with the development of the Social Security program since its beginning, that from the start it was meant that the plan should "provide benefits as a matter of right."

I propose that we make these promises a truth by repealing the earnings test entirely for all of our older citizens.

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the observance of the 56th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It is very fitting that so many of my colleagues in the Congress have taken the time to commemorate this day. It is a day when we should take time to commend the Lithuanian people, and to remind the world that the struggle for freedom and justice continues in this beleaguered nation, as it seeks to reestablish independence and self-government.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence. This is the goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a

long period of Russian domination. Yet after only two short decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination when it was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Then following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since that time, Lithuania has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic.

Propaganda from the U.S.S.R. would try to assure the West that the Lithuanian people are delighted with their satellite status and the Soviet methods of farming and industrial techniques have brought about economic growth never dreamed of in Lithuanian history. The citizens of the free world know that this is but a sham. We know the Lithuanians like so many Russian satellite nations consist of people yearning to be free of this oppressive yoke of the Russians.

The spirit of Lithuanian independence is not dead, and with the emergence of a new era of peace and cooperation in the world, the Russian nation may yet begin to yield their grip on the Lithuanians. We honor and salute the brave people of Lithuania, and assure them that we in the United States share and support them in their efforts to taste freedom.

ADDRESS AND POEMS BY HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, each week it is my distinct pleasure to join my colleagues at the Congressional Prayer Breakfast and to benefit from their many insightful experiences and thoughts. I want to take this opportunity to share with the Members of this body a particularly inspiring address delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. COHEN) at the Congressional Prayer Breakfast on December 6, 1973.

I especially want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that at the conclusion of the address are a number of poems authored by Mr. COHEN. I believe that these poems' expressions and creative use of words tend to add new depth and meaning to our senses and perceptions. I am sure that my colleagues will treasure the beauty of these poems as much as I.

The material follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. COHEN
BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST, MEMBERS DINING ROOM, DECEMBER 6, 1973

Last week, a young political science student called and asked me a series of questions as a part of a survey he was doing. He asked me if I considered myself to be a religious person. My answer was yes. He then asked, "Do you go to church every week?" I answered no. He then finally asked, "Does your political career take precedent over your religious beliefs or practices?" My response was and is: No, because they are often one and the same. I remember what Thomas Jefferson once wrote in a letter to a friend,

"I never did, or countenanced in public life, a single act inconsistent with the strictest good faith; having never believed that there was one code for a public and another for a private man."

The same principles that we believe in as private men serve us no end if we do not practice them as public officials and it is within this context that I would like to talk to you this morning.

On the way into Washington this morning I thought of a need to try to gain some perspective on the seemingly insoluble problems, governmental, social as well as theological, that confront us.

I was reminded of the legend about Rabbi Schneur Zalman, a great Hassidic rabbi of the late 18th century who was imprisoned on false charges. While awaiting trial, he was visited by the local chief of police. Impressed with the rabbi's calm confidence and demeanor, the police chief frequently engaged him in conversation and asked a number of questions that had puzzled him in reading the Scriptures. Why was it, he asked, that a God who was so omniscient, so omnipotent, had to call out when Adam was hiding and ask him, "Where art thou?"

"You do not understand the meaning of the question," Rabbi Zalman answered. "This is a question God asks of every man in every generation. After all of your wanderings, after all of your efforts, after all your years, O man, where art thou?"

Indeed, it is most appropriate, as people in Washington like to say at this point in time, to ask the question as to where we are—where we are going—as a nation, as individuals.

We live in an age of doubt and disillusionment, one in which we engage in self-criticism almost daily, magnifying our errors while muting our accomplishments. There is a growing despair and distrust enveloping our Government and the men who serve in it. I recall that Warren G. Harding (I hesitate to pluck his name from the pages of history) once said that government is after all a very simple thing. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter later noted that "there never was a more pathetic misapprehension of responsibility" than in Harding's superficial conclusion. We indeed know that government is not a simple thing, it's a very complex thing and it is one which requires the dedication of our most gifted, idealistic and capable men and women. Indeed if any definition of government is necessary, it seems to me that Governor Reagan was far more accurate when he suggested that government is like a baby's alimentary canal. It has a healthy appetite at one end and little sense of responsibility at the other.

I speak in earnest and not in jest for never in the history of this country have our people been more concerned about, more critical of, more disenchanted with, or more alienated from the very institutions which exist to bring order, efficiency and service to those whose dollars support them than they are right now.

Prior to Watergate, if there ever was such a time, national polls showed that on a scale of 20, the public ranked politicians 19th in terms of trustworthiness and honesty, just one cut above a used car salesman. This year we have the distinction of being ranked 20th.

We are living in difficult times . . . the bright light cast by the promise and the principles of America in a world so often filled with darkness and oppression suddenly has been dimmed in the eyes of millions of Americans and of those abroad. As noted by one political observer, there seems to be a "spiritual plague" spreading across our country. A recent survey disclosed that a majority of people believe that America is in serious trouble.

Thirty percent of those college students interviewed said that things have gotten so bad that they would prefer to live elsewhere.

Seventy-five percent of the parents today prefer that their children not enter public service. Gordan Strachan, in perhaps the most moving testimony before the Senate investigating committee, said that his advice to the young people of this country would be to "stay away" from politics.

The daily headlines are almost beyond our comprehension—I won't go into the sorry litany other than to say it is, indeed, easy to slip into a state of negativism, a mortification of the soul. There is a clear and present danger that the cynicism may harden and calcify into a deposit that will afflict us for generations to come.

This malaise and sense of despair is by no means confined to politics, to this administration, to this generation, or even to this country. It is a spiritual cancer that has been spreading slowly but perceptibly for some time. Consider, for example, T. S. Eliot's anguished observation of his spiritual wasteland found in "the rock."

THE ROCK

The Eagle soars in the summit of Heaven,
The Hunter with his dogs pursues his circuit.
O perpetual revolution of configured stars,
O perpetual recurrence of determined seasons,

O world of spring and autumn, birth and dying!

The endless cycle of idea and action,
Endless invention, endless experiment,
Brings knowledge of motion, but not of stillness;

Knowledge of speech, but not of silence;
Knowledge of words, and ignorance of the Word.

All our knowledge brings us nearer to our ignorance.

All our ignorance brings us nearer to death,
But nearness to death no nearer to God.
Where is the Life we have lost in living?
Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?

Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

The cycles of Heaven in twenty centuries
Bring us farther from God and nearer to the Dust.

This spiritual decay has continued over the years without abatement and is reflected in our daily contact with each other. I perceive among the vast majority of our citizens—of all economic classes, even the most affluent—a sense of uneasiness. A feeling of helplessness, a lack of fulfillment. And this feeling is exacerbated by the fact that it is not easy to define. It is like what Robert Frost said about love: It is "indefinable but unmistakable." I know it when I see it even if I can't tell you why.

We have accumulated great wealth and made great scientific and technological strides, but our progress has not measurably increased the quality of our existence. We have become a nation of strangers, wandering through a maze of mirrors, often without mission, without moral consciousness or even care of consequence. What we have sacrificed at the altar of accelerated prosperity is an inner peace and a perception of the higher verities.

Man's soul is becoming soiled by the spreading stain of, not only doubt or disbelief, but the lack of direction. The incredible network of roads and airline routes has enabled us to speed faster and faster across the nation and around the world, and we do so without realizing, as does *Richard Bach's* *Mystical Seagull*, that perfect speed is not a matter of simply going faster and faster, "perfect speed is being there."

Craftmanship has succumbed to the trip-hammer hum of mass production. Pride in a product has been subordinated to profit sheet statistics. The consumer is engulfed in a bedazzling array of shiny but shoddy goods.

Customer complaints are answered on an inane form letter spewed out by an automatic typewriter. Credit reputations are rumpled and ruined in whirling and erring computers. Inadequately tested drugs cause the malformation of babies. Anti-biotic ointments are found to produce deafness while curing diaper rashes. The list goes on and on . . .

What we have lost in this country is the human dimension. The voice of the individual is being drowned in the vortex of material progress.

The burden which we all carry, that unrelenting pressure which we all feel, is the product of one attitude—indifference. As George Bernard Shaw once wrote, "the worst sin toward our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them: That is the essence of inhumanity."

Only when we are prepared to restore our respect for each individual, with whom we share a commonality of interests, aspirations and frailties, only when we recognize that the multiplication and perpetuation of life and the accumulation of possessions are not ends in themselves—only then can we begin to irrigate and cultivate the soil which has grown dry and barren with neglect.

All of this does not tell you much about Bill Cohen. He is not an easy subject for me to talk about . . . as an indirect result of my early religious training, I developed a love for languages. In college I majored in Latin with a special interest in Latin poetry. This experience gave me a sense of history, a sensitivity to the beauty in the world, an awareness of the joy and sadness in the smallest of things, but above all a sense of the divine order of things.

I thought I might share with you some of the observations that I have committed to verse during the past fifteen years. They are simply impressions, fleeting emotions and not at all good poetry. The meter has been marred by the clip clop of my wooden tongue. I hope you will overlook this deformity. They are about my wife, my sons, the song of seasons, the order of things.

CAN SEASON BE THE REASON?

Winter freezes summer blood to ice,
And chills the passions that await the spring;

The lover suffers seasoned sacrifice,
At Altars bleak with crystal covering.

What heart can hold a love in winter's time,
When even Nature slacks her passioned pace,

When minor creatures flee the upper dome,
For warmer realms of borrowed, burrowed space?

But spring has courage to oppose the cold,
And passes on to those in love the same;
The sounds of life and future birth take hold,

Of human ears that closed at winter's name.

Yet is it fair to un-impassioned reason
To say that love depends upon a season?

THE GROVE

Come and touch me now, Diana
And let your boughs
Brush against my face.

Entwine
Your shadow into mine
While your limbs are still green
And the white of winter
Is a season or two away;

The sun is high,
Our roots dig deep
And songs still leap among our leaves;
But today the forest's springs seem quieter
And yesterday the squirrels were hiding
Chestnuts in some hollowed trees.

OCTOBER SUNDAY

Autumn just touches you
one day,
in a way that
no other moment
does.

Trees surrender their green
for gold
at the first touch of cold
and cry quietly
in color
at the betrayal of the sun.

The wind paints flesh
the hue of apple skins
Spirits soar in concrete stadiums,
while winter's scout
cuts the throats of perennials
and muffles the pain in ice.

Strange, how we rejoice
at the brilliance of
the red,
knowing their lives
are nearly dead,
and our children play
in paper graves
dug by fallen
leaves.

Stranger still, the custom
of mourning the death
of summer
with a family ride
through the countryside
pointing at the splendor of it
all.

MAINE SPRING

Spring came late
this year,
Or, perhaps, it's just
that Winter refused
to leave.

The sky was gray
and cold so long
that April came
with snow instead
of rain.

Fine trees and evergreens
were blown brown,
birch trees lay
bowed to the ground
in unwilling homage
to the crown
of white weight
that makes its kingdom
where ice consents to serve
as mate.

But just the other day
about the first of May
there appeared the sun
like some burning salmon
on a run.

Suddenly brilliant flower heads
emerged in painless birth,
rows of rainbows spread,
petals knit in silken thread.

Trees began to shout in green
while the season's
feathered supplicants
left among their leaves,
and children could be seen
skipping rope, in
new and tattered jeans.

Motion was everywhere, in everything,
even the night began to sing
with crickets' busy legs;
Proud robins and jays sent trills
through valved lutes and piccolos
hidden safely in their
happy throats.

Swollen ridges and ruts
sagged as the liquid beneath
rose and ran rippling
into the streets;
Dogs bounced and barked
and galloped through
the city parks

Sunshine, shadows
sound and echo were abound,
song was in the air
color in riot everywhere

One transparent moment in May
I saw the promise of rebirth,
heard the whisper of repair.

Memorial day is a moment
when celebration and sadness
are joined hand in hand
in a strident brass band march
on every Main street
at 10 A.M.

It is a holiday weekend
filled with pain
and potted flowers
for some,
you know the ones
who circle through manicured lawns
in a quiet drone,
searching for those now gone
sunk in brevity
carved in stone.

A time for families
to gather from distant coasts
and drop tears over the memory
of tall ghosts,
sons or brothers
who gave their green for all
and forever.

Then there is the parade
where balloons and miniature flags
are held by babies
resting on their fathers' height
and the shirt-sleeved crowd
rejoices at the sight
of some friend who steps left
when the sergeant barks right.

A veteran from some ancient war
steps proudly to a patriotic beat and blare,
his frozen face, the subject once
of an artist's special grace,
is strapped in a metal disc
that gave thin shelter
against the risk
of destruction.

By the reviewing stand
pass ROTC units, then
a local high school band,
And there, in the very rear,
dressed in blue shirts and bright scarves
come the smallest group,
the youngest troupe.
Cub scouts, with
blushing flower faces
and embarrassed grins,
unsure of their presence,
of their particular
significance.

Is it simply the promise
of a continuing nation
or is it instead
a subtler solace to those
who mourn their dead,
that these sons of others
will one day answer
a written call
and stand ready to fall
in some foreign land
in the name of freedom.

I really don't know,
I only ask because today
my son was somewhere
in that parade
and I couldn't bear to
go.

A LITTLE GREENER NOW

I feel a little greener,
cleaner somehow for
having walked through
the woods today.

The wind whispered to the
trees in hushed tones,
though not fully heard,
could still be understood.

Pines pierced the sky
and held back the light
from the night beneath,
where minor creatures went at ease,
and rocks wore moss
in cool shades of suede

Silence there was shattered
only by a caw or winged cry,
some sudden dark flutter
that warned all others of
the strange passerby.

I paused just long enough
under those needled boughs
to hear a harmony too perfect
to be reproduced by man.

A LITTLE GREENER NOW

I hugged the shadows, kissed the leaves,
was loved in return, it seemed,
by the breeze,
and felt the green fill of life
flow from the trees
gently into me.

Then I turned and left
that dark unmapped retreat
and dissolved into the
roar and ruin of the street.

VIETNAMESE ORPHANS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as the first Member of Congress to present a bill to facilitate the adoption of Vietnamese-American orphans I believe, along with my colleagues who have since presented similar legislation, that the time has come for a full discussion through congressional hearings of the problems facing these children and their prospective parents.

Last week I began the presentation of a three part series of the most common points of discussion in regards to Asian-American adoptions.

Today I am completing this series with final excerpts from *The Children*, a handbook on Asian-American adoptions, written in 1969 by Jan de Hartog, the father of two adopted Asian daughters and a well known author. I am most grateful to Atheneum Publishers, New York, for granting permission for reprinting these copyrighted excerpts:

SOME COMMON OBJECTIONS TO THESE ADOPTIONS

5. "IN THIS COUNTRY, THEY WOULD BE HORRIBLY SPOILED"

An elderly lady in a semi-official position, who had been highly vociferous in her objections against "the import of Asian children", was cornered by some of our parents after a meeting and badgered until, flustered and furious, she finally came out with one specific reason for her active opposition. These chil-

dren, she said, so appealing to look at, would run the grave danger of being spoiled rotten once they got here and thereby become impossible to live with in later life.

To us, at the time, it sounded like a ridiculous argument; we discovered to our surprise that a number of educational experts, while conceding that the lady in question might have exaggerated the danger, sincerely though she had a point. Our children, they feared, might indeed run the risk of being severely spoiled, with the result she mentioned.

In a sense, they were right. All of us with children from Korea or Vietnam have found ourselves in situations where, in a restaurant, an airport or a supermarket, total strangers come up to our children to say, "Now aren't you a cute little baby? Aren't your Mummy and Daddy lucky people to have two such darling little girls to call their own?" Mummy and Daddy, case-hardened by now, may wince as they smile; to the children, if the worrying experts are right, this will be acutely harmful. You cannot go on calling an impressionable, brightly intelligent urchin "cute", "darling" or "the sweetest thing I ever set eyes on" without, so it is argued, force-feeding him with flattery until he turns into a mini-megalomaniac, strutting where he used to skip, saying his prayers with pigeon-chested condescension, as if he were ordering a menu from room service rather than humbly approaching his God.

I cannot agree with this somber prognosis. Were we ourselves to indulge in this kind of hyperbole at home it would be a different matter, but to fear that occasional admirers, mostly elderly, ingenuous and harmless, will inflate our child's ego until he has to be clubbed in front of the mirror seems an exaggeration. On the contrary, although that kind of situation is always icky and awkward to get out of, I welcome the occasional sentimentalist who feels he simply has to tell my children how pretty, cute and clever they are. Although I am at pains to hide this from my wife, I don't even blanch when some effusive fan, peek-a-booming among the bolognas or the rolls of toilet paper in our local supermarket, reminds my children how lucky they are to have such a darling, selfless Daddy; for not only have I a high tolerance for flattery, but my common sense compels me to relate the episode to our children's past. After they have survived years of unimaginable deprivation, especially emotionally, I cannot understand why they should be considered too fragile and insecure to take some harmless, drooling adulation in their stride. What is more, the reception that awaits them here is not always so generous and benevolent as we would like to believe. Why we should worry about their being spoiled by praise while assuming them to be immune to contempt escapes me.

6. "THEY WILL NEVER BE REALLY YOURS"

Among the dire warnings you will be given by other people, this one may impress you most. But to think that any child, even a natural one, can ever be one's "own" is asking for trouble at the onset of adolescence, when the human young awakens to the fact that the people he has been calling his parents are not only purely incidental to his identity, but complete strangers who, rather than understanding him best, are about the last people in the world to understand him at all. Only after the egotist who flew the coop has reached maturity himself, through marriage and parenthood, will he modify this concept of your relationship—usually about the time he starts doing something about Mother's Day again after a long interval.

In the early years of interracial adoptions it was assumed by social workers that this type of adoption was more hazardous than

the normal kind, where a child was selected to resemble as much as possible one or both future parents. Adjustment, it was thought, became easier in direct ratio to the closeness of this resemblance. When practice began to prove that interracial adoptions worked out better on the whole, experts delved assiduously into case histories for the reasons for this discrepancy, and after a while one did emerge: because of the difference in appearance the adoptive parents of an Asian child were unable to hide the fact that he was adopted. This, rather than causing emotional distress in the child and parents as had been assumed, made for a healthy, realistic relationship. The fact that people saw at a glance that the child was adopted ruled out the tragic situation, fairly common at that time, in which a child after having lived for years in the conviction that his parents were his own was suddenly exposed to the traumatic discovery, usually by accident, that he was adopted.

I can tell you even after so short a time as a year and a half, that my Korean daughters and I are joined by a relationship which is surprisingly deep-rooted and affectionate. I am proud of them, fascinated by their unique individuality and moved by their unselfconscious tenderness. They may not be mine, but I am theirs, without reservation; and to my surprise, for reasons known maybe only to mothers, this turns out to be all I need to feel at peace with the world and grateful to be alive.

And if you think that's mawkish, just you wait.

7. "YOU WILL NEVER LOVE THEM THE WAY YOU LOVE YOUR OWN CHILDREN"

At one time I thought I would never find bureaucratic unwieldiness expressed more succinctly than in the question, the last on a list of thirty submitted to aliens who desire to become citizens: "Can you read or write?" I have since been forced to transfer my laurels to a questionnaire for prospective adoptive parents composed by a concerned social agency which contains the following item: "You have one child of your own. If both your own child, and the one you propose to adopt were to fall into the water at the same moment, which one would you rescue first?"

You will find that this question, once you have allowed it to sink in, will go on haunting you; at first because of its surrealist preposterousness, like the mathematical problems of our schooldays, "Five Chinese eat seven bags of rice, how many bags of rice does each Chinese eat?"; later by the nagging thought that, indeed, the agency may have something there.

Do parents who have children of their own ever love adopted children as much as they do their own flesh and blood? For a while it may seem to you that the question is not only searching, but valid. Only after you have managed to rid yourself of the spell that the self-confidence of ignorance always manages to throw on one will you awaken to the abysmal stupidity of the concept that love should or can be ladled out, like soup, in equal parts among your dependents with scrupulous impartiality.

Love, if its illusive mystery has to be defined for consumption by a Univac, is an emotion engendered by one person in another which will ultimately result in an unselfishness uncongential to the human animal. In its sublimated form, so the mystics tell us, it does not even need an individual but can be engendered by all mankind and ultimately by all living things. But even in that rarefied and superhuman form love remains an intensely personal emotion which has nothing to do with duty, sense of responsibility or the desire to give everybody a fair share. If my children could reassure themselves on the subject of my love only by

jumping in the water with their hands tied behind their backs and weights attached to their legs, in order to find out whom I would rescue first, they would deserve to drown and the person who composed the questionnaire with them.

But once you have shaken off the questionnaire, the question remains unanswered. It should remain unanswered, but such is human nature that we will go on asking ourselves, in secret, especially during the months before the child arrives, "Will I, when put to the test, give preference to my own flesh and blood, although on the surface my adopted child will share equally in my affection?"

It needs the reality of the human presence before this mad bat of a question can be chased back into the bureaucratic belfry from which it swooped. It needs the actual feel of a little body in your arms, the actual sound of a voice calling you Dad, the actual stumble toward the toilet at dead of night and the patient wait for the tinkle with your knees on the cold floor and a small sleeping head on your shoulder, for you to realize with a feeling of inexpressible relief that the concept of love as a limited fund that has to be doled out in ever smaller portions as the number of claimants increases is nonsense. So you end up by loving one child more than another, or in a different way? The Bible is full of favorite sons. They figure honorably in American presidential elections. Which child expert, family-planner or adoption-plumber can demand that parents sign a document stating they shall love a child they have never set eyes on to the same degree and in the same manner that they love their own offspring whom, at times, they would gladly strangle?

Each new generation of young girls hears it said and reacts to it with a sense of revelation that, in the beginning, a person is in love with the idea of love, not with one particular human being. We parents start by being in love with the idea of a child, until the individual hacks his way through the foliage of our sentimental generalization. Never fear, he will: probably sooner than later. In no time at all he will stop being "the Vietnamese orphan you and your wife adopted," he will stop being orphaned, Vietnamese and adopted in succession, ultimately he will even stop being a child and become himself: unique, irreplaceable, never seen on earth before, never to be seen again, absolute and ultimate entity of mankind.

The moment will come when you look, for the first time, beyond the mirrors of each other's eyes; if at that moment the person who wrote the questionnaire were to come in and pose his question, you would look at him in astonishment and wonder what life had done to him to make him that way.

FIRE PREVENTION SYSTEMS
TAX INCENTIVE

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to create tax incentives for the installation of fire prevention apparatus and extinguishing systems in existing buildings. The bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow an ordinary expense deduction for the cost of installing such systems, and would be allowed only for buildings that are already constructed.

Because of the recent catastrophe resulting from uncontrolled fires, we have all been made keenly aware of the necessity for adequate fire protection in large buildings. Presently, however, the Federal Government cannot require the installation of sprinkler systems or other devices to help prevent fires; also, as is so frequently the case in cities throughout the country, many existing buildings are without adequate protection devices because they were built when installation of such systems was not required. While these buildings were certainly constructed in good faith and in compliance with the building codes of the localities, we must now seek to improve the safety of today's occupants.

A major goal of my bill, then, is to provide the owners and lessees of such buildings with an incentive to undertake the expensive installation of protective and extinguishing systems. A tax deduction would make it economically feasible for them to do so. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will consider this bill as it continues its deliberations on reforming the Internal Revenue Code.

The need for such legislation was highlighted earlier this month with the tragic fire that devastated a Sao Paulo skyscraper, killing some 180 people and injuring nearly 300. Following that catastrophe, the former superintendent of the New Orleans Fire Department, Louis San Salvador, warned that similar disasters could occur here, and that "we had better be prepared for it." The Federal Government can do something to help prevent such disasters by providing adequate tax incentives for the installation of sprinkler systems and other preventive apparatus in existing buildings, and this is the purpose of my bill.

Builders now know that sprinkler systems and other fire prevention measures are needed, especially in new high-rise constructions, and they are able to plan for installation costs in financing their projects. However, installation costs for existing buildings are extraordinary, and at present, owners cannot justify them economically without having to greatly raise rental fees.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we need Federal aid to meet this urgent problem. I believe a Federal subsidy program or grant program would be too slow and cumbersome in addressing the situation. Rather, the best method to meet this problem is through our tax code, by providing incentives that would encourage owners to equip their buildings with fire protection devices, which would in turn also prompt local governments to require their installation.

The text of the legislation follows:

H.R. 12944

A bill to provide a tax incentive for installation to certain buildings of fire sprinklers and other fire prevention or extinguishment apparatus

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 189. CERTAIN EXPENDITURES TO INSTALL FIRE PREVENTION APPARATUS.

"(a) Treatment as Expenses.—

"(1) In General.—A taxpayer may elect to treat any qualified fire prevention expenditure which is paid or incurred by him during the taxable year as an expenditure which is not chargeable to capital account. Any expenditure so treated shall be allowed as a deduction.

"(2) Election.—An election under paragraph (1) shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations.

"(b) Qualified Fire Prevention Expenditure Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified fire prevention expenditure' means any expenditure for the installation to any building owned or leased by the taxpayer of a fire sprinkler system or other fire prevention or extinguishment apparatus which meets—

"(1) standards for such system or apparatus which would have been required to be so installed under Federal, State, or local law if such building were not exempt from such requirement by reason of being built or modified prior to the effective date of such requirement; or

"(2) in the case of such installation occurring in the absence of any Federal, State, or local law which requires such installation, standards established under regulations, prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate under subsection (c) after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce.

"(c) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 189. Certain expenditures to install fire prevention apparatus."

(c) Section 263(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to capital expenditures not deductible) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "or"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) expenditures to install certain fire prevention apparatus, deductible under section 189."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

CURRENT MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE ON AUTISM

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, in the testimony today before the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee concerning the extension of the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1970, Dr. Donald J. Cohen of Yale University School of Medicine very forcefully and comprehensively brings forth the current medical knowledge on the neurological basis for autism. I wish to commend him for his very fine work and express my appreciation to him for his unyielding efforts in the cause to place autism in the

Developmental Disabilities Act. I would like to share with you his testimony:

TESTIMONY OF DR. DONALD COHEN

My name is Donald J. Cohen, M.D., and I am a child psychiatrist and Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine. I am a clinical researcher and physician, and my major concern is for children with severe disturbances in their development, particularly children whose range of disabilities leads them to be diagnosed as autistic or as psychotic.

Childhood autism is the most overwhelming severe behavioral disturbance of childhood. Its presence is often detected during the first month or two of life, and always before the child's third birthday, and its natural history is often a pervasive, lifelong developmental disability, which spares no area of social, emotional, or intellectual functioning.

During their preschool and schoolage years, children with childhood autism are characterized by a variety of deviations in behavior: loss of speech or failure in its development or in its normal unfolding; impairment of emotional relationships with persons, usually associated with a tendency toward preoccupation with inanimate objects and social aloofness; disturbances in sensory perception; unusual, bizarre, or stereotypic behavior and patterns of motility; episodes of intense and irrational panic; anxiety and resistance to any change in the environment or routine; absence of a sense of personal identity; and uneven, fragmented, and blunted intellectual development. Only a few of these children, perhaps 10%, have the capacity for intellectual performance within the normal range, with the remainder performing as retarded children. But no child with autism can function like a normal member of childhood and adult society.

Children with the autistic syndrome have been clearly recognized for over thirty years. They come from families at every level of society, and have been found throughout the world, from highly technologically advanced cultures and from developing nations. Families of autistic children do not seem to be different from families of any other kind of children, with their share of personal difficulties, as well as with that kind of strength which allows for a husband and wife to stay available over months and years to a child who can drive a professional to distraction during the course of 30 minutes. Epidemiological data and genetic information are quite limited, as they are for all serious disturbances in childhood.

The data which are available indicate that the condition appears in about 1 in every 3,000 children, making it much more common than phenylketonuria (PKU), which is found in 1 child in every 15,000, but not as common as Down's syndrome (Mongolism), which can occur in about 1 in every 700 births. It is rare for there to be more than one child in a family with childhood autism or for there to be a familial history of severe psychiatric disturbance. However, in almost every case in which one child in an identical twinning suffers from childhood autism, his identical twin is also autistic. This high, perhaps 100%, concordance rate in identical twins strongly suggests a congenital basis for the autistic disturbance.

Careful scientific investigation of autistic children during the last decade has revealed a number of indications of central nervous system disturbances. At least 40 to 50% of autistic children have abnormalities of the electroencephalogram or brain wave, indicating neurological dysfunction. By adolescence, at least one quarter of the autistic children have epilepsy. Neurological examination, even in children with normal electroencephalograms and without seizures, often reveals

evidence of neurological problems indicated by abnormalities of reflexes, coordination, and sensory perception. Disturbances of neurophysiological organization, perhaps associated with the obvious difficulties in relation to motility patterns, have been clearly demonstrated.

During the past several years, there have been many advances in our understanding of the way in which the central nervous system functions on a chemical level. This biochemical knowledge is now being focused on understanding children with childhood autism. There have been several important suggestions from biochemical research, including our own investigations, that some children with childhood autism may have abnormalities related to the biochemistry of central nervous system integration. That children with childhood autism suffer from a neurological dysfunction thus seems to be reported by a confluence of evidence: the onset of this disease syndrome during the first weeks and months of life, as the most metabolic disorders; abnormalities of neurophysiological integration, electrical activity of the brain, and physical examination; the high concordance rate in identical twins; disturbances in biochemical functions related to central nervous system metabolism; the high incidence of seizures; the worldwide distribution of a syndrome which is identifiable from various cultures and economic conditions; and the clinical picture of a disorder affecting every sphere of functioning from early in life and persisting throughout a lifetime.

Several weeks ago I saw a preschool aged girl with all of the classical signs of childhood autism: social aloofness, developmental retardation, stereotypic behavior, emotional lability, and disturbed language functioning. Metabolic evaluation, however, revealed that this youngster was suffering from an entity for which practically every child in the United States is screened during the first week of life, phenylketonuria.

Before the time of mass screening for PKU, many children with this inborn disease of metabolism were diagnosed as having childhood autism, a diagnosis which was often supported with the observation that many of these children are attractive, agile-appearing, blond hair, blue-eyed youngsters with no obvious signs of brain malformation. The autistic syndrome can be found associated with other organic disturbances, including such dysfunctions as lead intoxication and encephalitis; measles encephalitis; other disorders of amino acid metabolism such as PKU; retrolental fibroplasia and other conditions which lead to blindness.

The medical evaluation of a child who presents with an autistic syndrome thus includes a search for any known conditions which may lead to this pervasive behavioral syndrome. When such a condition is discovered, for example on the basis of a urine screening test, the more specific diagnosis is given. When it is not, a child may be labeled autistic.

As we learn more about the metabolism of the central nervous system and elucidate other biological disorders, we will be moving children from the large, non-specific category of childhood autism to one or another class of biologically denied condition. This process of increasing clarification of diagnosis, based on scientific advance, has been particularly dramatic in relation to children with the diagnosis of mental retardation. Over the past decade, literally over 150 disorders of metabolism have been identified, many of which are associated with mental retardation appearing during the first years of life. However, many and perhaps most children with the diagnosis of mental retardation, still today elude any specific neurological or biological diagnosis. These mentally retarded children, just as most

children with childhood autism, are diagnosed on the basis of behavior, clinical history, and our scientific conviction that they suffer from disorders of central nervous system integration.

For many children with epilepsy, an aetiological diagnosis is also impossible. The origin of their central nervous system excitability can often not be traced to a discrete lesion in the brain or insult to the structure of the central nervous system. We have recently demonstrated one possible biochemical disorder in children with epilepsy related to the metabolism of central nervous system neurotransmitters. Future work will, no doubt, clarify the metabolic basis of many types of so-called idiopathic epilepsy. Yet, here, too, there is no doubt but that these children and adults suffer from a neurological disorder, although one about which much more needs to be learned.

Optimal care for a child with autism, as for one with severe mental retardation, cerebral palsy, or epilepsy, requires comprehensive planning, instituted at the time of diagnosis. Children with autism require professional care for many years, and, for most, throughout their lives. Such care requires the collaboration of a variety of specialists, including educators, speech therapists, psychologists, psychiatrists, neurologists, pediatricians, and experts in vocational rehabilitation. The exact services which any particular child requires depends on his needs and strengths, and on his particular developmental level. For children during the preschool years, parental guidance and day programs emphasizing behavior modification may be required; during the schoolage years, more intensive special education is often required, and the use of medication, speech therapy, and psychotherapy may be important; during the adolescent years, vocational training must play a major role in the child's life.

By age five years, some autistic children may require full time residential care, although the great majority do not; by the age of twenty years, however, probably most autistic children would benefit from halfway houses and other kinds of alternatives to living with their parents. For the adult with autism, as for the adult with mental retardation, opportunities for productive work in sheltered and guided work environments may mean the difference between a sense of value and a lifelong sense of worthlessness.

This brief description of the variety of professionals and services required by children with autism, throughout their development, may bring to mind the already familiar concept of comprehensive and longitudinal planning for children with mental retardation. This similarity is, of course, not accidental: while the needs of any particular child depend on his unique situation, there is a close resemblance between the types of services required by children with childhood autism and those required by children with severe mental retardation. For many children diagnosed as autistic, the distinction between their condition and some forms of mental retardation may be of no practical consequence whatever.

Our increasing understanding of the biology of developmental disabilities makes many traditional distinctions between various clinical categories less meaningful. Children labeled with different categorical names may suffer from disorders of the same biological systems; other children given the same categorical label may have disorders of very different neurological systems based on differing pathophysiological processes. Clinical researchers must search for specific treatments based on understanding of biological disorders and move toward precise, functional definitions of various types of developmental problems. However, the care and education of children cannot wait until we

have specific biological knowledge; and no child who can benefit from what we already know about the education of autistic and other developmentally disabled children today should be deprived of these opportunities. The inclusion of autism under the Developmental Disabilities Act as a specific syndrome is thus justified by available scientific evidence, as well as by our humane concern.

IRS COLLECTS INTEREST WHEN THE TAXPAYER FILES LATE, SO LET THE TAXPAYER COLLECT IT WHEN IRS REFUNDS LATE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, no matter how early a taxpayer files for a refund, the Internal Revenue Service under current law can wait until June 1 to mail him a refund check without owing him interest on the amount of overpayment being refunded.

I think that is unfair, and so do the 24 Members who join me today in introducing legislation to change it.

In early April of 1973, millions of taxpayers were looking in their mailboxes each day to find that the refund check they expected was not there. This was especially true of taxpayers whose returns were being processed at the new IRS service centers in New York, Tennessee and California.

The delay was more painful than ever, because the average refund as of late March was nearly \$100 higher than it was for the comparable period a year earlier.

Under existing law, the IRS has 45 days from the April 15 filing deadline to make a refund without having to pay interest on it. This means that if a taxpayer files by March 1—barely 30 days after he is supposed to have received his W-2 form from his employer—the automation wizards at IRS can fiddle with his return for a full 90 days before having to pay him interest on what he has coming back.

Yet the IRS is keen on collecting interest when the situation is reversed and the taxpayer is filing late. The IRS is so keen on it that it will even demand an interest payment from a taxpayer on money that was refunded to him in error.

The IRS has said that, on the average, it takes 6 weeks to issue a refund check. I think that is too much time to process returns that are filed early, so I am reintroducing legislation to require IRS to pay interest to individual taxpayers who file their returns before March 1 if the refund check is not mailed out within 30 days after the return is filed.

To solve a problem that can plague the small businessman, the bill also requires IRS to inform a taxpayer why a refund is being made—that is, the tax and the taxable period to which the refund applies, and the reason for making the refund.

This is because a taxpayer singled out for what may be an erroneous refund

has been cursed. He is stuck with an unexplained check, since IRS computers aren't geared to respond to complaints or queries from the outside world.

At present, the most such a taxpayer can do is sit tight until IRS comes to its automated senses, realizes its mistakes, and asks for the money back—at 6 percent interest for the period the refund was erroneously in his possession.

This is a short, uncomplicated bill that can even things up a bit for the taxpayer, and I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will consider it along with the other tax reform proposals it is studying. The cosponsors are: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SIKES, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. LITTON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. KETCHUM, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. HUBER, Mr. YATES, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. WARE.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS COMMISSION REPORT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the newly issued report of the National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis. It was my privilege to write the bill that established this Commission and I think it has proven to be one of the most effective such units ever organized in the field of health.

The release of the Advisory Commission's report is the culmination of almost 2 years of dedicated effort. The push for a study of the status of MS research was initiated by Robert Baptiste of Mansfield, a constituent of mine and member of the Attleboro Jaycees. His perseverance sparked the interest and concern of the Massachusetts Jaycees which in turn enlisted the National Jaycees in the fight for the establishment of a National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis. This civic-minded organization of 6,000 member chapters generated broad based support for the proposal.

The grassroots phenomenon did not stop here. Soon after the legislation which would create such a Commission was introduced in Congress, 90 Members of the House and Senate had joined as cosponsors. Though many Members took part in guiding the legislation to enactment, several should be singled out for special thanks. Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS, Democratic of Florida, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, took a special interest in the bill and should receive plaudits from all who seek a cure for MS. On the committee the unanimous vote will long be

remembered as will the leadership of Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, Republican of Minnesota, Congressman JAMES HASTINGS, Republican of New York, and Congressman BILL ROY, Democratic of Kansas. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democratic of New Jersey was responsible for introducing the companion legislation in the Senate. His heartfelt belief in the need for such a Commission has been borne out by the group's recent recommendations.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis calls for an expenditure of some \$54 million over the next 3 years. Such a request is realistic in scope and yet would provide the resource tools necessary to take giant strides toward a cure for this dread disease.

Multiple sclerosis is a tragiccrippler of young adults between the ages of 20 and 40. The disease strikes indiscriminately at young men and women in the prime of their lives. It is estimated that there are 500,000 victims in the United States alone and countless millions elsewhere in the world. In addition to the effects on both the victim and his family it has been estimated that every male MS patient taken out of the labor market results in a loss of \$450,000 to our economy.

The National Commission on MS has recommended specifically that the Government accelerate its spending on basic neurological research by \$37 million over the next 3 years beginning in fiscal year 1975. Such an investment would result in an expenditure of less than 9 cents a year for each American—an incredibly low figure. I feel this great country can afford to spend 9 cents a year per person to conquer a disease as debilitating as MS.

Though we know neither the cure nor the cause of multiple sclerosis the implementation of the Commission's recommendations would develop a diagnostic test specifically for multiple sclerosis.

The encouraging research leads highlighted by the Commission are in the fields of virology, immunology and epidemiology and the report is heavily weighted on the side of studying MS in man rather than in laboratory or animal models as has been done in the past. Specifically, the Commission has recommended the establishment of three new clinical research centers to determine those factors that adversely affect the course of the disease and the establishment of one comprehensive multiple sclerosis treatment center to evaluate current treatment methods and to devise new methods to minimize the disabling, crippling and painful effects of the disease.

The Commission believes that funds alone will not solve the problem of MS. Meaningful productivity appears to be largely dependent on certain key elements that do not presently exist. These have been identified as the delegation of responsibility for the MS program to one staff member at the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke; the creation of an NIH Multidisciplinary Study Section on MS to review and eval-

uate all proposals for research and development related to this disease; and encouraging effective collaboration between scientists representing the various scientific disciplines concerned with MS.

The presentation of the National Advisory Commission's report is an excellent example of the rewards of citizen participation in the governmental process. It was a constituent and MS victim who so poignantly expressed the need for such a Commission to me. Support for the legislation mushroomed through the works of civic-minded young men. Congressional response was both quick and heartwarming. It is my hope that the Congress will study the Commission's recommendations and provide the resources necessary for a concentrated effort in search of a cure for MS.

TRANSFORMING URBAN AMERICA

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Washington Post included a thought-provoking article on the rebuilding and revitalization of America's cities by Wilfred Owen, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a nationally recognized authority on urban affairs.

Mr. Owen's thesis is that the gas shortage has ironically become the catalyst for renewed efforts to make the center city a decent place in which to live and work. He applauds the imminent demise of the commuter ethos which has encouraged people to move farther and farther from their jobs and describes the renewal of the Cedar-Riverside area of Minneapolis as an example of city planning for people rather than for business.

I agree with Mr. Owen's conclusion that the primary domestic challenge facing us is how to make our cities livable, desirable, and attractive, and I insert the article at this point in the RECORD so that the author's views may receive the wider attention they deserve.

SAVING GAS—AND SOCIETY (Wilfred Owen)

The gasoline shortage focuses attention on a fundamental defect of the American city: We are using our ability to move to compensate for our inability to build a satisfactory urban environment.

What we are up against is the obsolescence of the accidental city, which puts a premium on moving because it offers so little in the way of living. Vast central city areas are plagued by poor housing and inadequate services, neighborhoods are rocked by drugs and crime, and the ugliness is all-pervading. Under those circumstances the automobile has become the logical method of escape to dormitory suburbs, where driving is a necessary means of surviving; it may take a gallon of gas to buy a quart of milk.

The suburban commuter life-style increased 100 percent in the past decade in Dallas and Houston, 84 per cent in New Orleans, and 56 per cent in Pittsburgh. Nationwide, reverse commuting was up 79 per cent, reflecting the fact that poor people and

blacks living in center cities are unable to find either housing or acceptance close to jobs in outlying areas. Those who work close in live far out, and those who work far out live close in. It is a perfect set-up for the petroleum industry.

The real energy crisis, then, is the drain on human energy. The average commuter spends a month of daylight hours every year beating his way over the concrete trails between home and job. If people were considered as important as fossil fuels, someone would have appointed a human energy czar in charge of rebuilding the cities.

Planned communities around the world are beginning to show how systems of urban living can be designed for people rather than for business. A city designed for human purposes provides good housing in a pleasant neighborhood with the option of living near work, walking to the store, having recreation nearby, and reducing the unnecessary travel that results from the inconvenience of having things located in the wrong places. Those who prefer perpetual motion have the option of generating extra mileage if they want. By contrast most unplanned urban areas deny people those choices.

Planned cities are demonstrating that large-scale city-building is physically and economically feasible and that many of the design concepts, as well as the financing methods and community social systems, could apply to existing cities and suburbs. The federal government is now supporting planned urbanization through loan guarantees to help pay land acquisition and other front-end costs. Planned cities may be either satellites of old cities, such as Reston or Columbia, or rehabilitation of blighted areas in existing cities. Cedar-Riverside in Minneapolis is one of the latter.

What is happening in Cedar-Riverside points the way toward transforming urban slums and blight all over America. A private city-building team, which operates out of a converted ice cream factory, is in the process of redesigning a depressed and depressing 100 acres of the old city into a new city for 30,000 people. The result will be an attractive downtown community just 12 blocks from the center of downtown Minneapolis and a few steps from the University of Minnesota.

The Cedar-Riverside planners have put together over 400 separate parcels of "charming slum" property in an effort to rebuild the whole place in a way that will restore "the enjoyment and celebration of life," with due consideration for the wishes of existing tenants. All of them, if they wish, will be included in the new community. The aim is to combine good housing, pleasant neighborhoods, easy access to jobs, good health-care services, improvements in education, provisions for recreation, and a wide range of cultural activities. A theatre in the round has been fashioned out of a pizza parlor, and beer joints have become centers for the performing arts. High-rise apartments have both subsidized and unsubsidized units in a mix that conceals which is which, and day-care centers, clinics and other community facilities are located in the apartment buildings. Much of the surroundings will be refurbished rather than destroyed.

Already Cedar Avenue, the once dingy main commercial street, has lost its typical city street pallor. The poles and wires are down, the sidewalks are repaved, store fronts are being renovated. Pocket parks are being substituted for vacant lots. Colorful murals camouflage ugly walls. Half the street acreage has been vacated to consolidate the land into large tracts for building complexes and for open space. A new pedestrian transport system is being built at second-floor level to take the place of unneeded street mileage. And an elongated town center plaza and surrounding buildings will keep the motor vehicles below the surface.

Projects such as Cedar-Riverside point out the best thing about a gasoline shortage; most things that need to be done to cope with it are things that ought to be done anyway. It is time for the richest country in the world to overcome the poverty of its cities. It will take a combination of national economic reforms to reduce poverty, massive housing programs, new land-use planning policies, and institutional arrangements for managing and financing the urban habitat.

But we know from new communities around the world that building and rebuilding whole cities is physically possible and can prove financially feasible through cost-saving techniques, new design concepts, a combination of public and private efforts, and the use for community purposes of the profits from rising land values.

Transforming urban America would require a single urban development fund to consolidate federal aid for urban areas, and

the creation of urban development agencies at the metropolitan level with city-building responsibilities.

Making urban areas livable, desirable, and attractive for people of all incomes and races is the overriding domestic challenge for the last quarter of this century. Putting the emphasis on living instead of moving is a shift in priorities that seems bound to save gasoline. If we put our minds to it, it might even save urban society.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 25, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Philip A. Tammaru, Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church, Seabrook, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, with so much bitterness in the world, we pray for a broader vision of the needs of all mankind.

Many nations have become enslaved by communism; among them Estonia. Today we observe her day of independence. Yet she is captive.

We ask that Your spirit may help the leaders of the nations to find a way by which the peoples of the Earth can be free and live at peace with one another.

Bless the President. Give courage to the Representatives in the Congress to do the right thing in Your sight.

May this country still offer refuge to the "tempest tossed" and "huddled masses yearning to breathe free." May the challenge of the spirit of '76 be always before us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2296. An act to provide for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to protect, develop, and enhance the environment of certain of the Nation's lands and resources, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS OF U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MURPHY of New York; Mr. LONG of Maryland; Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio; and Mr. GILMAN, of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS OF U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of title 10, United States Code, sec-

tion 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STRATTON, of New York; Mr. HORTON, of New York; and Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS OF U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia; Mr. SKES, of Florida; Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin; and Mr. ARMSTRONG, of Colorado.

TOURISM

(Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, tourism is in fact the second ranking retail expenditure in the United States. It makes a significant contribution to my State of Wyoming ranking as our third largest industry. Wyoming and several other States could not prosper without it today.

In light of the role of tourism in our national economy, I think that it is appropriate that proper consideration be given in any allocation of fuels to providing adequate supplies of energy for all segments of the tourism industry. Today I am introducing a resolution asking for such due and proper consideration.

RESOLUTION DIRECTING IMMEDIATE FACTFINDING ON OIL SUPPLIES

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Shah of Iran said yesterday on a national television network that the United States has no oil shortage—that imports of oil into the United States are as great as ever and possibly greater, and suggested oil companies are guilty of manipulating an oil shortage in order to increase their profits.

This statement comes from the head of a nation which exports 5 million barrels of oil a day, one-fourth of all the oil from the Middle East and which is a principal exporter to the United States.

Withholding of oil and especially gasoline from the public has created a national emergency in which millions of people cannot get to work, children cannot get to school, and businesses—especially small firms—are forced to close their doors. Americans must know now the facts behind the so-called oil shortage.

Today, I am introducing a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to find out those facts. The committee will be empowered to subpoena every American oil executive, to require them to report to Congress under oath precise import figures, inventories in the United States or under U.S. companies' control, and on distribution of oil in and exports from the United States. My resolution calls for the committee to report its findings and recommendations to the House within 30 days from the passage of the resolution. I am delighted to state that eight of my colleagues have already joined me in this measure: JOHN McFALL, of California; GLENN ANDERSON, of California; JOHN MURPHY, of New York; DOMINICK DANIELS, of New Jersey; PAREN MITCHELL, of Maryland; JONATHAN BINGHAM, of New York; KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia; and CHARLES RANGEL, of New York.

PLIGHT OF SERVICE STATION OPERATORS

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my district I had a very important and very interesting meeting for all of the gasoline dealers, the service station operators, if you please, whether they were independent agents or dealers or the like.

I wish that every Member of the House could have been present, because a sense of urgency would have been communicated. Of those present, 90 percent stated categorically that if things continue as they now are, they will be out of business in less than 60 days. Everyone present reported having dismissed on an average of four employees from their business within the last 60 days. There is absolute chaos and confusion as to the regulations and the allocation program that the Government is supposed to be conducting. There are contradictions, confusion, and disorder is rampant.

It seems to me ironic after the meeting that the great Government of the United States, the Congress included,