

competition in the energy industry, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution relating to obtaining a full and accurate accounting for members of the U.S. Armed Forces missing in action in Southeast Asia and U.S. contribution to the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.J. Res. 458. Joint resolution designating the composition known as The Stars and Stripes Forever as the national march of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution to authorize the return of the remains of Pocahontas to the United States and the establishment of an appropriate memorial commemorating her place in American history; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning recognition by the European Security Conference of the Soviet Union's occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution elimination of illegal drug traffic; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and International Relations.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a Federal Audiovisual Procurement Office; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VANDER VEEN (for himself,

Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NIX, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL,

Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that during the Nation's present economic crisis, and so long as the national unemployment rate remains at 6 percent or more, the emergency unemployment program established by the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 should be extended to continue benefits for involuntarily unemployed individuals when 25-percent or more of workers entitled to compensation thereunder are unable to find jobs during the period for which they are eligible for benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SIKES, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ZEPFERETTI):

H. Res. 463. 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 International Relations.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BLOVIN, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EMERY, and Mr. FASCELL):

H. Res. 464. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that House conferees may conduct business only at conference meetings open to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MOTTI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. QUITE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H. Res. 465. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide

that House conferees may conduct business only at conference meetings open to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KETCHUM, Mrs. KEYS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H. Res. 466. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that House conferees may conduct business only at conference meetings open to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 7013. A bill for the relief of tenants of Scully lands in Marion County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEDORN:

H. Res. 467. Resolution to refer H.R. 6948 "A bill for the relief of Robert H. Carleton," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

123. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Rhode Island League of Cities and Towns, Providence, R.I., relative to general revenue sharing; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6674

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "\$4,445,250,000" and insert "\$4,200,000,000".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "\$886,300,000" and insert "\$871,300,000".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

USDA AND HEW—TANDEM WELFARE PROGRAMS

HON. JAKE GARN

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last week reported that the Nation's welfare rolls now total a near record 11,147,071, a figure only 8,888 below the all-time peak in 1973. This number, staggering though it may be, no longer represents the largest Government assistance program for the poor. Striding out in front we now find the food stamp program, which aided 19.1 million participants in March. Translated into dollars for fiscal 1975, the projected Federal cost of food stamps is conservatively estimated at approximately \$5

billion as compared to a total fiscal 1974 cost of \$2.9 billion.

It is difficult to comprehend that only a decade ago when the Food Stamp Act was enacted, recipients numbered a mere 367,000 at a cost to the American people of \$26 million. Now there are 52 persons receiving food stamps for every one who began when the legislation was enacted.

As our depressed economy pushes the rolls of welfare and food stamp recipients every skyward, a two-headed monster is rearing its head. Food stamps has become another variety of a welfare program. What this means is that two giant bureaucracies in Washington—HEW and USDA—are running parallel welfare programs.

This situation is fundamental to many of the problems which plague the overall welfare system of our Nation today. Local welfare officers who must administer both programs are having to thread

their way through a bureaucratic morass. Can we be surprised at the high error rate when welfare workers and employees must perform two differ and complicated procedures for processing applications. Two separate bureaucracies running welfare programs is one bureaucracy too many.

Had food stamps met its original objectives, it might not have grown to its present proportions. The program started in the early 1960's was a small program with basically a twofold purpose. There was a problem of agricultural overproduction and food stamps was viewed as a vehicle to help the small farmer by raising the price of farm commodities by distributing farm food surpluses through normal food outlets while at the same time raising the nutrition levels of the truly needy.

There is little evidence that the program has succeeded on either count. As far as helping poor farmers is concerned,

I am certain my colleagues hear the same cries I do from the farmers in their own States who complain that they receive only a small percentage of the retail price. The majority of the retail food dollar is not received by the farmer but is siphoned off to pay for transportation, processing, and so forth. Very little of this supposed increase in retail sales caused by food stamps goes into the pockets of the farmer.

The second objective of the program has failed more dramatically than the first. For a program designed to improve the nutrition level of the needy, there is little, if anything in this program which requires or encourages the purchase of nutritional foods. Recipients may use their stamps to purchase steak instead of hamburger or a convenience food instead of pot roast when nutritional benefits may be equivalent; or they may shop at costly convenience markets instead of regular supermarkets. In fact, there is evidence that less nutritional but more palatable commodities are occasionally substituted for what should be essential foods.

The incidence of malnutrition above the poverty line should be sufficient proof that income supplementation in the form of food stamps will not eradicate or even reduce malnutrition. If we are truly concerned about nutrition we should seek out alternatives such as educating the poor on the importance of nutrition or actually lowering the cost of nutrition to those individuals whose diets are deficient.

Food stamps has failed to serve its two masters. The decrease in malnutrition has only been slight in the last 5 years in spite of a 400-percent increase in Federal food assistance programs.

Our welfare and health care systems are administrative nightmares leading us down the road to bankruptcy. The costs of these programs to the American taxpayer exceed the entire budget of all but a few countries. New York alone spends more for public assistance than the gross national product of some medium-sized countries.

It appears that Congress has long since forgotten that there is a practical limit to the growth of the Federal Government's role in domestic assistance programs. If these programs continue to expand unchecked, total Government spending will grow to more than half of our national output. I need not insult my distinguished colleagues by explaining how this spending will be financed. And as our capital markets are drained, less and less will be left for private industry and for new productivity to create the jobs we need.

The growth of our domestic assistance programs has taken place in an unplanned, patchwork pattern. The result is that we have too many programs trying to achieve similar objectives. We must now, more than ever, take steps to eliminate the gaps and rationalize our efforts.

The old American spirit of self-reliance and individual initiative has not been served by Congress and the administration. At the best we have given scant help to the truly needy who are unable to make their way alone in the world.

But at worst, we have diminished the American sense of pride and self-reliance.

U.S. PROSECUTORS SHOULD BE PROSECUTED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, the Justice Department injudiciously without a shred of evidence began an investigation of me for narcotics trafficking or association at least with those who were so involved. Now, as the facts rapidly unfold detailing the Government's complete lack of a case involving me, it becomes evident that the Justice Department is investigating the wrong party. The real culprit in this whole travesty is U.S. Prosecutor Liam S. Coonan. Mr. Coonan, a much decorated and highly praised criminal strike force prosecutor apparently lacks the character, integrity, and moral rectitude necessary to determine the fate of those rightly or wrongly accused of Federal crimes. If his aggressive attempts to manufacture false evidence against me are typical of his prosecutorial modus operandi, then many persons in prison now should be released immediately.

Mr. Speaker, this man has acquitted himself as ruthlessly and irresponsibly as a little man with big powers possibly can. He has been accused of attempting to create a narcotics case against me by offering to drop charges against those awaiting trial and to reduce sentences for those already convicted if they would just implicate me in a drug-related crime. But apparently Mr. Coonan has found that even convicted felons are more honorable than some of those who convicted them.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that Mr. Coonan ought to be investigated. The Attorney General ought to appoint a Special Prosecutor to carefully analyze cases prosecuted by Liam Coonan for the purpose of determining the validity of the evidence, whether or not it was legally obtained and whether or not it was fabricated or falsified.

I am not nearly as concerned about the frivolous charges made against me as I am about those less able to defend themselves. I have certain resources at my disposal that most Americans do not. In addition, my entire career has been one of fighting the degenerate exploiters in our society. So one more serpent poses no real threat to me. In my 20 years of public life, I have encountered the pros, met them on their battlefields, used their weapons, ignored their battle plans, routed their troops, and overrun their lines. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as living testimony that the Liam S. Coonans in our society only succeed if we allow them to.

Mr. Speaker, not only do I recommend to the Attorney General that Mr. Coonan be fired, but also that he be prosecuted

for gross negligence, malfeasance in office, and conspiracy to obstruct justice.

THE SITUATION OF HUNGARIANS IN ROMANIA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, between 1965 and 1968, I have often spoken about the discrimination and harassment exerted by the Romanian Government against its almost 2.5 million Hungarian minority, concentrated mostly in Transylvania.

After remaining stationary for several years, the situation started to worsen again since the spring of 1974 and the events force me and my colleagues to raise our voices. A special poignancy is lent to the question by the Presidential proclamation of last week sent to the Congress for approval. This proclamation awards the most-favored-nation status to Romania.

Unfortunately, the performance of Romania in the fields of human and civil rights is a poor one. The educational situation of the Hungarian minority on the secondary and university level is grossly inadequate and university graduates are scattered nationwide into purely Romanian areas, facts admitted by our State Department.

Job discrimination continues unabated as some new testimonies of recently emigrated people show which are attached to the speech of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

Lately the rich archival and library materials of the churches which contain much of the historical record of the Hungarians who had ruled the province of Transylvania for almost 1,000 years is being made inaccessible. A law was passed in October 1974 which transfers into state archives and museums all art objects, records, books, letters, archival materials, and documents which are over 40 years old and could be of importance to the history of the people of Romania. As there are no qualified archivists who read Hungarian, Latin, and classical Greek, the materials would not be cataloged and made accessible to scholars and are even in the danger of partial destruction.

Even in Hungarian majority areas local, state, and county officials are mostly Romanian, especially on the higher echelons. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) provided some eloquent proof for this state of affairs.

Considering the real situation, we must proceed very carefully with any approval of a most-favored-nation status for the Romanian Government at a time of severe recession in our country. At the minimum we must ask our State Department to raise the issue of continued harassment and oppression of national and religious minorities in Romania in their talks with the representatives of the Romanian Government, otherwise

the whole affair becomes a farce as far as our commitment to human rights and equal opportunities are concerned in our foreign policies.

"CLUSTER'S LAST STAND"

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in Postal Record by the National Association of Letter Carriers President James H. Rademacher has come to my attention. It is entitled—"Postal Disservice." The caption is most apt.

The Postal Service's lack of service is especially evident in its policy concerning curbside mail boxes. In a move to economize, a certain segment of the public is failing to receive the delivery service to which they are entitled. The discrimination is blatant, the repercussions are severe.

Communities in my district have voiced their displeasure and their indignation over the newly instituted curbside policy and I believe their discontent is legitimate. In his remarks, Mr. Rademacher outlines the postal abuses that my constituent must live with. The Postal directive is not confined to my area, however, and I am sure many of my fellow members have heard from individuals and towns in their own area. Congress can make a difference. Not only must we wrestle with a proposal for a permanent Postal subsidy, we can work to insure swift enactment of a bill introduced in the House by my friend from Texas, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE. The remedy is within our grasp and for that reason I call my colleagues' attention to the following article:

POSTAL DISSERVICE

(By James H. Rademacher)

Inflation, recession, depression and unemployment are all terms which can be used to excuse dereliction of duty and avoid responses which otherwise would require affirmative answers. With apologies to a Postmaster General who has yet to get his feet wet, we find we must comment on the continuing discrimination which is practiced by the United States Postal Service in matters affecting delivery service to mail receptacles.

If an American citizen—postal patron is entitled to delivery service, that entitlement should be fulfilled whether it be in lean years or otherwise. The assurance of the most efficient means of mail delivery should be a guarantee whether a postal customer has just purchased a home in a new development or if he has been situated for any period of time. When postage rates are determined, the costs are expected to guarantee equivalent services, irrespective of the particular location of the resident. With economy uppermost in the minds of those who establish policy, service continues to be absent from the priority list within the world's largest communication network.

We refer to the ongoing attempts of management to force postal patrons to erect mail receptacles at curbsides and we also deplore the continuing construction of cluster boxes which postal officials contend are not resulting in worse service—"only trimming accommodations no longer considered essential."

The problem here is that the determination of essential accommodations remains in the hands of management. In testimony recently presented to a Congressional Committee, USPS spokesmen indicate a savings of about a nickel daily when mail is delivered to a cluster box grouping rather than at a doorstep. Recipients of such delivery can not request a rebate from the savings which cause so great inconvenience.

Cluster boxes are generally being arranged in new subdivisions where developers are apparently persuaded to cooperate with the innovation. In addition to the use of cluster boxes as a substitute for legitimate mail delivery, more and more patrons are being urged to transfer receptacle boxes to curbsides. Additionally, in new developments where it is more economical to serve from vehicles to curbside delivery, customers have no say and are forced to comply with outdated postal regulations. For example, in a copy of a letter received at union headquarters, more than 80 petitioners are demanding house delivery in a new development at Youngstown, Ohio. The group was rejected in its demands in a very curt response from the Youngstown SCF Manager/Postmaster who concluded his reply by stating "delivery to your area will be mail service to curbside boxes." In stressing the need for doorstep delivery, the petitioners very eloquently pointed to these problems involved with deliveries being made at curbside:

Safety of children. Receptacles located at the curb create a worsening problem of keeping youngsters from venturing into streets.

Outright discrimination in maintaining two different delivery plans within one development.

Elderly persons fear falls and other hardships when required to receive mail at curbside, especially in inclement weather.

Vandalism is on the increase, including tampering with mail and mail receptacles. California Senator John V. Tunney has expressed interest in the problem of curbside delivery and has introduced legislation providing that USPS may not require installation of mail boxes at the curbside. He was joined in his concern by numerous city managers including J. Wayne Dernetz of Del Mar, California who complained:

Gross unsightliness located up one side and down the other of neighborhood streets.

At a time when citizens are cooperating by removing rooftop antennae, installing cable television, improving landscaping, improving the appearance of fire plugs, no one is paying any attention to the problems created by curbside rural-type mailboxes.

Some customers would be willing to even pay a service fee rather than have the beauty of their property diminished by construction of ugly curbside mailboxes.

The NALC has lodged a strong complaint about cluster boxes and curb delivery during testimony on legislation which would establish a permanent subsidy for the Postal Service. The Union proclaimed, however, no subsidy should be granted without an assurance that the American people will have the very best possible service to their doorsteps on city delivery routes. This continuing disservice to the American people is now a growing concern of many members of Congress who control the purse strings which can well make it "Cluster's last stand" and bring curbside to porcheside.

GENES ARE KEY TO ABILITY

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, a rather interesting and informative

article appeared in the April 6, 1975, issue of the Birmingham News. It is a column written by noted educator Dr. Max Rafferty in which he puts to rest the myth that environment is the most important part of a child's education process.

As Dr. Rafferty so eloquently points out, "If kids are born stupid, then they are."

The article follows:

IF KIDS ARE BORN STUPID, THEN THEY ARE

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

Mediate—nay, chew upon—this recent statement by Joann Rodgers in the National Observer: "You may give a child excellent parental attention, a good home, fine schools and cultural experiences; but if the youngster wasn't born smart, he'll probably never be smart."

Now, before you start to cloud up and rain all over Miss Rodgers, let me point out that she was merely recapping the conclusions of the 1974 First International Congress of Twin Studies, sponsored by the Mendel Institute of Medical Genetics and Twin Research.

Take a long look at some of the findings, all of which fly directly in the teeth of the educational establishment's slogans and shibboleths over the past 30 years:

1. "Genes play an overwhelmingly dominant role in determining one's basic level of intelligence . . . Manipulation of the external environment after birth has little effect."

2. "The intelligence of adopted children is much more often closely similar to their biological mothers—whom they never saw—than to the intelligence of their adoptive mothers, adoptive fathers or adoptive brothers and sisters."

3. "The IQs of identical twins are more alike and get progressively more alike with age, while the IQs of nonidentical twins are more often dissimilar and become progressively more so with age."

The psychologists responsible for these bombshells are Dr. Joseph Horn of the University of Texas, Dr. Ronald Wilson of the University of Louisville and Dr. Adam Metheny, also of Louisville. Their bona fides are, I submit, impeccable and their research stood up against all challenges.

Here's why the waves they made in American education are still spreading:

A basic tenet of today's educational theory is the infinite perfectibility of the individual through "proper" schooling. If a child appears stupid, it's somebody else's fault. His parents neglected him. Society failed to supply good housing for him. Uncle Sam didn't give him enough food stamps.

The merest suggestion that the kid was in fact born stupid, is growing up stupid and will eventually die still stupid regardless of whether he lives in Watts or in Beverly Hills will bring down upon you whole platoons and regiments of screaming school people, gnashing name-callers, and indignant ink-slingers, for all the world like so many maddened piranha. "Undemocratic" and "bigoted" will be the mildest expletives you'll receipt for.

So now the experts are saying, in effect, that environment—including school—really doesn't have much effect on intelligence—which is innate—and a whole generation of environmentalism is crumbling and toppling like a sand castle at high tide.

Note the implications—Project Head Start, for example. This apple of every bureaucrat's eye during the late Sixties, devouring billions of tax dollars the way the Cookie Monster shovels in cookies, turns out to be a cipher in terms of making "deprived" children better, smarter or more amenable to learning. Hear Dr. Horn's report to the Congress:

"Gains made by Head Start children were

minor and temporary and probably attributable to extra attention they received rather than to the . . . program itself."

Then, too, there's the whole matter of forced busing. The whole rationale for this court-mandated weirdo is the assumption that changing the black child's school environment is going to make him somehow a better student and increase his ability to learn. But if the Horn-Wilson-Metheny conclusions are valid, where any child—black or white—goes to school is relatively unimportant. His genes and chromosomes are the things which will determine his mastery of subject matter, not his school address or whether his classmates are black, white or polka-dotted.

Does all this make education irrelevant? Nope. It just keeps it from getting too big for its britches.

NO TRADE WITH CUBA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the protracted campaign by the Soviet bloc and its supporters to end the political and economic quarantine of Fidel Castro's Communist stronghold continues.

Indeed, the drive for "normalization" of United States-Cuban diplomatic and trade relations now reportedly has the support of the Secretary of State.

"Normalization" of American relations with revolutionary Cuba means that the United States would be picking up the tab for subsidizing the tottering Cuban economy which now costs the Soviet Union a minimum of \$2 million in foreign aid every day.

It is not in the interest of our country to prop up the Cuban Marxist-Leninist regime.

The following editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press focuses on the issues involved, and I commend it to my colleagues and all freedom-loving Americans:

PROMOTING SURRENDER TO CUBA

Sen. George McGovern, D.S.D., has said in Communist Cuba, where he is visiting, that both he and Cuba's Red dictator Fidel Castro feel that "inevitably" the United States will establish trade and diplomatic relations with Communist Cuba.

Why?

Sen. McGovern, in view of the many past policy mistakes the United States has made in coddling Communist enemies, may be predicting accurately what is going to happen. Castro surely is talking about what he wants to happen. But why should we let it happen? There is no good reason for the United States to do any such thing.

Castro has chosen to be an enemy of the United States and of freedom.

In his early days when he was still just a colorful outlaw guerrilla in the mountains of Cuba, he had a propaganda claque going in the United States, playing him up.

This took place although officials in our government had clear evidence that he had participated in a revolutionary overthrow attempt in Bogota, Columbia, in which Castro seized a radio station and broadcast: "This is Fidel Castro from Cuba. This is a Communist revolution."

While the American people were not told

clearly that Castro was a Communist revolutionary, our government knew he was. He still is. It was a mistake of our leadership to allow him to come to power. It would be a mistake of our leadership if he were allowed to have American trade-aid and diplomatic support while he remains in power.

Castro is exporting Communist revolution throughout the hemisphere. We have advertised in Asia that American support is not trustworthy, causing many friends and would be friends to back away from us and begin trying to make accommodations with the Communist aggressors. Do we now want to advertise to the other nations of North and South America that we are not firm in opposing Communism here, either, and that we will even end up aiding the Communist revolutionary Castro?

It is reported that because of nontrade between the United States and Red Cuba, Russia is being forced to subsidize the Cuban economy to the tune of one to two million dollars a day.

Can you think of any good reason for the United States to relieve the Russian Communist aggressors of this burden in supporting Cuban Communist aggressors?

Can you think of any reason for us to help make permanent the captivity of the people of Cuba who want freedom but who have been engulfed by Castro Communism with Russian support?

Can you suggest any assurance we may have that Russian missiles—perhaps with nuclear warheads—are not still in Cuba, aimed at the Southeastern United States?

There is no good reason for us to do anything about our Cuban policy at this time, Sen. McGovern and Fidel Castro to the contrary notwithstanding. But be on guard. The campaign is getting under way for another American surrender to Communism—this time not on the other side of the world, but 90 miles from our shores.

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF FRANK VARAGNE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 100th birthday of Frank Varagne of Gardena, Calif., I wish it known that this is a remarkable person, and I am proud to represent the district in which he lives.

Frank Varagne was born on May 24, 1875 in Walbridge, Ohio. The son of immigrants from France, he was a man of the soil. His labors as a farmer were in the finest of American tradition, and this is not an easy life. During those years the loss of his beloved Liza led to his rearing four fine children, these being Harold, Leger, Evelyn, and Ruth. These children in turn gave him 6 lovely grandchildren and he now has 17 great-grandchildren to share his golden years.

For 30 years Frank Varagne has been a fine citizen of Gardena. He has been an active member of St. Anthony's Church for all of these 30 years. His wants are modest, yet his interests are wide. He is known to be an ardent fan of the Los Angeles Dodgers. And his own interest in automobile racing has taken him often to the "500" race in Indianapolis, where many celebrities have recognized him and come to know him there

where they share common interests and the love of good sportsmanship.

If you test the memory of Frank Varagne, you find that it is very keen, whether the subject be facts and knowledge about radio, historical events or the current events of today. He follows the issues carefully and keeps himself fully informed at all times through the news programs which are his favorites.

He is a gentle man, humble in the eyes of God and his fellow man, never seeking praise or recognition. Proud he is, as he has right to be. And with a sense of humor that makes him widely loved by so many.

We are fortunate that America has been the homeland of this outstanding, honest citizen. And it is a very great honor to wish him a happy 100th birthday.

THE FACTS OF LIFE

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, in a paper presented to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Dr. V. E. McKelvey, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, made some very important points about the energy situation in this country. In reading his remarks, it is important to consider the following facts: If we are able to limit the growth of our total energy consumption to 2 percent per year—which will be a dramatic reduction—we will double our energy consumption in about 35 years, we obtain over three-fourths of our present energy from petroleum and natural gas; as our supplies of petroleum and natural gas dwindle, this Nation will become dependent for virtually all its energy on coal and nuclear fission.

In his paper, Dr. McKelvey said that:

It is obvious that the changeover from the two fuels which provide three-fourths of our entire energy supply will have immense impact upon the energy sources chosen as alternates. Intricate technologies must be developed and perfected, vast amounts of capital must be assembled, immense facilities must be put into place, and hundreds of thousands of people must be recruited, organized, trained, and directed. Yet, we have only the barest glimpse of the true nature and dimensions of the task before us.

In his paper, delivered by Dr. George Gryc, of the Survey's Menlo Park, Calif., office, McKelvey reviewed the trends and events that preceded the present energy situation. He stressed the urgent need for creativity in approaches to the discovery, recovery, and production of naturally occurring sources of energy.

McKelvey said:

We have been jarred by the embargo, the production curtailments, and the spiraling prices for oil since October 1973; but if we let it go at that, we shall have missed the most important point to be learned from all the travail that has ensued.

McKelvey emphasized:

That point is that the oil of the Middle East is an exhaustible resource, and given the continuation of rates of increase in production that were in effect during the past

ten years, the physical capacity of the Middle Eastern province would have been reached within most of our lifetimes.

To underline his theme, McKelvey pointed out that—

If all the proved reserves of the Middle East—about 315 billion barrels—happened to be located in Kansas, the U.S. requirements alone would exhaust the supply in less than 30 years at an annual growth rate in consumption of four percent, assuming this were physically possible to do. Even if we were to allow no growth at all in consumption above the present level, we would be out of oil in 50 years. If we reduced consumption to two-thirds of our present rate, our conservation would buy only 25 additional years. The fact is that fixed supplies will eventually be depleted at any rate of consumption; and if we are to survive, we are obliged to continue the relentless search for new resources to serve our needs—changing, adapting, innovating, creating—as our predecessors have been doing, on the whole, successfully, for at least a thousand generations.

Although various estimates of the amount of oil and gas that might be recovered from known and unknown fields have a "comfortable ring" about them, the realities associated with getting additional volumes of oil and gas turned into pipelines are something else, McKelvey said:

It will require an all-out, unremitting effort, involving continued levels of activity which the petroleum industry has not seen since the peak of the boom in the mid-1950's, and much greater outlays of capital. All this, for what can only be considered a holding action to prevent the collapse of our system until the new sources of energy can be developed and brought on stream.

Actually, the leaders of the oil exporting countries, in seeking to maximize the value of their own wasting assets, have given consuming Nations pointed notice, many years ahead of time, of the need for actions to shift dependence upon oil to more abundant energy sources, McKelvey pointed out:

This is good advice, even in the light of large discoveries that have been made recently in such areas as the North Sea, Mexico, Indonesia, and in a number of African and South American countries, because as large and welcome as these discoveries are, they can in no way be counted on to supply more than a fraction of the demand for energy that can plainly be foreseen in the closing years of this century.

McKelvey said:

It is plain that the world's largest energy consumer—as a service both to itself and its neighbors—ought to make more of an effort to pull its own weight. It is singularly well equipped to do this in view of its long experience in large-scale energy production and its immense endowment of alternate fuels. The extent of our resources is not the major question; the availability is. The shortage areas are time, investment capital, technology, and social, economic, and political ingenuity.

Some have imagined that conservation is the touchstone with which we can command our energy problems to disappear; however, in all but the initial stages, conservation will prove to be exceedingly difficult and elusive, and at best, it can contribute only part of the solution to our problem. The relationship between energy conservation and energy production is not on an either or basis. The implacable requirement facing us is for both. We have no choice; we are bound by the

harshness necessity both to conserve energy and to produce it in every practicable way we can find.

McKelvey concluded:

It has been said that petroleum is first found in the minds of men, and this is no less true for other sources of energy as well; the resources are here, waiting the application of human capabilities and will. While it is God who creates rocks, it is man who creates resources by actions which match materials to human needs.

TRIBUTE TO WALLY NYMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 the Rotary Club of Hawthorne, Calif., will honor a man who demonstrates those qualities which I consider finest in the human being: love of family, dedication to profession, concern for community, and a true and genuine love for one's country.

Wally Nyman, my longtime friend, will retire this year after a most distinguished career as an educator and administrator. Wally's work will long be remembered by those of us who appreciate selfless determination to improve the lot of all human beings.

Born in Michigan in 1914, Wally came to California at a young age where he received his early education, graduating from Inglewood High School in 1931. He continued his scholastic ambitions at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he earned his bachelor of arts degree in history in 1935.

After a brief teaching assignment in Fresno, Calif., Wally returned "home" to Leuzinger High School in 1938 to assume teaching responsibilities there. Wally assumed another responsibility that year, he married his lovely wife, Edith.

In 1943, Wally entered the U.S. Navy where he served as a communications officer on the U.S.S. *Baltimore* during the Second World War.

Following his discharge from the Navy in 1946, Wally returned to Leuzinger High School where he instructed for the next 4 years. It is remarkable that despite these other time-consuming obligations, Wally managed to obtain his master of science degree in 1950 from the University of Southern California.

Recognized for his prowess in the field of education, Wally became principal of Hawthorne High School in 1950, serving in that capacity for the next 12 years. He will retire as assistant superintendent of Personnel for the Centinela Valley high school district, a post he has served so well these past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, Wally Nyman is a man to whom knowledge and learning has always been a challenge; a man whose best efforts, and finest years, have been devoted to helping others strive to know, to learn, and to believe.

His countless contributions to his community will not soon be forgotten. His

active participation in the Rotary Club, the YMCA, the Centinela Valley Community Chest, the Hawthorne Coordinating Council, and the Family Services Council serves as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, Lee and I are sure that his wife, Edith, and daughter, Christina, are as proud of him as we are.

As the Roman historian Sallust said in ancient times, "every man is the architect of his own fortune," this can be said of Wally Nyman, for his fortune is knowledge and compassion, and there is none more admirable.

OTHER PATHS TO FOLLOW BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article by Stephanie Price, a student at Marian High School, Chicago Heights, Ill., which appeared in the school paper, the Marian Megaphone. I believe this article to be a well-reasoned and timely message to this year's class of high school graduates, as well as a commonsense approach to education for those students who wish to further their education and to those students who are still undecided as to their future goals.

The article which appeared in the May 2, edition of the Megaphone, follows:

OTHER PATHS TO FOLLOW BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

(By Stephanie Price)

Does the prospect of college bore you, break you or give you the blues? Although our society impresses upon us the need for further schooling in a classroom situation, numerous alternatives are available, and sometimes more rewarding.

If a college classroom situation rushes your learning or inhibits you, many highly recommended home study trade and business schools may attract you. They enable you to work at your own pace and concentrate on one particular job skill. Some of the courses offered are mobile engine service, refrigeration and air conditioning, bookkeeping, drafting, accounting, secretarial, radio and T.V. service and repair, electronics, interior decorating, and real estate.

Still, some of you are turned off by the idea of any kind of further schooling. For you, on-the-job training or apprenticeship programs can be of help. This will teach you a skill through first hand experience. Dental assistants, photographers, construction workers, carpenters, plumbers, models, tool and die makers, and welders are only a few of the opportunities open to you.

What about those who wish to travel and actually experience different lifestyles around the world? The army, navy, marines, and air force are constantly recruiting young people. Here also is the choice of specializing in an interesting trade or even making a career of the service itself.

In our competitive society we are forced to plan for the future at an early age, many aiming toward college. But for those who are discouraged at the thought of college, alternating doors are waiting. All it costs is a little time and effort on your part to find them.

AMERICA AND THE TERRIBLE
LOGIC OF VIETNAM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, many in the United States speak of the end of the war in Vietnam as if it represented something other than victory for Communist aggression and something other than defeat for both the United States and the cause of freedom, independence, and self-determination in the world.

The United States committed more than 500,000 men to battle, and lost more than 50,000, in order to prevent aggression from succeeding. We failed in that attempt. We failed not because of a superior enemy or overpowering odds but, quite to the contrary, because of a failure of will. Because success did not come quickly, we welcomed defeat. This is what the Communists counted upon and events have proven them correct.

While many in the Congress believe that the abandonment of South Vietnam was virtuous, history may tell a far different story. The distinguished deputy editor of the London Telegraph, Peregrine Worsthorne, was in Washington during the time in which Vietnam was abandoned. His reports are instructive.

Mr. Worsthorne notes that:

It was a disturbing experience to be in Washington during this past week . . . Congress . . . has elevated its determination to refuse further aid into an act of almost heroic virtue, treating President Ford's impassioned pleas with derisive contempt, as if it was upholding honor while he was seeking to impugn them.

When Secretary of State Kissinger appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. Worsthorne reported:

He was treated like a criminal in the dock, with the Senators seeming to take pride in proclaiming their faith in American impotence, in the pointlessness of further intervention, as if their recognition of the inevitability of defeat was a form of high courage which would earn them an honoured place in history.

Mr. Worsthorne declared that:

I watched them filling out, their heads held high, posturing proudly before the television cameras, for all the world as if sealing the fate of South Vietnam was their finest hour, the moment when they walked with destiny.

I wish to share with my colleagues the report of this perceptive British observer as it appeared in the London Daily Telegraph and insert into the RECORD at this time the article, "America and The Terrible Logic of Vietnam," by Peregrine Worsthorne:

AMERICA AND THE TERRIBLE LOGIC OF
VIETNAM

(By Peregrine Worsthorne)

It was a disturbing experience to be in Washington during this past week. At one level, in rejecting utterly the Administration's case for last-ditch aid to give the South Vietnamese a final chance, the Congress and the media have reason on their side. Why pour further American money and equipment down the drain? After all,

Churchill refused to send those RAF squadrons to succour France in 1940. But he did so with an anguished heart, knowing that Britain's very life depended on saying "no."

This, however, has not all been the mood of Congress. It has elevated its determination to refuse further aid into an act of almost heroic virtue, treating President Ford's impassioned pleas with derisive contempt, as if it was upholding American pride and honour while he was seeking to impugn them.

When the Secretary of State went before the Senate Appropriation Committee to argue the President's case, he was treated like a criminal in the dock, with the Senators seeming to take pride in proclaiming their faith in American impotence, in the pointlessness of further intervention, as if their recognition of the inevitability of defeat was a form of high courage which would earn them an honoured place in history.

I watched them filling out, their heads held high, posturing proudly before the television cameras, for all the world as if sealing the fate of South Vietnam was their finest hour, the moment when they walked with destiny.

LITTLE SENSE OF SHAME

What is extraordinary and shocking about the manner in which the United States has observed the collapse of its client state is its undertones of self-congratulations, not so much a trauma, more a cause for satisfaction. Only the President and the Secretary of State insist on using the language of shame, and they are mocked for it; more than mocked; castigated and reviled; accused almost of an un-American activity.

It could be that this will be only a passing phase, and that as the reality of the Communist take-over in Saigon begins to impinge there will be a recovery of concern about the consequences of the American washing of hands; washing of hands ceasing to be respectable once it is seen to be taking place in a bloodbath. But I doubt it. For it is difficult to exaggerate the extent to which there is now a vested interest among all those who observe foreign affairs to see no evil; to make the best of a bad job.

So much moral capital has been invested in the effort to get America out of Vietnam, so many newspaper editorials, political speeches, and pulpit sermons, such a wealth of passion, that it seems almost impossible for the American people to recognise that this withdrawal crusade—for such it has become—may also lead to disaster, just as the crusade to get America in led to disaster. Indeed the way in which America is trying to end its involvement in Vietnam is strangely similar to the way in which it all began.

The Washington establishment then, those Kennedy New Frontiersmen, could not bear to see the ugly possibilities inherent in the original involvement, so utterly convinced were they of its moral necessity. There is exactly the same belief in the possibility of limited consequences, about the decision to disengage.

What one noticed in Washington last week was the same kind of moralising fantasies that caused America to mislead herself about Vietnam in the first place, repeating themselves like some dreadful echo from the past.

"Because America's motives are so right in getting out," the argument runs, "no evil can flow from it. The American retreat from empire will be quite different from all other retreats from empire, just as the American advance into empire had been assumed to be going to be quite different from all other advances into empire. Surely the world will understand. America is abandoning her allies for the best of motives; dishonouring her obligations out of high-minded altruism. When we do these things, it is not like other nations

doing them, because we are Americans, God's elect."

As American intervention began, so is it ending—in self-deception, self-righteousness and Utopian dreams, with one form of euphoria replacing another, one lot of puerile assumptions about the innocence of American disengagement succeeding an earlier lot about the innocence of American entry.

It seems to me terribly important that this state of affairs should be properly understood in Western Europe. The truth is that America is getting out of Vietnam in the same dangerous way as she got in; that is to say, in a cloud of unknowing, the only difference being that whereas the mistake in the past sprang from a naive innocence about the dangers of one form of rhetoric—the rhetoric of power—the mistake today springs from naive innocence about another form of rhetoric: the rhetoric of impotence.

But the appalling lesson that they learnt about the dangers inherent in the use of power has not taught them to be cautious, as it should, about the inherent dangers of the non-use of power. The price and cost, and potential tragedy of the destruction of American power are today no more understood than a few years ago were the price and cost, and potential tragedy of its creation.

MCCARTHY-LIKE ATMOSPHERE

Take the extraordinary case of the backlash against the CIA. Doubtless its intelligence-gathering and covert operations had got out of control. But so now has the reaction against them.

It has meant nothing less than the demoralisation of a large part of the American foreign policy establishment, most of whose work at some point has involved them in CIA work, either directly or tangentially. So they wake up each morning waiting to read some revelation in the newspapers which will involve them in ruinous "scandal."

With so many members of Congress bent on cleansing the Augean Stables, how could it be otherwise? The atmosphere is not wholly unlike that of the McCarthy years, with CIA links—now held to be tantamount to Fascist links—replacing Communist links as the smear.

On visits to Washington over the years I have been staying at the Metropolitan Club, which is the equivalent of White's, the Travellers and the Athenaeum rolled into one. It is there, at luncheon, that the establishment meet. During the Kennedy years it was, for a British visitor, a wonderfully touching and nostalgic experience to listen to the American pro-consuls discussing the business of empire like characters out of Kipling. The place was alive with the small-talk of great affairs. But no longer.

That necessary confidence that binds a governing class together in mutual trust has melted away under the heat of Congressional inquiry and media attack. Nobody trusts anybody.

The point that needs to be understood seems to me this: 15 years ago the relationship between the White House and Congress, between the media and both, the vocabulary of public discussion in the press and television, the moral mood, all these might have led me to expect, and guard against, the excesses of imperial adventure.

Today there is cause to expect, and guard against, the excesses of post-imperial guilt. Whereas the mood in Washington then was pregnant with one form of imprudence, so today is it pregnant with another.

Both the President and the Secretary of State have warned about this, but the latter is assumed to be lamenting only his own predicament, and the former echoing only that lamentation like a puppet. (Quite wrong, incidentally, Ford is very much his own man, and very much more impressive than is yet apparent).

EFFECT ON PEKING

What, then, is it that they fear? Let me be specific. It is that:

Communist China will lose interest in rapprochement with the United States, the whole value of which, from Peking's point of view, rested on assumptions about the determination of the United States to resist the Soviet Union. Any sign of a diminution of that determination—and how can acceptance of defeat in Vietnam not be taken as such a sign?—will, therefore, tend to undermine the delicate relationship between the United States and China.

This in turn will prompt China to look for a new source of strength against the Soviet Union, to replace the flattering American giant: obviously Japan, which must also be reconsidering its total military reliance on the United States. The logic of Vietnam, in short, is to compel both China and Japan to come together, a diplomatic and military revolution of incalculably dangerous significance.

The North Koreans will use this moment of American disarray to launch a new attack on South Korea, and China will no longer have the incentive to use its influence to prevent such a move.

There are two American defence treaty commitments. Is it conceivable in the present American mood that Congress would allow this to be honoured?

Communist parties in Western Europe, sensing American lack of continuing sensitivity to the spread of Communist influence will grow less cautious, and be encouraged to do so by the Soviet Union. Because the United States has adopted a low profile in face of a Communist take-over in one Nato ally, Portugal, this will encourage the French and Italian parties to expect the same passive reaction to similar political development there, with results that would destroy the cohesion of Nato.

West European Conservative and Social Democratic forces, sensing a turning of the tide in world affairs, will begin to grow resigned and fatalistic.

And most important of all, the United States itself, observing these developments, about which in the present condition of fractured political leadership it will be able to do nothing, will grow increasingly isolationist, concluding that its only sensible course is to concentrate exclusively on protecting its own interests.

A by-product of this would be fierce economic nationalism since, in the absence of satisfying and promising outlets for the use of American power in the diplomatic and security areas, the full thrust of American pride and purpose would be degraded into areas of economic domination, where American power can still get results.

STOPPING THE ROT

Such are some of the fears of the American Administration, quite openly expressed. Are they reasonable or paranoid? In my view they are reasonable. But if they are not, it is almost more alarming, since an American political and social climate that can induce paranoia among its leaders is itself a matter of the gravest possible concern.

Perhaps Congressional obstruction, and media criticism and a general popular mood of deep disillusion with American foreign policy have driven the Administration mad. But that is the most disturbing conclusion of all, since, if this Administration does not renew American faith in the defence of freedom, there is none other on the political horizon more likely to do better—or even half as well.

It would be nice to end on a note of cheer. "Come on," I said to an old Washington friend whose judgment over the years I have come to respect, "tell me something comforting." He thought for a long while, brow furrowed by the strain, and I began to fear the

worst. Then, to my infinite relief, his face began to lighten.

"The destruction of Israel," he said, "that's going to set the alarm bells ringing. Nothing else will bring us to our senses and stop the rot."

How dark must be the tunnel of despair if that is the only light of hope at the end of it.

BUREAUCRATICIZING THE HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Government involvement in medicine—especially the medicare and medicaid programs—is costing billions of dollars a year. With the rising costs of medical care there has been various efforts by the Federal and State governments to try to bring costs down.

It can be understood why this is being done. The reduction of costs is necessary.

It does seem to me, though, that costs have gone up as Government involvement has increased. Medicine, like so many other areas, also has suffered from the inflationary spiral.

The desire to cut costs is commendable. However, this worthwhile goal seems to often result in quite something else. And that is more Government involvement in medicine with doctors and other medical personnel having to spend ever-increasing amounts of time on filling out governmental forms.

The small businessman continually is hit with more paperwork from the bureaucrats in Washington who think that they know what is best in numerous local communities—one community quite different from another. The same thing is being seen in medicine.

Total governmental control of medicine is becoming the form of American medicine. PSRO's—Professional Standards Review Organizations—which I have previously discussed in this body are under the final control of bureaucrats in Washington. Numerous other requirements are placed on the medical profession by bureaucrats in Washington.

Under the same law that mandated the PSRO's was language mandating "utilization review." Basically, this requires hospitals to operate by certain "norms" and to review full written justification for the admission of patients receiving medicare or medicaid. This justification then must be prepared and reviewed by a utilization review committee.

Under the regulations, small hospitals particularly are hit hard. First, they sometimes do not have the numbers necessary under the conditions prescribed to make up the utilization review committees. Second, the paperwork requirements for small hospitals seriously reduce their ability to provide medical services as they do not have the large staffs necessary to handle the paperwork. The result is less medical care and higher costs. Government is called upon

to help solve the problem at least part of which it helped cause.

Who ever said Government was not creative? It is constantly creating headaches for numerous businesses and services throughout the country. And it is usually the little guy who is hurt be he the small businessman, the customer, or the doctors and patients in smaller hospitals.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the text of an article by James J. Kilpatrick entitled "The Hospital and the Bureaucrats" from Nation's Business of May 1975:

THE HOSPITAL AND THE BUREAUCRATS
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Several months ago, a small-town physician in Oklahoma, Dr. Claude H. Williams of Okeene, cried out in despair against what he termed a "death sentence" on his community hospital. Late in March, Health and Welfare Secretary Caspar Weinberger granted a three-month reprieve. But unless the terms of the reprieve are more helpful than they now appear to be, Okeene's little 34-bed hospital is doomed. Bureaucracy will have killed it.

Dr. Williams' plight is duplicated many times over. Of the nation's 7,100 hospitals, nearly 1,800 have fewer than 50 beds; of these, almost 400 have fewer than 25 beds. These are the small rural hospitals, having staffs of only as many as six doctors. Typically, the institutions are the proud results of community effort. Daniel Webster's famous tribute to Dartmouth finds an echo here: They are small, these hospitals, but there are those who love them.

The story provides a textbook example, on a scale that anyone can understand, of bureaucracy gone berserk. The story therefore has its good aspects, for bureaucracy has its good aspects; bureaucracy is not intrinsically evil. The problem, one surmises, is that bureaucrats of the best intentions often dwell in an ethereal world of their own, light-years removed from the realities they seek to regulate. It seems unlikely, somehow, that Secretary Weinberger or his aides know much about the hospitals at Okeene, Watonga, Cherokee or Alva, all in northwestern Oklahoma. These institutions are real, and the Secretary's regulations have them in trouble.

Under various programs of Medicare and Medicaid, tax funds are provided to pay for the hospitalization of patients under Social Security or public assistance. In many institutions, such patients constitute more than half of the patient load. Payments for their care are indispensable to a hospital's survival. The two programs are costly: In the coming fiscal year, the President's budget asks \$7.4 billion for Medicaid, more than \$10 billion for Medicare.

It doubtless is true, as various critics have charged, that some doctors and some hospitals, seeing such vast sums available, have abused the programs. That is, they have admitted patients who never should have been admitted; or they have kept patients hospitalized after they should have been discharged. It was in a commendable effort to prevent these abuses that the government, last November, laid down its utilization review regulations. They were to have become effective on Feb. 1. Under the reprieve, the effective date now is July 1.

This is how the system works. The Okeene Municipal Hospital must prepare a written set of "norms" for all categories of prospective admissions. Such "norms" are defined as "numerical or statistical measures of usually observed performance." You are a person on Social Security, living somewhere in the boondocks of Blaine or Kingfisher County, and you come down sick. You make it into the Okeene hospital, where a doctor orders your admission.

Within 24 hours, a full written justification for the admission must be prepared and reviewed by a utilization review committee. This "staff committee" is to be composed of "two or more physicians with participation of other professional personnel," or by a "group outside the hospital which is similarly composed." The reviews may not be conducted "by any person who is financially interested in any hospital or by any person who was professionally involved in the care of the patient whose case is being reviewed."

At the time Dr. Williams cried out for relief, the Okeene Municipal Hospital had a staff of two doctors. The hospital at Watonga had three, the 20-bed hospital at Waynoka had one. Ten institutions in the general area had a total of only 26 doctors. It is a fair assumption that most of the doctors have at least some financial interest in some hospital; they would thus be disqualified from serving on a review committee, even if their 60-hour workweeks could be stretched to include committee service. In practice, every doctor attached to a small hospital becomes professionally involved in the care of every patient. This is rural practice.

How is your admission to be reviewed and justified according to the predetermined "norms"? Dr. Williams says flatly, "No way." The hospitals do not have the clerical staff, let alone the time, to fill out elaborate reports on every Medicare or Medicaid admission, detailing "the diagnosis or symptoms indicating the need for the admission, the physician's plan of treatment, and other supporting material (e.g., recent test findings, recent case history, schedule of tests planned, etc.) the group or committee may deem appropriate." No way.

But if the admission is not thus reviewed and justified, no payments will be made for the patient's care.

Between now and July 1, "alternative means" are to be explored. According to a spokesperson at HEW, it might be possible for a nurse or a records librarian to make an initial determination that a particular admission met the written "norms." If in doubt about the admitting doctor's judgment, the nurse or librarian could telephone some other doctor somewhere else. The other doctor, somewhere else, would then drop whatever he was doing in order to approve or disapprove the judgment of his distant colleague. It sounds, somehow, a little improbable.

Utilization review is only one of the burdens placed upon the small institutions. Back in July of 1974, an inspector for the Social Security Administration descended upon the Okeene Municipal Hospital. Subsequently he prepared a seven-page, single-spaced statement of "deficiencies and plan for correction." The document is a masterpiece of bureaucratic harassment: "Storage of garbage is not stored properly." In reports of staff meetings, "the names of discussants was [sic] not given." As to records, "there is no registered record administrator which makes periodic visits to the hospital to evaluate the records." The author of this infuriating document could not spell "examination;" he could not spell "privileges," "Caesarean," "judgment" or "specialization." His most serious citation, having to do with the supposed lack of an emergency water supply, later was acknowledged to have been "an error."

This is bureaucracy in action, out in the boondocks. The reality, as distinguished from the theory, is that rural physicians are swamped by the everyday demands of patient care. Overwhelmingly, these are doctors of honor and integrity. They are working formidable hours, with limited clerical and nursing staffs, and they are providing a kind of community hospital service that is indispensable to their people. They can cope with most of the medical and surgical situations

one would expect—they can cope with epidemics, with the farmer who manages to get a leg caught in a baling machine, and with other emergencies—but they cannot tend to their patients and tend to the big-city demands of bureaucracy also.

Because these observations seem to have focused on a single area in Oklahoma, probably it should be emphasized, for the record, that Dr. Williams is no isolated dissident. In Louisiana, Dr. H. Ashton Thomas, executive vice president for the Louisiana State Medical Society, has objected as severely. The utilization review requirements, he says, are the work of "technocrats," unfamiliar with actual hospital care. The small hospitals of Louisiana, in his view, could comply only by "paper-faked deals." Dr. F. Michael Smith, Jr., of Thibodaux, is still more emphatic. Compliance, as he sees it, means "sham, subterfuge and perjury."

How did these critical problems develop? They developed somewhat in the fashion of the Mad Hatter's watch. If you remember your Alice in Wonderland, the watch needed repair and the Mad Hatter asked the March Hare to minister to the timepiece. It still ran two days wrong. "I told you," says the Hatter, "that butter wouldn't suit the works." The March Hare says defensively that "it was the best butter," and the Hatter grumbles that some crumbs must have gotten in as well: "You shouldn't have put it in with the bread knife."

That is what has happened here. With the most proper and virtuous intentions, the Medicare and Medicaid people set out to repair a minor malfunction in the government's hospitalization machinery. They proceeded to impose a bewildering array of regulations geared to the largest big city hospitals. It would be unkind to suggest that the bureaucrats knew that enforcement would demand still more bureaucrats, and that the labors of these bureaucrats would produce work for still more bureaucrats, and so *ad infinitum*. In charity, let it be said that the bureaucracy was motivated solely by an earnest desire to provide high-quality hospital care, and to protect the taxpayers from unscrupulous rip-off.

All right. Where do we go from here? A Congress firmly controlled by liberal Democrats soon will turn to the business of national health insurance. Before long, the taxpayers will be asked to finance not \$7 billion for Medicaid and \$10 billion for Medicare, but \$50 or \$60 billion for everyone. The federal government then will be pervasively involved be claims, payments, reviews, justifications, appeals and the preservation of medical records from the cradle to the grave.

We ought to think about where we are going. No matter how national health insurance may be financed and administered, new armies of inspectors, coordinators, auditors and supervisors will be required. In the name of accountability, new volumes of rules and regulations will have to be composed. National "norms" of admission and treatment inevitably will appear. Government's standards will replace individual judgment. Doctors and hospitals that deviate from certifiable procedures eventually will weary of bureaucratic combat. The tendency will be to "go by the book," to take the easy way.

At some point—and that point is nearer than most Americans think—the people must wake up to what is happening to the private practice of medicine in our country. The doctors know what is going on, but they are an inarticulate bunch, for the most part, ill-equipped—and lacking the time—to communicate with people who may be concerned when they're sick but remain indifferent when they're well. Meanwhile, small-town Americans need to look to their small hospitals. The institutions are suffocating under a bureaucratic blanket, and may not survive.

SHRUNKEN DREAM

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD today a recent editorial from the New York Times on the state of housing construction in the United States. This perceptive editorial points out that, while the Congress has initiated a program to stimulate the sale of backlogged homes, we must now conceptualize long-term solutions to our housing dilemma.

The slowdown in housing starts affects many different sectors of the population. In my home district, Contra Costa County, Calif., the unemployment rate among construction workers far exceeds the national jobless rate. Among those in home building, two-fifths of all workers are jobless. And, of course, far more than only those construction workers are economically affected. The communities in which these workers reside suffer from the resident's reduced purchasing power.

In addition to the economic impact of stagnation in home building, there is the social side of the problem. Throughout the United States, hundreds of thousands of Americans live in substandard, dilapidated, energy-inefficient, decaying homes. A systematized national home construction program would improve the living conditions for these citizens, and the resulting social benefits would be obvious.

The editorial clearly indicates that homes are becoming economically unfeasible for the average working family. It is a call to action for this Congress, and I urge my colleagues to note its important message.

The article follows:

SHRUNKEN DREAM

The cost of the American dream—that rose-covered cottage or split-level ranch in suburbia—is now up to \$41,300 (new) or \$35,600 (used) and is unavailable to anyone with an income of less than \$23,300. Since the average family's income is half of that, the average family is just out of luck.

For the more affluent family, what used to be the \$35,000 "luxury" model is a routine \$60,000 to \$70,000. With inflation and today's high construction costs and interest rates, five out of six American families cannot afford the American dream at all.

These depressing figures come from a recent Congressional Joint Economic Committee report. The shocking message behind the figures is that the high cost of housing has finally outstripped most people's ability to pay for it. Even the currently increased availability of mortgage money has done little to stimulate sales. And the new tax law that will give 5 per cent of the purchase price of a new house as a tax reduction to move current unsold stock is no permanent solution.

The answer from builders is apparently to be a reduced, stripped-down product; a shrunken dream that will cost as much as the previous standard model. A better answer—finding ways to increase the attractiveness and livability of smaller, less costly houses on smaller lots—is often made difficult or impossible by the rigidity of existing Housing and Urban Development Department regulations and local codes.

These restrictions do not apply to mobile homes, which account for almost 28 per cent

of all new housing because they are the only realistically priced dwelling units. The construction industry, which could offer far greater amenities than mobile homes with far less environmental damage, cannot even begin to compete under present rules.

The inevitable conclusion is that an appallingly large number of Americans are now housing-deprived; and virtually nothing is being done about it. Nor is anyone facing the prospect of a considerable lowering of the American standard of living and environment.

The solution is not temporary tax gimmicks for overpriced houses, but innovative design and legislative reforms. Thus far, both industry and government have failed either to define or deal with the real dimensions of the problem.

**RESOLUTION OF JACKSONVILLE,
FLORIDA CITY COUNCIL**

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert in the RECORD a resolution of interest to all my colleagues. This resolution, passed by the Jacksonville, Fla. city council on April 8, 1975, strongly urges Congress to focus its attention on the needs of permanent programs administered by local governments. These permanent programs have been neglected and underfunded by Congress due to the emphasis on temporary public service programs. This resolution merits our close attention. It makes sense to me. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 75-355-104

(A resolution urging the Congress of the United States to alleviate unemployment by increasing funding of presently existing permanent programs rather than by creating temporary public service employment programs; providing an effective date.)

Whereas, the economic condition of this country is deteriorating; and

Whereas, fiscal legislative remedies in the past have taken the form of programs designed to create temporary public service jobs; and

Whereas, there are numerous presently existing meritorious permanent programs administered by local governments which are not adequately funded; and

Whereas, economic stimulus would be just as effective and have a greater utility to society if the Congress of the United States increased funding to presently existing permanent programs administered by local governments in lieu of funding temporary public service employment programs; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Jacksonville:

Section 1. The Congress of the United States is urged to alleviate deterioration of the economic health of the nation with fiscal legislation that would increase funding of presently existing permanent programs which are in dire need of funds rather than by creation of temporary public service employment programs.

Section 2. The Council Secretary shall provide copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lawton M. Chiles, Jr., the Honorable Richard B. Stone, and the Honorable Charles E. Bennett.

Section 3. This resolution shall become effective upon signature by the Mayor or upon becoming effective without the Mayor's signature.

**NOWAK URGES SWIFT ACTION ON
EMERGENCY JOBS BILL**

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report on H.R. 4481, making emergency employment appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, includes increased funding that greatly enhances the opportunities for areas such as Buffalo and Erie County to obtain additional economic planning and development assistance from the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration.

I would like to take this opportunity to urge swift congressional clearance of this multifaceted legislation, which also includes funds for summer jobs for youth, community service jobs for older Americans, part-time jobs for college students, and acceleration of public works construction and maintenance projects.

This measure is essential to our efforts to accelerate our national economic recovery. In comparison to the need, this legislation indeed is a modest proposal. By itself, this bill is not going to provide an overnight panacea to cure unemployment. Yet, I believe it will provide the strong stimulus on several economic fronts that has been postponed too long. There are too many persons in this country who need help now, right now. They cannot afford the luxury of waiting for the crystal ball predictions of economists to become realities.

This Nation always has found its pocketbook large enough and its generosity broad enough to provide assistance in various forms around the globe. It would be indefensible, therefore, to deny the help needed now by our own sorely tried citizens.

I am particularly pleased with the conference report's total funding of \$456 million for EDA, which in recent years has been denied adequate funding levels to give its potential an adequate national test. Because of high unemployment, Buffalo and Erie County have been declared eligible for special EDA assistance. Earlier this spring, for example, Buffalo received a \$1.4 million EDA grant to support land preparation work for the South Ellicott Industrial Park project.

The bulk of the \$456 million fund—\$375 million—will be used in conjunction with \$125 million already appropriated for quick-starting community improvement projects. Buffalo has applications pending with EDA for approximately \$2 million for such projects. The additional \$81.6 million earmarked for EDA is to supplement the agency's economic planning, technical assistance, and business loan guarantee programs. In this area, the newly created Buffalo and Erie County Economic Development Task

Force has pending a request for \$130,000 for planning and staff support.

Frankly, I would have preferred that more money in this bill went into EDA-type programs and public works construction, which involve immediate job creation and long-term community facilities that help spur growth in the private sector. On balance, however, the general thrust of this bill is toward the prompt and positive action the Federal Government must take to help revitalize the economy.

**INVESTMENT CLUBS PROMOTE
CAPITALISM**

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in an era when the defense of economic freedom is so timid, it is heartening to learn about Campaign 1976, a program sponsored by the National Association of Investment Clubs with the cooperation of the New York Stock Exchange and a number of prestigious organizations and corporations.

The objective of Campaign 1976 is to promote the basic ideas of capitalism and to encourage individuals to participate by buying shares of stock.

The association, organized by four investment clubs in 1951, is composed of thousands of small clubs whose members meet periodically to discuss investments and to pool modest amounts of money in the stock market. Hence, it teaches individuals sound investment principles and helps them build investment experience without risking large sums of money.

The idea of investment clubs is not new. During the past 20 years over 2 million people have become owners of industry through investment club membership. But Campaign 1976 is unique and commendable in using club promotion as a tool to teach capitalism.

This Nation's economy is experiencing some difficulties today, as it has in times past, but let us not forget our free economic system has made possible material abundance beyond the dreams of earlier ages and peoples in less fortunate lands. Amidst anti-free-enterprise proposals and deterioration, Campaign 1976 is refreshing and timely. I want to share information about it with my colleagues. Thomas E. O'Hara, chairman of the association's board of trustees, describes the campaign of investor education in an editorial in the May 1975, issue of Better Investing, the association's publication designed to provide club members with investment ideas each month. I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD:

CAMPAIGN 1976

For many years, the National Association of Investment Clubs has worked to do its part in helping to maintain a strong capital market and a growing economy by introducing individuals to the benefits of owning a part of American industry.

Perhaps now more than ever, industry depends upon a free flow and availability of capital, and, in turn, greater employment de-

pends upon the vigorous, productive industry made possible by sound capital markets.

Recognizing these needs, NAIC has now conceived and is building CAMPAIGN 1976, an action program aimed at interesting more of our citizens in individual ownership of industry.

Investment education has been NAIC's forte, and with this as the base, and with the cooperation of business and industry, their related associations and organizations and the securities industry, millions of our citizens will be acquainted with the program.

Mr. James J. Needham, Chairman of the Board of the New York Stock Exchange, is the Chairman of the Governing Committee of CAMPAIGN 1976. The following are the distinguished persons and organizations who have joined the Governing Committee to date:

CAMPAIGN 1976 GOVERNING COMMITTEE

Chairman: James J. Needham, Chairman of the Board, New York Stock Exchange.
Karl Bendetsen, Director, Champion International Corp.

Arch N. Booth, President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Richard M. Brodrick, President, National Investor Relations Institute.

W. Donham Crawford, President, Edison Electric Institute.

Justin Dart, Chairman, Dart Industries.

Jerome H. Holland, Director, various corporations.

E. Douglas Kenna, President, National Association of Manufacturers.

Paul Kolton, Chairman, American Stock Exchange.

Juanita M. Kreps, Vice President, Duke University.

Gordon S. Macklin, President, National Association of Securities Dealers.

Charles H. Prout, Vice President, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.

Raymond A. Rich, Chairman, U.S. Filter Corporation.

Robert W. Sarnoff, Chairman, RCA Corporation.

Carl Spielvogel, Vice Chairman, Operations, the Interpublic Group of Companies, Inc.

O. Pendleton Thomas, Chairman, B. F. Goodrich Corporation.

J. W. Walter, Chairman, Jim Walter Corporation.

C. V. Wood, Jr., President, McCulloch Oil Corporation, and Chairman, Committee of Publicly Owned Companies.

Each has agreed to work toward enlisting other corporations in the program which, in turn, will be asked to invite still other companies to join in the effort. This compounding of participation should lead to a burgeoning national movement with tremendous potential impact.

In concept, the plan is quite simple, inexpensive and yet meaningful.

Eight pieces of literature have been produced for distribution beginning in the last quarter of 1975 and continuing through seven additional quarters. Each of the small folders succinctly discusses the import of a particular economic factor as it affects the individual. Subjects covered are pricing goods, the benefits of high productivity, the need for profits, why capital is important, the role of free trade, the implications of world trade and the ramifications of inflation.

It is felt that when every citizen understands how he or she is affected by all these components of the economy, a greater understanding and appreciation of capital markets, business and industry can be achieved. A natural outgrowth would be a desire to participate in and contribute to free enterprise by becoming an owner of American business.

The organizations taking part in Campaign 1976 will distribute the literature to

their employees, shareholders, public customers and other groups as each decides.

It is our hope that many people will, as a result, want to learn more about how business and industry operate, their problems and their successes. Education becomes the key.

We believe that few mediums can match the Investment Club as a way for people in all walks of life, of all ages and all levels of income to learn how industry works and at the same time become owners of that industry with modest sums. Learning together is what Investment Clubs are all about, and through this method, NAIC has introduced over 2,000,000 of today's investors to ownership of industry.

The literature of Campaign 1976 urges people to take whatever path they like to learning and suggests Investment Clubs as one route toward investment education.

Campaign 1976 is designed (1) to make a major contribution to bringing about a better understanding of business, investment and economic factors and how they relate to creating more and better jobs, and (2) to interest a large number of individuals in becoming owners of industry.

For details of the program and samples of the literature write Campaign 1976, The Investment Education Institute, 1515 E. Eleven Mile Road, Royal Oak, Mich. 48067.

H.R. 6573

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week passed a budget resolution targeting a deficit we can not afford and do not really intend to comply with anyway. The day before yesterday we voted on the fourth of the budget rescission bills forwarded by the President. That took us once again back in the world of fiscal realities.

H.R. 6573, reported by the Appropriations Committee, rescinds a total of \$17,873 of budget authority. That is not bad, but it is \$220,000 less than could have been dropped had the committee followed the rescission recommendations.

The committee, and particularly the subcommittee on HEW and related agencies, has tried to act responsibly. In fact, I think that they are to be commended for deleting unnecessary and largely duplicative funding for the areas of health services evaluation, community mental health center construction and District of Columbia facilities construction. However, in a period when we obviously need to tighten the Federal belt, \$220 million funded under a continuing resolution, no less, for health manpower programs seems extravagant.

No one contests the need for expanded nursing and paraprofessional assistance in the medical field, but these particular programs are not urgent now. In fact, in light of the fact that we will be considering the Health Revenue Sharing and Health Services Act later this week, it seems premature to handle them now.

H.R. 6573 was simply another case of allowing expenses of too much money for too little benefit. However, I supported it because it does reduce expenditures slightly. I can only hope that in

the future we will try harder to be a little more responsive to our Nation's fiscal needs. The committee has muffed another chance to save the taxpayers some money.

SENATOR GOLDWATER AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, we were privileged to have a great American, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in Montgomery, Ala., to help in the observance of the Annual Law Day U.S.A. Senator GOLDWATER addressed a joint meeting of the Montgomery County Bar Association and the Montgomery Chapter of the Federal Bar Association at the Law Day Banquet at Maxwell Air Force Base.

As is his custom, Senator GOLDWATER was very frank in his comments about recent happenings in the foreign policy field, and he made some very cogent remarks about our will and ability to fulfill our commitments abroad. I would like to share his statements with other Members of the Congress and insert the text of his speech in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

It is a great privilege to share with you tonight your commemoration of Law Day in this year which marks the beginning of our Republic's Bicentennial celebrations. The Founding Fathers taught us in many ways what the true meaning of the rule of law is to a free people.

Shortly after taking up his commission as commander of the patriot armies, Washington promised his countrymen:

"When we assumed the soldier, we did not lay aside the citizen; and we shall most sincerely rejoice with you in that happy hour when the establishment of American liberty upon the most firm and solid foundations shall enable us to return to our private stations."

Eight years later, Washington fulfilled that pledge. Having been invited to lead his army in insurrection against the state governments, which had dismally failed to attend to the financial sufferings of the army, the commander in chief addressed a mass meeting of his officers in camp in Newburgh. In an effort to dissuade the army from intervening into civilian affairs, he assured his companions that "despite the slowness inherent in deliberative bodies" the legislatures would "act justly." He implored them, "As you value your own sacred honor, as you respect the rights of humanity, and as you regard the military and national character of America, to express your utmost horror and detestation of the man who wishes, under any specious pretense, to overturn the liberties of our country. . . ."

When Washington finished his prepared speech, the crowd remained sullen. His biographer, James Flexner, relates that Washington reached in his pocket and pulled out a piece of paper from a member of the Continental Congress that would show the officers what that body was trying to do. He would read it.

But something was the matter with their commander. He seemed unable to read the paper. He paused. He fumbled in his waistcoat pocket. And then he pulled out something that only a very few intimates had

seem him wear, a pair of glasses. He explained, "Gentlemen, you will permit me to put on my spectacles, for I have not only grown grey but almost blind in the service of my country."

This simple statement won over the audience to Washington's persuasions, as they looked with respect at the commander who had led them so far and long.

Historians believe that had Washington been unable to suppress the insurrection, the resulting chaos would probably have left behind several small nations, ripe for conquest by outside powers. Flexner writes:

"Americans can never be adequately grateful that George Washington possessed the power and the will to intervene effectively in what may have been the most dangerous hour the United States has ever known."

A friend and admirer of George Washington also left a legacy of rule by law. This patriot, who had starved and frozen with Washington at Valley Forge, who had served his country as Congressman, diplomat and Secretary of State before filling the seat of Chief Justice of the United States for thirty four years, understood the need for solving problems in the court room and not on the battlefield.

In arguing for the Constitution at the Richmond convention, delegate John Marshall explained that it was the purpose of this charter to create an independent legal system that would settle disputes peaceably.

"What is the service or purpose of a judiciary," he asked his fellow delegates, "but to execute the laws in a peaceable, orderly manner, without shedding blood, or creating a contest, or availing yourselves of force?"

One hundred and fifty three years later, a future justice of the Supreme Court, Robert H. Jackson, wrote: "Struggles over power that in Europe call out regiments of troops, in America call out battalions of lawyers." John Marshall's biographer Leonard Baker, contends that this concept of Marshall, restated by Jackson, better than anything else, "explains the stability of the American Government." Baker continues: "No government of another major power has lasted so long, has been so much the product of rationality rather than violence."

But legal order presupposes the preservation of basic social institutions upon which the freedom of all depends. How to secure both order and liberty, in the face of hostile forces from outside our community who refuse to bring disputes into a legal forum?

Marshall's answer, given during the undeclared naval war between this Nation and France, was:

"Experience, the parent of wisdom, and the great instructor of nations, has established the truth of [the] position, that, remotely as we are placed from the belligerent nations, and desirous as we are, by doing justice to all, to avoid offense to any, yet nothing short of the power of repelling aggressions will secure to our country a rational prospect of escaping the calamities of war or national degradation."

This statement gives us some insight into the practical attitude which guided the Founding Fathers in the formation of the Republic.

However much they may have wished to avoid foreign troubles, they recognized that the Nation cannot be safe if its defensive capabilities are shackled by unrealistic rules.

It must be remembered that the framers had witnessed at firsthand the inefficiency of the Continental Congress in the management of military affairs during the War of Independence. Of the fifty-five framers who attended the Constitutional Convention, no less than thirty had performed military duty in the Revolution.

The framers also held fresh memories of Shays Rebellion, in which Governor Bowdoin

of Massachusetts had single-handedly called out the militia and raised an army to restore order, before the reluctant and divided legislature could be moved to action.

It is my strong belief that the framers strived to write a workable charter, one that would survive the ages. It is my further belief that the framers were concerned with grave dangers of internal disorder and foreign pressures, both military and economic, and that they chose to build a government able to cope with these kinds of problems.

Thus, for the first 184 years of our Republic, the Constitution has been interpreted as to permit United States Presidents to take defensive actions in response to, anticipation of, foreign dangers to our citizens, property or security.

As early as 1798, John Adams unilaterally issued an order allowing American merchant vessels to arm without the approval of Congress. This was questioned in the legislature on the grounds that if the President could take the measures which he had taken, "He, and not Congress, had the power of making war."

The Congress debated the matter extensively, but rejected any legislation that would regulate the President's actions. From the printed debate in the House of Representatives, it is clear the Congress distinguished between offensive and defensive military measures, recognizing that the President can take proper actions for the defense of the country, without restriction by Congress and without a declaration of war.

The Speaker of the House, Mr. Dayton, argued that the President, as commander in chief, was the official "whom the constitution as made exclusively the judge" of employing the armed vessels of the United States wherever he "though the common defense and general welfare required."

The President was also supported by Congressman Sewall, who ridiculed the idea that, "our citizens going without the territory of the United States are to be no longer objects of our attention" and "were to be abandoned to the elements or to the hostility of mankind, wherever they went."

This view of the President's primary responsibility for the public safety has been followed by nearly every President since. Only three years later Thomas Jefferson sent into the Mediterranean, on his own authority, a squadron of four ships with instructions that should hostilities be commenced by the Barbary powers before its arrival, "this force will be immediately employed in the defense and protection of our commerce. . . ." His orders provided that pirate attacks against our shipping will be "repelled and punished." It was only after actual fighting had erupted that Jefferson came to Congress for support.

Prior to our official entry into World War II, President Roosevelt, without consulting Congress, sent troops to occupy Greenland and Iceland and order United States warships to protect the British lifeline in the Atlantic. He knew that a Congress which had extended the draft in the same year by barely a single vote could not be counted upon to authorize these actions at the time they were needed.

According to a documented study my office has made of these incidents, Presidents have deployed troops into crisis areas and used force or the threat of force on more than two hundred occasions since the founding of the Republic without any prior declaration of war. These events show a consistent and growing practice by which President's have responded to foreign threats with the force they believed was necessary, and technologically available, in the particular moment of history. Although these measures have been reviewed and debated in Congress many times, not once before the 1970's had Congress approved any legislative

proposals to halt or prohibit any such defensive action.

From this usage and Congressional acquiescence arises an impressive source of constitutional interpretation, which has been accepted by the Supreme Court on at least two occasions as a basis for rejecting congressional attempts to reverse its earlier idea of executive authority.

But the President need not rely upon practice to establish his authority. The basic source of his power rests in the Constitution itself.

First, the opening sentence of article II of the Constitution reads:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

This is not a passive grant, but includes the traditional power of protecting the national safety that has been historically recognized by the law of nations as a right of the executive.

Second, the President is "the sole organ of the nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." At least six sitting members of the Supreme Court have accepted this description of executive power by John Marshall and interpreted it to mean that the President has "primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs."

Third, section 2 of article 11 designates the President as "Commander-in-Chief." This power has been traditionally defined to encompass "the conduct of all military operations in time of peace and of war, embracing control of the disposition of troops, the direction of vessels of war and the planning and execution of campaigns. . . ."

Fourth, section 3 of article II vests with the President the duty and right to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Supreme Court has construed this power to include enforcement not only of statutes and treaties, but also of "the rights, duties and obligations growing out of the constitution itself, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the government under the Constitution."

This, as I say, has been the historical interpretation of the Constitution. With the advent of the 1970's however, when the going started getting tough in Vietnam, Congress suddenly reversed itself and began to claim dominion over a host of military and foreign policy powers. In 1973, Congress enacted over the President's veto, the war powers resolution. This document asserts for Congress control over the entire field of troop commitment and deployment.

The law is triggered by the introduction of American forces, without a declaration of war, (1) into hostilities or imminent hostilities, (2) into the territory, air space or waters of a foreign nation, when equipped for combat, or (3) in numbers which substantially enlarge United States forces equipped for combat already located in a foreign nation, such as NATO areas.

When military forces are introduced in one of these situations, the President must report on it to Congress within 48 hours and periodically thereafter. The President cannot use the Armed Forces for longer than 60 days, unless Congress votes specific authority. He is given an additional 30 days only if the safety of our troops demand their continued use in the course of removal.

The President cannot take defensive measures, even during this 60 or 90 day period, if Congress orders the withdrawal of United States forces sooner. The law provides that the President must obey such a congressional directive.

Also, since 1973, Congress has imposed a ban on the use of any funds to finance the involvement of American military forces in hostilities in, or over, or from off the shores of, North and South Vietnam, Laos or Cam-

bodia. In addition, Congress had enacted a provision requiring the withdrawal of NATO forces proportionate to any balance of payments deficit caused by stationing our troops in Europe.

Recently, while President Ford was taking unto his own hands the protection of Americans in Phnom Penh and Saigon, Congress was spinning its wheels debating amendment after amendment to the supporting legislation that the President had asked for to demonstrate unity in our national policy. These amendments proposed to restrict the number of Americans who would operate our mission in Saigon, establish a ten-day time limit to accomplish the evacuation, and require the President to report every detail of the evacuation operation to Congress every few hours, among many other restrictions.

What we were primarily concerned with in this debate was a repetition of what history has been filled with in the past—a threat to American lives, American property and American freedom overseas. My point is to keep the War Powers Resolution, and its offspring, in debate, in the hope that at some time in the future this matter can be considered by the American people in the form that it should be, a constitutional amendment.

The unfortunate developments in Indo-China are pointing out, very graphically, to the American people that under this law, the President cannot protect American lives and property overseas anymore without authority of Congress, and, if he tries, they can call the whole thing off at any time.

To me, one of the weak points of the entire episode we are going through is that it has crippled, not only the President, but through him, the United States in its ability to remain a respected and believed power able to express its historic prerogatives across the world.

I can tell you from personal experiences in the Pacific, and from rather constant communication with friends around the rest of the world, the rank of this country is slipping and it is slipping fast.

Whether or not we can stop it, I do not know. I hope and pray we can. I think we can. But it is going to take a decision of the American people and the Congress, both. The President cannot do it alone.

The question I shall leave with you is whether rule by law can survive a weakened America, which seems indecisive about even protecting its own citizens? Do we have the will to act in an honest way to those people in the rest of the world to whom we have made promises? It is to the American people where we must truly seek a rebirth of our strength and determination. This is why I have laid this problem before you tonight.

A TRIBUTE TO RANDY CAIN

HON. JACK HIGHTOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to share with my colleagues the success of one of my constituents in an organization that prepares high school students for a vital role in our free enterprise system.

Randy Cain of Pampa, Tex., has just completed a year as national president, high school division, of the Distributive Education Clubs of America. This organization is made up of students throughout the Nation who gain valuable experience

in various aspects of business, including marketing, merchandising, and market research, through jobs that they hold while in high school. The DECA organization does not limit itself to the narrow definition of business, but also has a broad program of charitable and civic activities designed to assure that members will develop the sense of responsibility so important in our society.

Randy Cain's accomplishment and the vigor of the Pampa distributive education program and DECA chapter are in the best tradition of American perseverance and dedication.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEADSTART PROGRAM

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 10-year anniversary of the Headstart program. It has been and continues to be a pioneering force in the field of preschool education and child development.

One of our highest priorities must be the education of our children in a way that they can realize their full potential as human beings and become productive citizens. If we are to tackle effectively the problem of burgeoning welfare rolls and rising crime statistics, then we must use every lever to enable the educational process to be successful. The importance of early childhood years to the future development of an adult is well known.

We must begin at that age level, particularly for children who for one reason or another do not have the opportunities at home to prepare them for a successful and healthy elementary school experience. Headstart has done this.

Since its inception in 1965, more than 5.3 million children have participated in the Headstart program. Today the Headstart program operates in every State and U.S. territory. In Kansas, there are 28 programs reaching thousands of children.

In addition to its educational function, the Headstart program offers children medical and dental screening, nutritional, and social services. It is important to point out that parents and volunteers are involved in every aspect of Headstart. This has focused attention on the importance of parental involvement in the education of their children.

The success of Headstart has led to the initiation of other programs such as Homestart where trained personnel go to the home to assist in the education of preschool children and Follow Through which continues through third grade the educational services offered by Headstart.

The Headstart program provides an excellent example of what can be accomplished by people working together and it should be continued. Millions of children have benefited from these efforts. Our country will reap the rewards.

CHERI MANGHAM SCORES A FIRST FOR NROTC

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues in the House know me as a man who supports a strong National Defense Establishment and as one who has publicly expressed fears about the quality of the Armed Forces now entrusted with the defense of this country.

I would like to speak today, however, about one member of our Armed Forces about whom I have no such reservations—a young woman who has been tested and found not only qualified but superior in the talents she will bring to the U.S. Navy.

Last month Cheri Jane Mangham of Nacogdoches, Tex., became the first woman in the United States to graduate from the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program. She was No. 1 in the class of 25 ensigns at Jacksonville University in Jacksonville, Fla., on the basis of her performance record in the NROTC and her grade point average of 3.35 on a 4-point scale.

Her spectacular success in the program—made by service as battalion executive officer in charge of drilling, duty execution, and conduct of students—is even more remarkable since she completed the 4-year NROTC scholarship program in only 3 years.

Cheri transferred to Jacksonville University from Stephen F. Austin University in Nacogdoches. She was greatly encouraged in her decision to join the Navy by a former Navy nurse and a former Navy lieutenant commander who is now mayor of Nacogdoches—her mother and father.

Although Cheri majored in international relations, her military studies included naval orientation, sea power, navigation, electronics, missiles, radar, and military management. Those courses have prepared her for the next step in her naval career—and it is a very big step. She plans to become an intelligence officer for an aviation squadron, and she is now at Lowry Air Force Base in Colorado for training.

In a recent interview with a Jacksonville newspaper, Cheri talked about the problems she has encountered in the male-dominated NROTC program:

I knew it would be difficult. But if a woman has capability and wants to do something different with her life, there is no reason why she shouldn't.

This year is International Women's Year, a time when the many accomplishments of women are being highlighted and their potential for more involvement is being investigated. Cheri's past achievements and future prospects contain the success of the women's movement in microcosm. As a former Navy lieutenant, I salute Cheri for a job well done.

"BIG BLUE MARBLE"

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing controversy about which programs are to be aired on television is an understandable one since advocates on both sides exhibit rational arguments supporting their respective views. In the midst of this controversy, a program which is appealing to those who favor more programs geared to the large audience of children, is gaining international reknown. "Big Blue Marble," the first international children's television series, is a unique television program now being aired over more than 120 stations across the country. This 26-minute program visits three countries weekly, contains animated folktales, a "how to" segment, and a special "Dear Pen Pal." It is geared toward those viewers between the ages of 8 and 15, carrying them around the world through visual impact, and telling each other how they live.

The "Big Blue Marble" is offered free to stations as a public service by ITT. This is a wonderful idea, for it is a step in the right direction toward opening the communication barriers for the future adults of our world. "Big Blue Marble" is a means of overcoming the ignorance exhibited by so many of us stemming from a belief that those different from ourselves are less smart or not as good. The program contributes to a greater appreciation and tolerance for other people and cultures and comes at a time in a child's life when these attitudes are critically being shaped.

The program has won a special citation by Action for Children's Television—ACT—a committee of concerned citizens privately monitoring and attempting to influence positively television programming for children. I applaud this new program, and encourage its growth to every television station across the Nation.

I place at this point in the RECORD several newspaper articles describing the Nationwide impact of the "Big Blue Marble":

[From the New York News, Apr. 20, 1975]
THE WORLD'S A RAINBOW ON "BIG BLUE MARBLE"

(By George Maksian)

Each week thousands of youngsters go hopscotching the globe without once leaving their living rooms thanks to the magic of television's latest children's success, "Big Blue Marble," which is seen on 130 stations across the nation, including Channels 11 and 13 here (Sundays at 9 a.m. and Fridays at 8 a.m., respectively).

The youngsters visit such far-away lands as Tunisia, Bali, Jamaica, Kenya, Egypt, Thailand, Ireland, Switzerland, Colombia and Yugoslavia, to see how other children live, work, play and grow up.

Comes the fall, viewers will be given an extra treat when the series goes behind the Iron Curtain to Russia. "It will mark the first children's series to visit that country," said producer Henry Fownes, who co-created the program with Bob Garrison and Ken Snyder.

"I was in Moscow late last month negotiating the deal. And I got word today that they approved it. They said I was to have my crew in Moscow by May 10. Those

Russians work like an army sergeant. They don't give you much notice at all.

BETTER THAN OLGA

"After we arrive in Moscow, we'll head straight to Rostov in the south near the Caspian Sea. There we're going to do a piece on a gymnast who's supposed to be even more astounding than the Olympic champion Olga Korbut. We also plan to visit a children's railroad, which is entirely run by youngsters, from the engine car to selling tickets. Children's railroads are very common in socialist countries," he added.

"We'll head back to Moscow on the 18th (May), where we're going to film a segment on 'Pioneer Palaces.' This is a fascinating project, the most unique thing I've ever seen.

"There are 35 such places in Moscow, and 35,000 in the entire Soviet Union," he continued. "Not all, of course, are former palaces. Most are newly constructed buildings. These centers are for youngsters who want to learn everything from sculpture to modern dance. They even have a reproduction of a MIG fighter plane, where children can go in and examine all the parts.

"The Russians are very serious about their children and their education. As one Russian said to me during my visit, 'There's only one ruling class in Russia and that's our children.'"

STRONG FAMILY TIES

Fownes, who already has filmed programs in such Iron Curtain countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia, believes children are alike the world over. "It doesn't make any difference where they live," he said, "they have the same interests as our children. The only difference I sense is that there's less juvenile delinquency over there. But my observations are really limited," he admitted. "I'm usually very busy working. But generally you don't see kids roaming the streets as you do here."

The producer continued: "In Europe and elsewhere, there are strong family ties. Children from an early age are given responsibility and are expected to live up to it. They also get the respect that goes along with it. I think this is a very healthy thing.

"I'm not knocking America, you understand. But I believe that in this country our children are not required to pull their own weight. We're a very affluent nation. Over there, part of the growing-up process is to have a job and to have responsibility."

One of the most popular features of the program is the "Dear Pen Pal" segment. "This alone brings in an average of 5,000 letters a week," said Fownes. "Any American child who wants a foreign pen pal friend simply writes to the televised box number, giving his or her name, address, sex, age, special interests, and saying whether a boy or girl pen pal is wanted.

"The 'Big Marble' computer then matches the American child with one from another country of the same age and interests. Within weeks, the U.S. child gets a postcard telling whom to write, and where."

The producer said the series will be syndicated around the world next year to about 70 nations, or roughly 50% of the children in the world.

"Big Blue Marble," which is offered free to stations as a public service by ITT (their only requirement is that the program be presented without commercial interruption), gets its name from the picture of the earth snapped from moon orbit by Col. Frank Borman in October 1968. When his space capsule pulled away from the earth and he got his first look at the planet from space, he exclaimed, "My God, it looks like a big blue marble!"

SCENES OF POVERTY

"The title gives the impression that the world's a big, beautiful place," said Fownes, "but it's not enough to show just the icing, the pretty parts of the world. On our series,

we also go into the poverty, the anguish and the misery. We'll show, for instance, a poor shoe shine boy in Bogota, Columbia, and his struggle to exist. And we've done segments on blind skiers in Aspen."

Fownes said the aim of the series, which made its debut last September and was given a stamp of approval by Action for Children's Television, is to instill in youngsters a sense of understanding appreciation and tolerance for people, countries and cultures around the world. "If it does that, I'll consider the show a success," he said.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Apr. 6, 1975]

"BIG BLUE MARBLE" FILMS WORLD'S CHILDREN
(By Jo Ann Levine)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—What can you do with a world that looks like a marble when seen from outer space?

Hold it close and warm in your hand, play games with it, discover what everybody else is doing with it.

That is just what "Big Blue Marble," the child-size name for the first international children's television series, does as it films children around the world telling each other how they live—and laugh.

Sandwiched between 10 hellos and 10 good-byes in different languages, this 26-minute weekly program, uninterrupted by commercials, is in its first season on 120 stations in the United States.

Bob Garrison, the series' co-producer, says that Alpha-Venture, Inc., expects by the end of 1976 that "Big Blue Marble" will be syndicated to about 70 nations, or roughly 50 percent of the children in the world.

The series, which cost \$3 million to research and complete 26 weeks of programming, is offered by International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation (ITT) as a public service to any station which agrees to offer it without commercial interruption.

The program has won a special citation by Action for Children's Television (ACT), a committee of concerned citizens privately monitoring and attempting to influence positively television programming for children.

Each program features children in three countries outside the United States and one segment on children in the United States. Each program also includes a section on how to make something, a folk tale, some jokes, and a pen-pal section.

One program starts with an animated skit: "Waiter, get me France," says one character. France lights up on a map while the characters explain that "France is between Spain and Germany." A nine-year-old girl talks about the sand yachts which her family race along Normandy Beach. Then the next segment is in Hong Kong, where a little girl named Carolyn takes viewers around her father's snake farm.

While Carolyn, another child, and the manager of the farm lug a python, Carolyn explains that the snake is so heavy it takes three people to carry it. After unpacking some elephant snakes, watching a cobra being milked, and noting that "snakes are good citizens," Carolyn confides that her father wants her to take over the farm some day. She isn't sure she wants to because "I may want to do something more unusual."

Viewers, who are expected to be from about 8 to 15, then are shown how to make designs with paint and potatoes before moving on to Holland where a miniature city called Madurodam is filmed in such a way that at first it appears to be regular size.

Other programs include a child milking goats in Switzerland, another working on a fishing trawler in Iceland, a 15-year-old girl from Virginia living with six other girls in a New York City penthouse while on a ballet scholarship, and a dog-training school in England where the teacher explains there are no disobedient dogs, only inexperienced owners.

Four crews travel around the world filming

stories for the program which is edited in New York.

Clare O'Brien, the series' educational director, said that reactions from children indicate they are most interested when children do the talking, and that they enjoy watching children who are able to effect things on their own.

One teacher in California said, "Before the show, my class used the term, 'foreign children.' After seeing several of the shows, they dropped the word, 'foreign.'"

[From the Newport News (Va.) Press, Mar. 27, 1975]

TV TRAPS CHILDREN, PRODUCER SAYS
(By Jo Ann Levine)

NEW YORK.—If adults had learned what Bill Bryan wants children to learn about watching television, they would keep it at a distance, move it out of the center of attention in a home, and be its master.

As producer of the local WCBS children's show "Patchwork Family," Bryan says that just because there is a block of children's shows running for six hours on Saturday does not mean that children are supposed to watch them all, or watch any indiscriminately.

"It is the responsibility of the parents to watch a program and to gauge that program either with or for the child," said Bryan.

The parents are the only ones who know the child. They are the only ones who know about the individual sensitivity.

"You have to say to the child, 'You have your viewing time (and I'm not the first one to say this). You can watch tomorrow from 8 to 10, it is an honor system.' You may even say, 'Make a choice (but try and keep an eye on it, too).'"

To Bryan, a good children's show does not talk down to children, and it keeps a "certain removal of distance." It allows the child to be a more independent critic of what he is watching, rather than forcing him to look.

With "Patchwork Family" Bryan says he has tried to have a cast with a "Take-me-as-I-am quality," and no people who come on and act as "I'm going to make you love me, kids."

It is the forcing which he feels has pervaded children's television: "Tell Mommy you want those cornflakes." Or, "You'd better tune in tomorrow."

"That's one thing I like about public television," Bryan cautioned. "They have this quality of removal of distance—whether consciously or unconsciously, or whether it is innate good taste; they do less of it."

"Children are interested in any subject. I don't care what it is, as long as you gear it for their age and present it in an interesting way."

To help parents put television into perspective for themselves and their children, Bryan says:

"Television is not show business. It can be entertainment but it is not a consuming entertainment. How can it be when it is interrupted every 15 minutes by a commercial? Or when all of a sudden a slide says, 'We bring you a special news bulletin'?"

"It is an informal device," he adds, "and therefore it is due only part of your time. In the old days, the average American saw just over one movie a week. Why should you demand something great every night? It can trap you, so you have to maintain your own distance from it."

Asked if he would suggest that people take television out of their homes, he said quickly, "I know people who have done it and have been delighted with it."

Then after a pause, he added, "No, I don't think so, because I think television can be quite valuable and entertaining. It should be treated in a more casual way; it should be the *raison d'être* of your evenings at home."

[From Grit, Apr. 27, 1975]

COURAGE ON THE SLOPES
(By Mike Lipman)

Vicki DeCastro has learned to ski pretty well on the slopes near Aspen, Colo.

That's not too unusual for a 15-year-old girl, except for one thing—Vicki is legally blind.

"I felt pretty good about getting up on skis," Vicki reminisced after a day on Buttermilk Mountain at Aspen. "That morning I fell a lot as I came down off Buttermilk. But by afternoon I had stopped falling. I had the most fun coming down the second time off the top of the mountain."

Vicki is from Sheridan, Wyo., and attends school in Colorado. That she and many other blind and partly blind youngsters and adults are learning to ski is the result of a program begun by another blind skier, Jean Eymere.

It all came about because Eymere refused to accept defeat when he became blind.

The story of the skiing experiences of Vicki, Eymere, and others will be told in an episode of Big Blue Marble to be shown later this year. The award-winning weekly television series geared toward youngsters eight to 15 is seen on more than 120 stations in this country and is scheduled to be shown abroad.

Eymere was a member of the French "B" Olympic ski team in 1956 and was the top downhill racer among European university students. In 1970, as a result of diabetes, he lost his sight.

Aided by a friend, Brian Webber, of Springfield, Mass., Eymere learned to ski all over again. Few would realize, as they watch him ski at Aspen now, that Eymere, 38, is blind.

Soon after he recovered his skill, Eymere got the idea that if he could be blind and ski, others could too. So in 1971 he created a program known as Blind Outdoor Leisure Development (BOLD).

He approached the Aspen Ski School and Aspen Highland Ski School with his idea. Both now furnish instructors at no charge for blind skiers. Lions Club International, whose projects often deal with sight, also supports the program.

The BOLD program, open to all ages, has spread from Aspen to Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Chicago. Eymere attends skiing clinics and provides instruction.

The first thing a BOLD ski student does is "see" the skis, boots, and poles by feel. Then come lessons in putting on boots and using the other equipment. Next, a student dons skis and learns to walk and slide.

In a one-to-one relationship, the instructor teaches the student how to position himself. To do this, the teacher faces the student, sets him into the proper stance, and skis backward holding onto him.

After the student learns to get set, the instructor skis behind him with his arms wrapped around the novice and the latter's skis between his.

Then comes the big test—soloing. The student begins on the small hills, learns to snowplow (cross the skis to slow down or stop), uses the chair lift, and so on.

"Quite often, a blind student progresses quicker than a sighted person," said Eymere. The reason is that the blind student is not afraid, he said.

Eymere estimated BOLD has taught about 50 youngsters to ski since it was organized. Last year, blind youngsters learned to ski on 157 days at Aspen. The youngest was nine; another was a 53-year-old man just as enthusiastic as the youngsters.

For Eymere, who lives in Aspen with his wife, Wils, and their two sons, Oliver and Dominique, it's a case in which the blind leading the blind has produced remarkable results.

[From Teacher magazine, May-June 1975]

BEING 'CHOOSY' ABOUT TV
(By Kathy Sterling and Jane Cohen)
"BIG BLUE MARBLE"

For a documented trip around the world try "Big Blue Marble" (check local listings). Except for public broadcasting, this is the first regularly scheduled children's show uninterrupted by commercials (they appear in a block at the end of the show). Each show visits three countries, contains animated folktales, a "how to" segment and the special "Dear Pen Pal."

Students can participate in "Dear Pen Pal" by writing to: Dear Pen Pal, Box 4054, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93103. The letter must specify the country the child is interested in and whether he or she would prefer corresponding with a boy or a girl (Maybe they will change that with time and pressure.)

An international correspondence may start as a summer project but last for years. Discuss what your students want to learn from their pen pals. Can they locate their countries on a map? What can they share about their own lives? Have an international costume party and serve foods that originate in other countries. You might, for example, serve french bread and chili. Include songs in foreign languages.

Ask your school or local librarian for help with your research or call on the language teachers at the nearest high school or college. Above all, find out if any students have relatives who speak another language or can help with the food. Although the project is international in scope, don't forget to include your own community.

Special films and teaching aids for classroom use in connection with "Big Blue Marble" are available to teachers at a modest cost. For details and further information, contact: Alphaventure, 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

Enjoy your summer!

[From the Philadelphia Tribune, Apr. 4, 1975]

"BIG BLUE MARBLE" YOUNGSTER TOURS U.S. CITIES

Youngsters who enjoyed seeing 12-year-old Richard Ace, Jr. play the drums with his father's reggae band on a recent segment of "Big Blue Marble," the international children's television series, will get the chance to see Richard perform in selected U.S. cities.

The young and talented Jamaican is now making a cross-country tour with his Dad's band. They have been in Detroit, Chicago and Minneapolis.

Other cities lined up so far include: New York City, April 3-4, Indianapolis, April 2, Los Angeles, March 31-April 1. The rest of the tour is being arranged.

The "Blue Marble" segment in which Richard appeared was filmed in Jamaica as each program of the 26-week series features children in three countries outside the United States and one segment on children in the U.S.—showing how they live and laugh.

The series, which cost \$3 million to research and complete 26 weeks of programming is offered by International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation (ITT) as a public service to any station which agrees to offer it without commercial interruption. In its first season it is running on 120 stations in the United States.

Bob Garrison, the series' co-producer, says that Alpha-Venture, Inc., expects by the end of 1976 that "Big Blue Marble" will be syndicated to about 70 nations, or roughly 50 percent of the children in the world.

The program is being considered for an Emmy nomination, has been named best new children's series by the Boston Globe and has won a special citation by Action for Children's Television (ACT), a committee of concerned citizens privately monitoring and at-

tempting to positively influence television programming for children.

Each program of "Big Blue Marble" also includes a section of how to make something, a folk tale, some jokes and a pen-pal section.

"Big Blue Marble" is not designed to teach specific disciplines," says Clare Lynch O'Brien, the show's educational consultant. "Instead, it aims to increase awareness, familiarity and curiosity about all the fascinating things to be found in the world."

Four crews travel around the world filming stories for the program which is edited in New York.

In the segment in which Richard played his drums, the show sailed from Jamaica to the Sulu Islands in the Philippines to observe a 9-year-old who works on the village farm. Finally, castles, dragons, rabbits, frogs and Indians—all made from sand—were displayed at the Annual Sand Castle Contest in San Diego, Calif.

"Big Blue Marble" takes its name from the picture of the Earth snapped from Moon Orbit by Col. Frank Borman. It showed the world looking like a marble. The show is aimed at children 8-15 and special films and teaching aids are used in conjunction with the series.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier, Apr. 5, 1975]
NEW SITAR STAR IS A TEENAGER

Indian sitar music, introduced to major U.S. audiences by Ravi Shankar and the Beatles, comes to the world of children's television on this week's "Big Blue Marble."

Fifteen-year-old Rajesh Sanghi, a native of India's capital, New Delhi, is seen practicing the complex stringed instrument under the watchful eye of his guru, Ustad Amjad All Khan. During the five-minute segment, filmed on location, Rajesh also explains the instrument's history and plays a famous Indian classic.

Young Rajesh has been studying the sitar for three years. The instrument is difficult to play and requires spiritual discipline as well as musical skill.

BEGINNINGS

The sitar originated in India or Persia and probably was developed during the 13th century. It is used primarily to play classical music of India called "ragas."

The complex instrument has six to seven main strings, which the musician plucks with a wire plectrum, or pick, worn on the right forefinger. It also has 12 to 20 sympathetic strings, which are not plucked, but vibrate when the main strings are played. The sitar, usually made of wood, has a long, broad neck and a pear-shaped body.

The Indian musician, Ravi Shankar, ranks as the world's best-known sitarist. The Beatles and several other rock musicians in Western countries have adapted the instrument for several of their more spiritual music.

TO BALI

Also on "Big Blue Marble" this week, Balinese children dance the "tramping." The young dancers perform in Western costumes to the music of a Balinese percussion orchestra, called a "gamelan."

"The Moose's Coat," an old North American Indian story from Manitou, Canada, is this week's animated folktale. The story tells how the moose ended up with a baggy coat and ugly horns while the other animals were given different coats.

Finally, young Christie Rice of Florida tells about her favorite sport, tarpon and bone fishing.

FIRST WORLDWIDE SERIES

"Big Blue Marble," the first worldwide children's television series, shows how children in different lands work, play, live and grow up. Presented without commercial interruption as a public service by International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation,

the weekly series is shown on 120 U.S. commercial and educational stations. It is slated for international distribution later this year.

AWARD-WINNING SERIES

Action for Children's Television (ATC), outspoken consumer interest group concerned with quality children's programming, has honored the series with its "Achievement in Children's Television" Award. Also, the National Association for Better Broadcasting (NABB) has selected "Big Blue Marble" as the best new television series for children and teens.

The Christian Science Monitor called "Big Blue Marble" a hit, and the hit, and the Boston Globe named the series the best children's show of 1974. "Big Blue Marble" is currently in contention for an Emmy Award as the Outstanding Entertainment Children's Series.

THE SOVIET UNION: AN ORCHESTRATED SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as Communist aggressors move to establish control over ever more nations of the world, it is useful to pause and consider just what kind of a society may be in prospect for the peoples who are now to be governed by Marxist doctrines.

In that regard, where better to look than to the granddaddy of all the Communist nations, Soviet Russia?

The Russian system, if it is nothing else, is just that—a system. Omnipotent and allpervasive, the Communist ideology permeates every aspect of life in the Soviet Union. Religion, home life, education, the arts and history alike are systematically controlled by the government, and orchestrated to produce the effect desired by those in charge.

In an era of détente, we should not forget that, not forget what it means to live in a Communist nation. Some incisive thinking on this subject was offered this week by the Peoria Journal-Star, which took an editorial look at Russian plans for the celebration of the 30th anniversary of V-E Day, and found much evidence of the sort of orchestration of which I speak.

The editorial makes good reading for all of us, and so I would ask that it be printed here in the RECORD:

ORCHESTRATING RED HISTORY

The Soviet Union is staging the most grandiose war celebration of even its history of celebration to mark the 30th anniversary of what we call V-E day—the end of World War II in Europe.

It is a curious phenomenon that has raised eyebrows at the scope of these activities this year, an unprecedented avalanche of books, movies, TV shows, art exhibits, even an opera to mark this anniversary and glorify World War II.

It is another example of how the Soviet system makes a decision and then inundates all forms of expression including the "arts" to produce a propaganda deluge.

Then you wonder, why?

Because you know it is calculated.

That is a hard one to answer.

But the new demonstration of the massive size and comprehensive nature of Soviet con-

trol and guidance of all forms of expression also demonstrates one way in which it is used—they give their own calculated, unvaried version of "history" with more regard for Red propaganda than for accuracy or truth.

Hence, all this material treats the war as almost exclusively a Russian achievement, but also describes it as "a war begun by capitalists and ended by Communists."

In fact, of course, it was a war begun by National Socialists in close and secret alliance with Soviet Russia, herself.

What really happened was that Communist and Nazi negotiators reached a secret accord in Moscow even while the Soviets were stringing along an open show of "negotiations" with Britain and France for a common front.

That agreement guaranteed Hitler a peaceful eastern border for the attack on France, and the war actually began with east and west to divide Poland between them. (Plus the "gift" of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, which countries were snuffed out by Soviet armies as Hitler was snuffing out his targets.)

The partnership was a huge success in mutual conquests and they then began to discuss longer term plans for literally dividing the world.

Hitler urged Russia to take India for starters and to eventually gobble up Asia, while he concentrated on Europe.

They finally "fell out" because both wanted Greece, Yugoslavia and the Middle East. Hitler wanted it, looking back to the classic World War I alliance of Germany, Middle Europe and Turkey. Russia wanted the Dardanelles and full control of the Middle Eastern outlets from her Black Sea coasts.

They couldn't agree, although they got far enough along in scheduling the "digesting" of proposed step-by-step conquests to figure that after a considerable gap they'd be ready for the final assault in a new war in 1980—on the United States! (We were neutral at that time!)

(Details on this did not become available to us until we got the German records after World War II.)

With his easy victory in France and the gobbling up of all Europe, Hitler began to look upon his former partner-in-crime as a more tempting target and more dangerous neighbor than Britain. So instead of finishing the original job, he launched his surprise attack on Russia.

The record is clear of both Stalin and Molotov being horrified and explosive about this breach of faith. The German alliance with Japan, also secretly worked out, shook them even more until a brilliant spy let them know that Japan was far more interested in the rice bowl of Southeast Asia than in the Siberian steppes and war with Russia.

None of this, of course, is included in the great commemoration of their "Great Patriotic War", much less in the ideologic bunkum about a war "begun by capitalists and gloriously ended by the wondrous might of Communism."

In fact, it was a war born by "National Socialist" Germany and the "National Communists" of Russia.

It was the capitalists who re-armed Russia when she was flat and desperate, delivering the materials of war over whole continents from the south and through the oceans. And it was the "capitalists" who rocked German forces back hundreds of miles into Germany and then waited for the Russians to make it from the other direction—for weeks.

Sort of upside down history.

But that is a basic fact we can't afford to forget. There is no such thing as "free press" in any complete socialist system. Every means of expression is not merely controlled in the sense of censorship but actually directed by the government for the

purposes of fact control and mind control of the people.

They don't just abridge liberty of expression. They orchestrate the arts, the entertainment, the news, the books, and everything to create whatever fake "truth" suits the purposes of the people in power in the Kremlin.

When investing useful facts to replace true ones is a way of life, and a dally "system", you have to be careful.

And you have to consider, also, what activities and what problems exist in this kind of system that require such total orchestration even after 50 years.

If their purposes are good and their system very successful, you would think they could relax a little bit at least.

Until they do, we had better be a bit less careless than we have been of late in just regarding these things as "another political system" and a "different culture" that "suits them" even if it wouldn't suit us.

It is neither a philosophy nor a culture. It is a raw tool for power.

When power is the God, it is dangerous to forget that fact.

EXPLAINING CITY GOVERNMENT TO YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Theilkas, the chairman of the task force on Career Education Committee for the city of Phoenix Commission on Youth, has done a fine job of explaining local government to fourth graders in a pamphlet titled "Your City Government: Sanitation and Streets."

In her imaginatively illustrated pamphlet, Mrs. Theilkas systematically explains the sanitation and street operations of the city of Phoenix. "Wild Bill," a fictitious character created by Mr. Bill Keans who is now Phoenix's new clean-up symbol, introduces children to the sanitation inspectors and workers whose job it is to take care of the complex sanitation and street systems. The pamphlet impresses upon the young reader the importance of respecting the efforts made to keep the city clean and safe.

An example of Mrs. Theilkas' writing style can be seen in the following paragraph describing landfills:

Every town and city must decide on the area that is best to dispose of its garbage and trash. The Sanitation Engineers and Department Heads study and plan for the best possible areas and how much the land will hold. Then the City Council decides where the landfills will be after they have checked all the facts and talked to the people who live near the fill. Also, our Parks and Recreation Department studies the landfill plans too. Because, when they are filled in we make them into parks, playgrounds, bike trails, and just wonderful green areas around the City.

Nearly everyone would concede the importance of educating our young people about how their government works, at all levels. Mrs. Theilkas' highly successful attempt at explaining city government to young readers in Phoenix can hopefully be emulated by other cities.

SPELLING IT OUT

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, with the fall of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and now Laos, together with anxiety and fear in the hearts of those who feel they may be next, it is imperative that the United States disengage itself from discussions of who should wear the mantle of shame or blame, and rid itself of self-flagellation.

In the wake of the seizure of the unarmed merchant ship, the *Mayaguez*, in the Gulf of Siam by the crew of a Cambodian gunboat, the eyes of the world, not just those of America, are on us.

Just this week, my hometown newspaper, *The Republican-Courier*, in Findlay, Ohio, published this editorial:

SPELLING IT OUT

Ever since Cambodia and South Vietnam have "gone down the drain," there has been a great deal of talk about reassessing U.S. policy here, there and everywhere. We would like to suggest one place, Korea, and just what can be done there to ease any situation in the future.

Why Korea? The answer almost jumps at anybody who looks at a map. It is the only remaining nation on the Asiatic mainland in which we have any vital interests. And almost next door to Korea is Japan.

It can be said with certainty that the U.S. has some type of commitment to the South Koreans. What should be done now, we feel, is for that commitment to be stated publicly, so that no question remains, and for the President to say bluntly whether or not we intend to fully honor that commitment under any and all conditions.

One of the tragedies of Vietnam was that the whole mess grew and mushroomed over a space of years under several different Presidents and different Congresses. As a war, it went nowhere because we never intended to "win" in the military sense of the word.

Finally, under clouds of doubt, uncertainty and lack of support from the people, the whole thing collapsed. We accepted a ceasefire that nobody expected would work. And now South Vietnam is gone.

This need not happen to Korea. What we should do now is tell everybody in the world exactly what our intentions are and just what we will do if Korea is attacked.

It should not be necessary to get "eyeball-to-eyeball" with the Soviet Union or the Peoples Republic of China before they understand just what they are up against.

Most of all, by laying it on the line now, the President will find out quickly just what the American people think about the situation. If they approve, fine. If not, adjustments would have to be made. We should never again get into any Vietnam-like situation without overwhelming support of the people.

In the meantime, let's put our cards on the table. There is no room for miscalculation.

Mr. Speaker, it is small wonder that the people of Korea look to the United States for some word of reassurance that we will seal our words with our deeds.

On May 10, an estimated 2 million persons gathered in Yoido Plaza, Seoul, Korea to cheer and proclaim their support of Korean President Park Chung Hee in his negotiations with President Ford and this Congress.

This rally was the Korean manifestation of asking the United States if we in fact will honor our commitments to South Korea. In the same spirit, the rally warned Kim Il-Sung, the North Korean leader, not to confuse South Korea with South Vietnam or Cambodia in strength or courage.

They let it be known that Korea is not built for jungle warfare, nor does it lend itself to undetected guerilla approaches which worked to the advantage of the Vietcong and the Khmer Rouge in the fall of Vietnam and Cambodia.

Even the opposition group, the New Democratic Party, certainly no endorser of President Park under other circumstances, gave firm support to the President in his measures of security and surveillance of Communist activities and checking the flow of capital out of Korea.

When their country's freedom is at stake, the Korean people back their brave and determined President. They may not always agree with his policies, but they stand together when their country is in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, many people here and abroad wonder how we regard Korea. Scattered criticism of President Park's administration is frivolous and untimely in the face of the greater issue of survival and alliance. It seems no time to be sitting in judgment of cosmetic procedures of an internal nature, at a time when other dominoes may tumble as did South Vietnam and Cambodia. Remember, Mr. Speaker, civil rights in Saigon are gone for good, not a few of them but all of them.

It is perilous to rely upon some Tooth Fairy to bring about a Shrang-lai of ideal democracy in Korea and place it under our pillows while we sleep and rest from our recent harrowing experience.

If Korea goes, where will the next stand take place? If Japan, why not Korea, where and when it still counts.

If Korea and Japan join the conquered countries, shall we say Alaska is far, far away from the predators?

The American people are tired of war and weary of heartbreak. We never again want to go through the nightmare of that tragic entanglement in Vietnam that took so many, cost so much, and left so little. I am confident we neither want another war, nor are we inviting one.

There is no such thing as a fortress America. There may never again be such a thing as safety on this Continent. The time of sleep is over and the time for decision is already at hand.

One of my distinguished friends, Korean-born Dr. Hancho C. Kim, in an article—editorial in the *New York Times* of Wednesday, January 8, 1975, and another in the *Washington Star* of Sunday, April 27, 1975, declared that we can neither let down the regime of President Park nor take on a war of attrition anywhere at this present time. As Dr. Kim puts it:

We are too weak to be anything but strong. Like it or not, we must pick our line of outposts once again because that is the way of the world. And having chosen it, we must in our weakness be prepared to stand upon it, beyond that weakness, with all the strength we know we have. If we do that, we may not have to do anything more. Korea

is our symbol of symbols, our own strong line of defense, governed by a capable, courageous, and determined man, Park Chung Hee. When we draw that line, we know that in President Park, we have a strong right arm on our side.

Mr. Speaker, we need not fear slipping into another war by daring to speak up and stand up at a time so many eyes look to us for leadership and so many ears are cupped to hear words of assurance.

We in the United States are not the warlocks, nor are we the marauders. We now more than ever want to be the architects of a true and lasting peace. But, we will not fulfill that dream unless we manifest strength and loyalty to those principles and bonds that have made us the greatest nation on Earth.

Mr. Speaker, let one and all know that it is the eagle that is our national symbol, not the chicken.

A SENSELESS DISPLAY OF POWER?

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has just recently extricated itself, on the eve of its 200th year as a Republic, from a tragic involvement in a distant land. It was a war to no avail and no purpose, a war which wrenched apart the very sinews of our nationhood for more than a decade.

A new government, formed as a result of our mistaken steps in Southeast Asia, but as untried as the new republic of 200 years ago and as uncertain in its halting steps toward mature statecraft, seized a U.S. merchant vessel. Our President has just responded today to this act with an unparalleled assertion and application of U.S. military power.

Let my colleagues of this House, Mr. Speaker, read the text of a most important message sent on behalf of the churchmen of our Nation, those keepers of the conscience, and the beacons of our national shame:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT FORD

My conscience requires me to make the following statement for communication to the members of the United Church of Christ and to the public at large:

If the United States is to have one shred of moral integrity left to it, we, the people of this country must rise up and denounce our government's senseless use of military force against Cambodia. There is no justification for using force of arms to solve a problem that could be handled in a civilized manner through diplomatic channels and the force of world opinion. It is imperative that each of us demand an immediate end to the attacks being made by our armed forces in Cambodia. Even now we should utilize the United Nations and any other diplomatic channels that are open to Cambodia to redress the actions of the President and his military advisers which have placed this nation in an untenable situation.

ROBERT V. MOSS,
President, United Church of Christ.

HOW MUCH PROGRESS HAVE BLACKS MADE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, while the average American is currently feeling the recessionary crunch as we approach the Bicentennial, the average black American has consistently suffered economic recession, if not depression, regardless of the health of the economy. Although we are fully aware of this imbalance, there is a much more stubborn force that maintains and perpetuates these inequities. Therefore, the progress that is thought to have been made by blacks in this country, is not really progress at all, as statistics continue to show that the discrepancy between white and black attainment continues to grow.

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM L. CLAY has addressed this problem in a recent column in the Boston Globe. I would like to share it with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

HOW MUCH PROGRESS HAVE BLACKS MADE?

(By WILLIAM L. CLAY)

Many blacks, to remain sane no doubt, grow up in America believing that discrimination and inequality illustrate nothing more than a long-term historical event. Slavery, then emancipation; segregation, then a successful civil rights movement. Progress? Doubtless. But coming down from our euphoria, we've learned in the last eight years or so that some of the problems are a great deal more intractable (if soluble at all) than those mere legal barriers to fundamental civil rights.

Beneath that thin layer of courts and legislatures lies the whole American institutional infrastructure, resistant and poisoned to the core—universities and public school systems, businesses, city halls, labor unions, families and neighborhoods, police departments, fire departments and on and on. The results are socio-economic statistical measurements that show our relative status in America as largely unchanged.

Let's look at the most recent record in the salient categories:

Income: In 1973 the median income for white families in America was \$12,600. For black families it was only \$7270. From 1969 to 1973, the median income for white families grew. For black families, it did not, meaning the income differential is widening, not narrowing. (Other evidence suggest it has widened still more since 1973.) Even the much sought after college degree has given false promises. In 1969 a black with four years of college made \$8715, a mere \$102 more than a white with four years of high school. The white college graduate made over \$11,000. It's no small wonder then that in 1973, 31.4 percent of all blacks found themselves below the low income level of \$4540, a plight endured by only 8.4 percent whites.

Employment: In a trend that has persisted in an even trajectory since the Korean War, blacks and other minorities are twice as likely to be unemployed as whites, black teens over 2½ times as likely as white teens. However high the overall rate is, the American formula instructs us to double it for the black rate.

Education: In 1973, 8.3 percent of blacks between 25 and 34 had completed four years

of college. For whites, the figure was 19 percent.

Family: Between 1965 and 1974, the proportion of black families headed by a woman rose from 24 to 34 percent. Among white families, only a slight increase was registered—from 9 percent to 10 percent.

Housing: In 1970, 23 percent of the 6.2 million housing units occupied by blacks were classified as "substandard." The corresponding white rate was only 7 percent.

Health: For the last two decades, the infant mortality rate for blacks has been approximately double the rate for whites and black mothers still die in childbirth at about five times the rate of their white counterparts. But if we have a harder time coming into this world, we have an easier time going out. Among blacks, the average life expectancy is now 69.3 for females and 61.2 for males. Corresponding figures for whites are 75.6 and 68.3 years, a better than six-year differential.

These are the real indices of residual racism and stubborn inequality in America today. And if the barriers are less visible they are indeed more damaging to our psyches and material welfare precisely because they are less visible.

It would appear that, the great victories taken into account, black Americans have little to celebrate in this nation's Bicentennial.

DEFICITS DESTROY JOBS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives adopted a budget that calls for a \$68.8 billion deficit for the next fiscal year. This would be the largest deficit in our Nation's history.

Liberal economic theorists argue that such a large budget deficit will stimulate the economy and produce jobs. In reality, however, large deficits destroy jobs.

Why is this so? Deficits must be financed. Simply stated, financing takes place by printing more money, borrowing more money, or a mixture of both.

Printing more money with no backing leads to greater inflation and higher prices. Federal Government borrowing results in crowding out others who are trying to borrow. This harms industries like construction which are so dependent on credit.

When the Government has to borrow more and more, it crowds out mortgage money. Money and resources are taken from mortgages and construction loans for homes, and commercial and industrial building.

It has been estimated that for every \$10 billion the Federal Government borrows, 500,000 new housing starts cannot begin due to lack of mortgage funds. This lack of housing starts results in the direct loss of over 1 million jobs and the indirect loss of over 2 million more in affiliated industries. The construction industry depends on supplies made by numerous other industries—from plumbing equipment to paints to nails to electrical appliances.

In a recent advertisement the AFL—

CIO leaders state "Borrowing money is part of the American way of life." But everyone knows—particularly the rank-and-file worker—that when you borrow too much you get overextended. The result is bankruptcy.

Unfortunately, that is where our country is heading—toward national bankruptcy. And the bigger deficits are only speeding that along—at the cost of jobs and production.

It was indeed unfortunate to read AFL-CIO President George Meany's statement yesterday calling for not a gigantic \$68.8 billion deficit out \$100 billion. That is totally irresponsible and does not represent the thinking of rank and file union members whose jobs are already threatened by inflation and Government bureaucratic program which destroy their jobs.

FOCUSING ON THE MALPRACTICE CRISIS

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman H. JOHN HEINZ III, of Pennsylvania, who serves with me on the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, recently addressed the Pennsylvania Medical Society in Harrisburg.

Mr. HEINZ urged strong and quick State legislative action to avert the medical malpractice crisis, and also urged the medical profession to move boldly to sweep clean its ranks of incompetent or negligent physicians.

I insert the text of Mr. HEINZ' thoughtful remarks to be included in the RECORD:

FOCUSING ON THE MALPRACTICE CRISIS

A generation ago, a Congressman invited to speak to a group of medical leaders about national legislation and the health care system wouldn't need much time. He could talk about the Public Health Service and the Indian Health Service, or the National Institutes of Health and Federal biomedical research efforts—but there wasn't much more than that. He could probably say everything that needed to be said about all the Federal health programs, shake hands, and leave within minutes.

But this generation has seen a near revolution in national health legislation. We could easily consume the entire morning discussing just a few of the recent Federal involvements in health.

Last December, for example, Congress enacted the new Health Planning and Resources Development Act—perhaps the most important health legislation since medicare;

Health manpower education and training still lingers in Congress, the focus of efforts by some to enact what amounts to a universal doctor draft—a highly controversial proposal of questionable constitutionality;

Several Members of Congress have proposed amendments to broaden medicare and medicaid coverage—including a suggested adoption of a Federal catastrophic illness benefits program.

We could spend the entire day exploring proposed amendments to PSRO—or some of the various health care regulation schemes floating around Congress disguised as national health insurance bills.

But in the little time I have this morning, I would like to focus on a problem in our health care system that I know concerns each of you deeply—the crisis in medical liability insurance protection. Unlike many politicians these days, I am not here to urge Federal intervention to solve this problem. I think Congress intervenes all too quickly and all too frequently in problems that can be solved elsewhere.

Instead, I'd like to tell you why everybody would be much better off if Congress stayed out of this mess known as the medical malpractice crisis.

I am not denying that a real crisis exists. There can be no doubt about that. You have experienced explosive increases in malpractice insurance prices, with Pennsylvania physicians facing increases of up to 250 percent and individual premiums as high as \$15,000 or more. Now, on top of these gigantic jumps, 4,000 Pennsylvania doctors are threatened with loss of all insurance coverage on December 31, 1975. They have no place to turn for necessary liability protection.

The effects of soaring premiums are already showing up . . . as they must . . . in higher medical bills to the patient. One example in Illinois is particularly disturbing. A hospital—as the result of a 500 percent increase in liability insurance premiums—charges \$12 per bed per day just to pay for that protection. HEW Secretary Weinberger estimates that increased premium costs, when combined with the higher costs of the defensive medicine practiced by wary physicians, could total as high as \$7 billion per year.

But while higher costs can be passed on, loss of insurance—now threatened in some states such as ours—would be simply devastating. Doctors would cease the practice of medicine since any uninsured medical action could result in a bankrupting personal injury claim. In Pennsylvania, we could lose 20 percent of our physicians at the stroke of the new year. Care would simply not be available for two to three million Pennsylvanians.

Even short of total loss of coverage, the medical liability insurance crisis further exacerbates the current maldistribution of medical care. Some doctors have retired early rather than keep part-time practices requiring insurance premiums identical to those of a full-time practitioner. Similarly, women physicians with young children may not practice at all during child-rearing years when faced with a steep premium. And still other doctors may practice where insurance is available at a lower price, rather than where their services are most needed.

Still another possible development would be the avoiding by doctors of certain high-risk medical procedures which, while of potential help to a patient, might also result in a malpractice suit.

Clearly, there is no disputing that a crisis is upon us. Not only are costs of insurance soaring but the very availability of care is threatened as well.

The need for action is quite clear. In the short run, we must assure that insurance coverage is available to all physicians and hospitals. In the long run, the number and size of injury claims requiring compensation must be controlled. But to do so, we must first identify and treat the causes of this crisis. Only then can we determine not only what should be done but just as importantly, which level of government should act.

Many problems have been identified as contributing to the malpractice mess. For instance:

The increasing frequency of personal injury suits of all kinds—we have become a litigation-oriented society that sues at the drop of a scalpel.

For another, Americans' expectation of medical care approaches a standard of perfection. Oversold on the benefits of medical technology, we fail to recognize the complexity of medicine and the risks of failure, and in some cases, the injuries that can occur where neither negligence nor incompetence is a factor.

For a third, the traditional physician-patient relationship has been modified. We live in a highly mobile society with highly specialized medical care. As a result, health care is less personalized than it once was. Since people are more likely to sue strangers than old and trusted friends, little wonder that malpractice claims have increased.

All these factors relate to the medical system. Various studies have identified several features of the legal and insurance systems that may encourage suits, increase the size of claims or make defense against them difficult if not impossible.

What is the remedy? Legislative proposals have been offered:

That would amend the statute of limitations laws that allow claims to be made decades after an alleged injury is suffered. The lengthy delays now allowed in filing claims, make a defense virtually unconstructable.

That would modify the doctrine of informed consent which burdens the doctor with the nearly impossible task of explaining virtually every medical procedure and its potential risks.

That would place ceilings on size of claims to be paid.

That would regulate by a sliding scale the size of contingency fees paid to a plaintiff's attorney.

And that would test alternate systems for compensating those injured by medical malpractice and maloccurrence. These alternatives—of which we presently know very little, include mandatory arbitration and the much acclaimed but virtually untested "no-fault" approach.

Some of these steps need to be taken—and soon. But I see no reason why they should be taken by the Federal government. The crisis is not nationwide. The availability of medical liability is not a problem in every State. Approximately half the States are not experiencing significant problems—and for the majority, the difficulty is one of the cost of the insurance, not its availability. In only seven States or so is there an imminent threat of loss of coverage.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH B. KEATING

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who paid tribute last night to Kenneth B. Keating. I too was saddened to learn of his death.

As a public servant, Ken Keating distinguished himself in all three branches of the Government: as a Member of both the House and the Senate, in the New York Court of Appeals, and as Am-

bassador to India and Israel. I recognize Ambassador Keating's diverse contributions to the State of New York and to the Nation as a whole, and I am grateful for his dedication. Kenneth Keating's leadership will be sorely missed.

HUBERT ALBERTZ—FREEDOM
FIGHTER

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Albertz is a little, ordinary man. Little in size—he is only 5 feet, 4 inches. Ordinary in terms of his employment—a building supervisor, or janitor, if you will. But measured in integrity, courage, and dedication to a cause in which he believes, Hubert Albertz stands more than 10 feet tall.

A Belgian immigrant, Hubert Albertz came to America like so many millions—looking for freedom—a chance to work and make his own way. Instead, he found compulsory unionism. He has spent almost half of his more than 70 years doggedly and determinedly fighting it.

It all began in 1947, when Hubert Albertz had the audacity to openly question a proposed dues increase in a meeting of his AFL-CIO Service Employees' Union Local 32E in New York City. He just wanted to know how the union funds were being used. For this he was hounded out of his union, out of his job, and out of his home.

Forced to move to another section of New York City, Hubert Albertz began a tireless effort for reinstatement in his local union that has continued to this day. He has had some success in that, for pension eligibility, the union has assigned him to another local. But Hubert Albertz will not rest until he is completely vindicated and reinstated in his original local—32E.

Last Friday night Hubert Albertz's long fight—his years of harassment, frustration, and suffering—were finally recognized by at least one group of Americans who know what compulsory unionism can do to a man. The National Right To Work Committee selected Hubert Albertz for its highest honor—the John Seeley Memorial Award.

Like Hubert Albertz, John Seeley knew what freedom means. So strongly did he oppose compulsion that he gave up his job of 27 years, rather than pay dues to a union he felt was not representing the workers' interests. The award is presented annually to the person most clearly emulating the qualities of leadership, integrity, and dedication to the right-to-work principle which marked Seeley's lifetime.

The National Right To Work Committee could not have made a better choice. John Seeley and Hubert Albertz—freedom fighters.

MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMICS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation faces potential energy shortages, the necessity of finding alternative methods and more efficient means of producing electric power is becoming increasingly important.

The scientific community is conducting research into various potential sources of energy which holds great promise for the future. One of these promising new methods is magnetohydrodynamics—MHD—a process of producing electric power by burning coal some 30 times more efficiently than present methods.

Research on MHD has been carried on for years, but as funding has increased in recent years, scientists are encouraged by the results. I am pleased to report that a major portion of the MHD research is carried on in the great Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

Two facilities in Tullahoma, Tenn., are carrying on cooperative research in this area. Certainly I support and commend this work which is continuing at the Arnold Engineering Development Center and the University of Tennessee Space Institute.

This research is certainly in the national interest and the Nation looks forward to continued progress.

I have recently been provided with a report prepared by Dr. Harold L. Falkenberg, Chief, Power Research Staff, Office of Power, Tennessee Valley Authority, concerning the research currently underway at UTSI.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the report herewith in the RECORD.

The report follows:

TVA'S CONSTRUCTION OF MHD FOR POWER GENERATION AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MHD DEVELOPMENT AT UTSI

1. The attraction of combined MHD/steam cycle power plants lies in the ability of such systems to provide improved thermal efficiencies over conventional steam plants. Such improvement in turn, would yield reduction in thermal pollution and reduction in fuel requirement (thus permitting us to conserve our domestic fuels and reduce our dependence on foreign oils). Furthermore, the inherent ability of the MHD generator to control sulfur emissions and the potential capability to burn coal directly could provide utilities with an attractive means to utilize this Nation's vast coal reserves—provided, of course, that technical problems facing MHD applications can be solved and that the power plants that eventually evolve are economically viable. The potential of using coal or coal products without prior purification seems to us the primary advantage of MHD over competing advanced energy conversion systems. We believe the work at UTSI addresses itself to the first steps in the development of this potential.

2. We have noted the developments of the

UTSI MHD program with much interest over the past three years and have been encouraged by the experimental results thus far. We are particularly pleased with the findings that direct coal combustion in MHD generators appear technically feasible.

3. Since the beginning of the UTSI MHD development program for power plant applications, TVA has contributed a total of \$100,000 toward this program. We also continue to provide the required pulverized coal for test operations. The Power Research Staff has maintained a close working relationship with the program activities and has provided advice and perspective, much of which has been accepted in establishing the basic scope and objectives of the program.

4. In January 1975, UTSI began a new three-year contract term with the Federal Energy and Development Administration (ERDA) in which substantially larger-sized equipment than presently used will be built and tested and in which a superconducting magnet will be acquired to conduct tests with substantially higher magnetic fields.

5. Sufficient ERDA funding is presently available and it appears that ERDA intends to continue full support of the UTSI effort. Therefore, TVA or other utility financing appears not to be required nor has it been sought thus far. It is expected, however, that as the national MHD development program proceeds to construction and operation of larger test facilities, the utilities will be asked to provide a site and supporting services.

6. We have been informally discussing with Dr. John Dicks at UTSI the possibility of TVA's providing a site at one of our power plants for any future test facility. We believe this arrangement would have a number of advantages and would help encourage the location in Tennessee of work associated with a subsequent pilot or demonstration plant. We plan to continue to discuss these possibilities with Dr. Dicks.

7. Despite the technical program that has been achieved in MHD thus far, we recognize that MHD is still in the early stage of development and that a substantial engineering effort must be undertaken before MHD could become a commercial reality. Preliminary estimates by ERDA, for example, place the operations of a demonstration plant no earlier than about the end of the 1980's. Therefore, the plans by electric utilities for power plant expansion for the next 10 to 15 years, must of necessity, include power generation systems other than MHD.

8. We are maintaining a role in the planning of a national MHD development program by active participation in an industry committee that oversees the funding of MHD by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and that assists in coordinating MHD program plans between EPRI and ERDA. Specifically, TVA is represented by a member that chairs the MHD Working Group of that committee. Our participation in this group and other task forces that review and provide recommendations on MHD program matters has allowed us to keep a current awareness of the progress and further needs of all major MHD development efforts.

9. It may be noted that through the then Manager of Power (TVA), Mr. G. O. Wesenauer, TVA was represented in the first Federal board to review the status of MHD and to recommend the course of future MHD development for power plant application (see OST report).¹

10. Also, in recognition of the need for

¹"MHD For Central Station Power Generation: A Plan for Action," prepared for the Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology by Panel on Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), June 1969.

more advanced MHD development at UTSI, TVA submitted an MHD program proposal to Dr. Dixie Lee Ray in 1973 for consideration in her five-year national energy R&D program to the President. The scope and objectives we had outlined therein are basically identical to those now contained in the recent UTSI/ERDA agreement.

**MARXISM - LENINISM - MAOISM-
ARTHUR KINOY THOUGHT: THE
NIC, PART II**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks on May 13, 1975—pages E-2397-8—I developed the background material on the origins of a new revolutionary Marxist organization, the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People or NIC.

As you will recall, the NIC leadership staged a so-called "celebration" on Sunday, May 4, in Lafayette Park just across the street from the White House. The NIC's rally was to honor the victory of the bloodstained Communist conquerors of South Vietnam.

This was, as far as I can determine, the first public demonstration of any note or size by this new revolutionary organization.

Founded by Arthur Kinoy, who wrote in his monograph on the mass party of the people that this revolutionary movement draws its "inspiration and courage from contemporary struggles of the Vietnamese, Cuban, and Chinese peoples," the NIC is building a revolutionary socialist political party on a nationwide basis.

The NIC three prime reasons for organizing a new radical political party: First, the political party is the traditional American form for seeking to take and hold political power; second, political campaigning provides a useful propaganda tool for indoctrinating the public; and third, the important practical consideration that the "traditional legitimacy" of the political party gives it the ability to "maintain its legality and ability to function openly as long as possible" before revolutionary armed struggle tactics are used.

Mr. Speaker, here we have yet another example of a revolutionary cabal seeking to manipulate legal loopholes and our constitutional respect for the political process and the right to dissent in order to prepare for an armed takeover.

Let us examine the NIC's statement of political purpose, a pamphlet entitled "An Open Letter to Activists and Organizers of the Past and Present on the Need for a Mass Party of the People."

The open letter states:

The National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People was formed in September 1973, at a meeting of people from different parts of the country. For several months before, there had been informal discussions about the possibility and necessity

of moving in the direction of organizing a new, broad-based party of the people.

We felt it was critical to involve in such discussions as many people as possible from different sectors of society before taking any formal steps. Therefore, it wasn't until June 1974 that we called an enlarged Interim Committee meeting to discuss a first statement of the political principles which unite us. This statement, the Open Letter, comes out of the discussions at that meeting. Many of us who have signed it were at the meeting.

*** overall it represents our best efforts so far to state our basis of agreement, from which we can move on together.

Open letter plainly states that the goal of the NIC is a "dictatorship of the proletariat," page 7:

Such a party would have as its fundamental program for this era the transfer of power from the capitalist state and the corporations to the people.

After explaining the legal advantages of using the organizational form of a political party, the open letter moves into a diatribe against the free enterprise system.

The NIC calls for a new social system in which, if its conditions were met, the family would be destroyed and children raised communally by strangers. As a corollary to the call for the induction of women into the working masses of the future socialist state, the NIC promotes homosexuality under the guise of "freedom of sexual orientation" as a "basic freedom we must affirm and struggle for as an important part of human liberation."

As did the Weatherman faction of SDS, the White Panther Party and the drug-crazed Yippies, the NIC seeks "to develop a culture of resistance to capitalist oppression. It must challenge the individualistic and bourgeois attitudes which are fostered by capitalist society." And the NIC, as do the alternate culture freaks, looks to the "traditions and survival cultures of the Native Americans, blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Chicanos" in developing its new "culture of resistance."

The National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of People exhibits an extreme hatred for America and dedicates itself to overthrow and destroy this country. When the NIC states its mass party of the people must engage itself in "struggles in every area," must prepare for "militant mass intervention" in alliance with international revolutionary struggles, and must "organize appropriate forms in the development of these struggles to overthrow and destroy imperialism," the NIC is clearly talking about using "armed struggle" tactics whenever it feels the time is ripe for it.

The relevant passage from Open Letter—pages 16-17—reads:

"The party of the people will be totally dedicated to the destruction of imperialism at home and abroad. The main enemy of millions of people engaged in life and death struggles from one end of the globe to the other is U.S. and world imperialism. The party must not only organize support for these many liberation struggles which are shaking the very foundations of imperialist rule, it must be prepared to open within the imperialist country itself struggles in every area against those policies of the imperialist ruling class which perpetuates its dom-

ination around the world. *** events are exploding which require and will continue to require militant mass intervention by the people internationally. A party of the people, built in the homeland of the most powerful imperialist rule, must as a basic and fundamental aspect of its purpose help organize appropriate forms in the development of these struggles to overthrow and destroy imperialism as a world system of exploitation.

Further to the theme of NIC support for armed struggle against our Government, the NIC Newsletter, reported in March 1975, of a problem concerning the political stance of NIC member David Dellinger.

Dellinger, who described himself in an SDS Radical Education Project brochure in 1969 as a "Communist, although not of the Soviet variety," came under fire from the NIC because he refused to sign the Open Letter. NIC explained:

He is in basic political agreement, but didn't feel he could sign because of a couple of formulations; e.g., implied agreement with the necessity of armed struggle.

Since Mr. Dellinger participated in the "expanded NIC meeting" held at Antioch School of Law here in Washington over the weekend of May 2-4, 1975, and participated as a speaker in the NIC's "victory celebration" for the Vietcong, it would appear that he has managed to "resolve his contradictions."

For the information of my colleagues, the published signers of NIC's Open Letter include:

Mark Amsterdam—N.Y.C. (National Lawyers Guild and Center for Constitutional Rights).

Peg Averill—political artist, Washington, D.C. (former Kent State antiwar activist).

Sally Avery—New American Movement, Durham, N.C.

Ella Baker—N.Y.C.

Norma Becker—War Resisters League, N.Y.C. (Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee).

Henry Beitscher—Philadelphia, PA.

Shepard Bliss—Cambridge-Goddard Graduate School, Cambridge, MA.

Krista Brewer—The Great Speckled Bird, Atlanta, GA.

Owen Brooks—Greenville, MS.

Al Brotsky—National Lawyers Guild, San Francisco, CA.

Leonard Calabrese—Radical Historians, Chicago, IL.

Joe Carnegie—Fight Back, N.Y.C.

Charles Cassell—Organization for Political Equality Now (OPEN), Washington, D.C.

Virginia Collins—Southern Conference Educational Fund, New Orleans, LA.

Walter Collins—Southern Conference Educational Fund, Louisville, KY.

Rhonda Copelon—N.Y.C. (National Lawyers Guild and Center for Constitutional Rights.)

Benito Diaz—Adams-Morgan Tenants Union, Washington, D.C.

Brian Doherty—Bread & Roses Music Collective, Washington, D.C.

Joan Drake—Lancaster Ball Bond Project, Lancaster, PA.

Janet Gallagher—Brooklyn, N.Y.

Aileen Goodwin—Socialist Education Center, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Ted Glick—Committee to Support Puerto Rican Independence, Washington, D.C. (former Harrisburg 8 defendant indicted on kidnap-conspiracy charges).

Bob Greenblatt—Brooklyn College, N.Y.

Jim Haughton—Fight Back, N.Y.C.

Moses Harris—Black Economic Survival, N.Y.C.

Dorothy Healey—New American Movement,

Los Angeles, CA. (former chairman of the Communist Party of Southern California).

Robert Hinton—D.C. Statehood Party, Washington, D.C.

Barbara Honig—Peace & Freedom Party of California, Los Angeles.

John Horton, Union of Marxist Social Scientists, Los Angeles.

Carol Horowitz—National Prisoner Project [of ACLU], Washington, D.C.

Charles Horowitz—Washington, D.C.

Andre Joseph—Mission Hill Health Movement, Roxbury, MA.

Michael Kane—Boston, MA.

Alice Keller—Chicago Women's Liberation Union, Chicago, IL.

Arthur Kinoy—N.Y.C. (National Lawyers Guild and Center for Constitutional Rights).

Nancy Lessin—Health worker, Roxbury, MA.

Bob Lewis—N.Y.C. (National Lawyers Guild and United Electrical Workers).

Stoughton Lynd—Chicago, IL.

Carl Marzani—Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, N.Y.C.

Alan McSurely—AFT Local 2322 (AFL-CIO), Washington, D.C.

Don Miller—Southern Conference Educational Fund, Jackson, MS.

Miles Mogelescu—New American Movement, Minneapolis, MN.

Bill Munger—Socialist Party, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.

Gall Pressburg—Philadelphia, PA.

Ro [Rosemary] Relly—N.Y.C. (former staffer of NLG's Coalition to Stop Guard Jury Abuse).

Ron Ridenour—ACLU of Southern California, Los Angeles (and in 1969 a member of the CPUSA's Southern California Student Club).

Lillian Shirley—Cambridge, MA (formerly an organizer for the Harrisburg Defense Committee).

Fred Soloway—National Lawyers Guild, Washington, D.C. (formerly with the Harrisburg Defense Committee).

Vivian Stromberg—Teacher Action Caucus, N.Y.C.

Ray Sundance—Berkeley, CA.

Barbara Webster—N.Y.C. [Mrs. Arthur Kinoy]

Burton Wechsler—National Lawyers Guild, Washington, D.C.

John Welch—New American Movement, N.Y.C.

Howard Zinn—Newton, MA.

Roslyn Zinn—Newton, MA.

In January, 1975, the NIC Newsletter reported on the advances it had made in developing its "mass party." Replete with the usual New Left obsessions with "participatory democracy," women's liberation and "third world" participation. NIC reported:

From the very beginning of our discussions almost two years ago we have constantly stressed the necessity for achieving a broad-based composition seriously representing Blacks, Women, Third World and working people, before the emergence of any crystallized national organizing form. We have also emphasized the necessity for any national form to reflect widespread geographic participation and to rest solidly upon local bases rather than developing as a heavily top-down structure.

NIC continued:

The very openness of our process and our caution is not prematurely freezing organizational forms has acted as a catalyst in opening significant discussions and beginning relationships with important sections of Black and Third World leadership and organizations. Of particular importance in this respect have been the discussions with Wal-

ter Collins, the executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and his discussions with Black groups throughout the South.

NIC stressed its initial successes in forming alliances with radical and violence-prone minority groups:

Other important relationships exist or are beginning to Fight Back, Black Economic Survival, Puerto Rican Socialist Party, American Indian Movement and the Congress of Afrikan People. In a number of cities women active in the organization of women's unions and other aspects of the women's movement have participated in the initial and ongoing discussions.

The National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People has begun serious steps to implement its proposed alliance with violence-prone racial and ethnic minority groups.

During April, the NIC's full-time "national traveler," Ted Glick, made a 3-week tour of Iowa, Colorado, Montana, Washington, and California to develop contacts with militant Mexican-American organizations including the Denver-based Crusade for Justice, La Raza Unida, and CASA—Center for Autonomous Social Action. And in the South, NIC has established contacts through the Southern Conference Educational Fund, SCEF, in the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In an even more dangerous development, the NIC and the Congress of Afrikan People, CAP, jointly hosted a meeting on March 14-15, 1975, in Newark, N.J., to develop "the basic strategy required to build a mass, united political movement in 1975 and 1976."

A report on the CAP/NIC conference written by NIC organizer Shepherd Bliss, copies of which were available at the recent "expanded NIC meeting" at Antioch Law School as were copies of the newsletters, pamphlets and other documents used in this report, quoted several group leaders on the need for armed struggle.

Keith Demarrias, American Indian Movement:

We see the struggle as more armed than electoral. We are backed against the wall, but we will support you as much as we can.

Le Roi Jones, aka Amiri Baraka, the founder and leader of the Congress of Afrikan People, was reported as saying:

Baraka—quotes Lenin that 'we must amass all forms of struggle and organization, ruling out none. Mao speaks of three magic weapons: vanguard party, united front, armed struggle. In the U.S. today we have none of these. We must develop all three.

One of the principal climate-makers of the 1967 riots in Newark, N.J., LeRoi Jones formed the Congress of Afrikan People in September 1970. For its first 3 years, Jones used the CAP to promote racial tension and a form of primitive communism known as "communalism." Late in 1974, Jones announced his rejection of "black nationalism" as "incorrect" and publicly embraced Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the only "correct" theory of revolution.

Among the groups reported by the NIC as attending that March CAP/NIC meeting, and a follow-up meeting on April 6, 1975, were:

All African People's Revolutionary Party, Washington, D.C.

American Christians Toward Socialism, New York City

American Indian Movement, New York City

Asian Americans for Action, New York City

* Black Economic Survival, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Black Panther Party, Oakland, Ca.

Black Women's United Front [a CAP front], Newark, N.J.

Boston Area Socialist Feminist Organization, Cambridge, Ma.

* Boston Labor League, Boston, Ma.

Bronx Tenants Organization, Bronx, N.Y.

Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, New York City

* The Collective, East Orange, N.J.

* The Commentator, Jersey City, N.J.

Community Action Team, Newark, N.J.

* Congress of Afrikan People, Newark, N.J.

El Comité, New York City

The Feminist Party, New York City

* Fight Back, Brooklyn and Harlem

The Guardian, New York City

* Human Rights Party, Ann Arbor, MI.

Madison Agenda for People, Madison, WI.

Mid-Atlantic Radical Historians Organization, N.Y.C.

* National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People, delegations from N.Y.C., Boston; Northampton; Lancaster, Pa.; Pas-

saic County and Somerville, N.J.; Washington, D.C.; and San Francisco.

National Lawyers Guild, Dorchester, MA

National Tenants Organization, New York City

* New American Movement—New York City, Boston, Pittsburgh and Durham, N.C.

October League, Brooklyn and Detroit

* People Against Racism in Education, New York City

People's Party, Summit, N.J.

Political Economy Program Center, Washington, D.C.

Prairie Fire Distributing Committee, New York City

Puerto Rican Socialist Party, New York City

Socialist Revolution.

National Conference of Black Lawyers, New Brunswick, N.J.

New York City Taxi Rank and File Coalition, New York City

United Black Workers, Newark, N.J.

War Resisters League, New York City

Wisconsin Alliance, Madison, Wis.

Women on the Move, New York City

Worcester Tenants Association, Worcester, Mass.

Workers Viewpoint, New York City.

Persons attending the March meeting included Sally Avery, NAM; Amiri Baraka, CAP; Joe Brennan, Wisconsin Alliance; Gil Banks, Joe Carnegei and Jim Houghton, Fight Back; Phil Carrol, Human Rights Party; Keith Demarrias, American Indian Movement; Claire Davis, the commentator; Moses Harris, Black Economic Survival; Jesse Gray, National Tenants Organization; David Harris, and Sherman Miller, October League; Ted Glick, NIC; Federico Lora, El Comité; Ngola, CAP; Arthur Kinoy, NIC; Russ Neufeld, Prairie Fire Distributing Committee—a nationally active Weather Underground Organization support group; Sandi Polaski, Boston Labor

*Groups now committed to developing a 1976 electoral strategy.

League; Cheryl Small, All African People's Revolutionary Party; and Nancy Wechsler, Boston Area Socialist Feminist Organization.

Mr. Speaker, LeRoi Jones is as great an influence among black revolutionaries today as was Eldridge Cleaver of the Black Panther Party in 1970 when he organized the terrorist gang of urban guerrillas known as the Black Liberation Army. His organization, headquartered in Newark, N.J., has branches in many other U.S. cities.

Arthur Kinoy, another intelligent and committed Marxist-Leninist revolutionary, has gathered into a loose coalition a broad range of U.S. radical leaders and revolutionary groups, including the above ground support group for the Weather Underground Organization.

These groups represent a clear threat to the internal security of the United States, and I am calling on the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over internal security matters, to begin a full investigation of the activities of the National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People and of its alliance with the Congress of Afrikan Peoples.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ELCY MCGOVERN

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to call to the attention of the Congress the accomplishments of one of Kern County, Calif.'s most active and dedicated residents, Dr. Elcy McGovern of Bakersfield. Dr. McGovern has served her community and Nation in countless ways with dedication and selflessness. On Saturday, May 24, 1975, she will be honored by Kern County Economic Opportunity Corporation. I am proud to be able to participate in this way.

Dr. McGovern has made a notable contribution to the educational program in the county of Kern, and has shown a great sensitivity to the needs of people. Her retirement from the education field did not curtail her interest. For the past 7 years, she has contributed her time, energy, and knowledge in her service to the Kern County Economic Opportunity Corporation.

Her complete dedication and support to the agency has been demonstrated in her active membership on the executive board, as an appointee of the superintendent of schools. She has served as a member of the by-laws and procedures committee, evaluation committee, personnel committee, delegate agency committee, executive committee, and as secretary of the board of directors.

Certainly, she is deserving of this recognition. Everyone who has been privileged to know and work with Dr. McGovern knows well the enormous dimension of her self-sacrificing compassion for others. It is a distinct pleasure to speak on Dr. McGovern's behalf today, and I

am sure that my colleagues join with me in tribute to this fine person.

VERNON E. JORDAN, JR.: A TRIBUTE TO MORRIS ABRAM

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1975, at the 69th annual dinner of the American Jewish Committee in New York, N.Y., a distinguished Atlantan, Morris Abram, was awarded the American Liberties Medallion.

Another distinguished Atlantan, Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, spoke in tribute to Mr. Abram for his outstanding career in the law, higher education, and Government service.

Mr. Abram, in his speech accepting the award, gave a message of hope and confidence in the future of America.

I commend to the House the addresses by Mr. Jordan and Mr. Abram:

REMARKS BY VERNON E. JORDAN, JR.

In the letter inviting me to join in paying tribute to my dear, good friend, Morris Abram, it was suggested that I say whatever I pleased about him.

And so, in the spirit of that invitation, I would like to make a revelation about Morris tonight.

And that is, during the many times in which Morris and I have met in fierce combat on the tennis courts, I have never yet been able to beat him.

This lays to rest the myth of black superiority in athletics.

The courtroom, as opposed to the tennis court, is another matter. Morris is justly renowned as one of America's great lawyers. Speaking as a lawyer myself, sheer technical expertise in the law is, however admirable in itself, only part of the story. The real test of a lawyer lies in the use to which he puts his skills; the extent to which he champions unpopular causes.

And here, Morris' record speaks for itself. Morris put his skills and his talents into the fight for human rights. I well remember his long, uphill struggle to combat the vicious county-unit rule in Georgia that effectively disenfranchised urban communities and especially blacks. I well remember his participation in civil rights suits at a time when such action was not only unfashionable, but downright dangerous.

Today, Morris continues to use his legal skills and his compassion for the neglected of our society as chairman of the commission investigating the nursing home scandals.

Throughout a distinguished career in private practice, higher education, and government service, Morris has maintained an intimate involvement with two groups in our society—Jews and blacks. He is a former President of the AJC whose many activities on behalf of the Jewish community, including those living in liberty in Israel and in oppression in Russia, is well known to you.

He has also brought his deep commitment and concern for justice to the cause of civil rights and black progress. This is especially evident in his position as Chairman of the United Negro College Fund, where I was privileged to be his executive director some years ago, his service on the board of Morehouse College and his Chairmanship of the Field Foundation.

It seems to me that these two major personal commitments of Morris' should also be basic commitments of our entire nation.

At a time when the state of Israel finds itself the target of international recriminations, unfounded UNESCO actions and costs of terrorism, our nation should stand fast to its commitment to a country that symbolizes the idealism, the hope and the opportunity of democracy in an increasingly undemocratic world. It should be said loud and clear that Israel, unlike Vietnam and Cambodia, is a free, democratic nation whose survival is in our own national interest and whose populace is willing and able and eager to stand up for itself and preserve its freedoms.

This is also a time of national withdrawal from the struggle for freedom at home. Black people find themselves the target of manipulated so-called "social issues," economic Depression and a rollback of many of the gains of the 1960s. It should be said loud and clear, especially on this eve of America's Bi-Centennial, that the promises of the Second Reconstruction must be redeemed, and that equality must remain a prime national goal.

Blacks and Jews alike must recognize, in the words of Whitney Young, that while we may have come over in different ships, we're in the same boat now. And the re-emergence of a recycled, George Wallace, makes intergroup cooperation more urgent than ever. If the parameters of American politics are set by the likes of a Wallace, both blacks and Jews will feel the hot breath of repression and hardship.

That is why I believe Morris' prime concerns should be those of all of us. He has devoted his career to what's right; to what's good, to what's decent in America.

If I had to sum up Morris' career in a brief phrase, I would say: "He has made a difference in the lives of people." Throughout his life, he has done things that made a difference. His career as a lawyer made a difference to people whose votes were suddenly counted in the state of Georgia. His career as an educator made a difference to countless young men and women not just at Brandeis, but on the forty-one campuses of the member colleges in the United Negro College Fund.

When you think about it, that's quite a tribute—to have made a difference in people's lives. So many people go through distinguished, even brilliant, careers without ever really touching their fellow men. They accumulate wealth, honors, prestige, even power, but when they depart, it is as if they had never existed. Others touch their fellows in a purely negative way, inflicting pain and punishment upon those affected by their decisions or their deeds.

But Morris has had a positive effect upon countless persons, some of them here tonight to join in honoring him; others spread throughout our land, some in high places some in humble ones, some who may not even know his name. But all can trace some betterment of their lives to Morris' actions and to his dedication to the cause of human rights.

Morris—we're just a couple of little Southern boys up here in the North, but this evening wouldn't be complete without a fellow-Atlantan to say a short piece about you. Down home, we talk on a lot longer, but tonight I'll observe the Northern style of brevity.

I just want to add two points of importance. One, I think of no one more deserving of this treasured American Liberties Medallion than Morris Abram, whose life and work perfectly exemplifies American liberty in action.

And, two, I intend to beat Morris Abram

on the tennis court, as the song says, I shall Overcome!

Ten years ago tonight I spoke in this room. My theme was Hope. Two old friends were on the dais: one the grandson of slaves, the other of Confederate veterans. Each had fought publicly for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The friends were Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mayor Ivan Alan, Jr., both of Atlanta.

Now, Martin King Jr. has been dead for almost a decade though his spirit and redemptive message are imperishable. His personal qualities and examples abide with us in the continuing life of his father who does us the honor of coming here tonight from Atlanta.

The ten years which have passed ravaged many hopes but they have also brought forth a new group of leaders in the forefront, one of whom is my friend and my brother in every confidence and dream—Vernon Jordan, Jr.

In such a setting I thought I could discuss a thorny but important question: Black-Jewish relations. I do so in full awareness that there are many views to this question and that my own, as so many of mine on other issues change with times and circumstances.

First, I would note that the subject preoccupies what would seem to be an inordinate amount of thought, time and discussion in a nation in which both Blacks and Jews are distinct minorities. In a nation of ethnic groups we seldom think of English-Italian, Irish-German, Chicano-Puerto Rican relations. Nor do we with much frequency or intensity analyze Jewish-Italian, or Jewish-Puerto Rican or Jewish relations with any other ethnic group.

The subject is apparently one of significance to Jews, to Blacks and to the thinking public.

Recently, the New York Times, in a much heralded article, announced that "Blacks and Jews Were Drawing Closer Again," citing supporting comment from Jews and Blacks, including an editorial from the Amsterdam News which was hailed as a harbinger of a spring of understanding and cooperation following a winter of vague discontent.

Black-Jewish relations preoccupy many leaders and thinkers simply because they are important to the social and political health of this country and to its progress towards justice.

Jews and Blacks historically have been vulnerable people. The state of their security can almost be said to serve as barometric measures of the social climate. When the state trespasses on the liberty of the Jew, the freedom of all is soon in peril; when joblessness of the Black (always higher than that of the general public) begins to escalate, you can be sure that the economy is on the slide and even Chrysler will be in trouble.

One reason Jewish-Black relations are important is that both are an urban people. Blacks are only recently so. In 1910, 27.4% of the Black population was urban compared with a corresponding white figure of 48.7%. By 1960, fully 73.2% of the Black population was urban, well ahead of the white percentage which stood at 65.5%. By the 1980s, the Black population will be almost entirely urban, which is substantially true of the Jewish population. The points of interaction and contact between Jew and Black are therefore maximal.

Jews and Blacks have had a conspicuous relationship during a period still fresh in memories of both people when their leaders fought side by side in the civil rights struggle of the 1960s and in some cases even long before. For all these reasons and more, the subject is relevant to all. It certainly is to me.

From the very beginning of my conscious-

ness the subject of Blackness in America and Jewishness in me have been determinative facts of my life. I have had to struggle long and hard and confessedly with only partial success first to understand the paradox of discrimination in what was said to be freedom's home and to overcome racial prejudice in myself while demanding that everyone treat me, a Jew, equally.

Though I make no claim to have been either miraculously exempt from, or immunized against, endemic racism in America, I can assert that my pure self-interest and that of every American, demands that the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican and the impoverished of all groups be brought into the main stream of American opportunity.

This has not proved to be easy, even when the historic sufferers have stood shoulder to shoulder. It will be impossible, if instead of making common cause against the enemies of justice, we engage in common squabbles amongst ourselves.

But as one swallow does not make a spring, one feature story in the New York Times does not paper over differences of views. Where these exist between Jew and Black they should be frankly addressed, the common ground found, occupied and seeded and the divergent views not ploughed under, but respectfully exposed and explored.

I should like to explore briefly as examples three important current issues:

BLACKS AND ISRAEL

Many Jews have been misled into a belief that Black support for Israel is almost nonexistent. First, there is very little evidence that support for the security and independence of Israel as a Jewish state has appreciably diminished overall in the United States in the white or Black communities. Second, there is no question where the Vernon Jordans, Roy Wilkins, A. Phillip Randolphs, Bayard Rustins and the King family stand on this question. Third, there is a circle of Black young and Black intellectuals who spout nonsense about a victimized Third World and would have us believe that these 40 or so nations are being threatened and oppressed by the beleaguered little State of Israel. As a personal note, I heard these absurdities in the late 1960s from the children of middle class whites—some of whom were Jewish. It made no sense when the oil gorged states of the Middle East could be classified amongst the oppressed of the earth and today, when oil is more precious than gold, it is an exercise in Orwellian doublethink. But Black or white young or old, uneducated or intellectual, anyone who is willing to sacrifice democratic Israel to Arab tyrants and oligarchs is not a fighter for freedom or a friend of Jews or Blacks who overwhelmingly desire and treasure freedom.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, QUOTAS, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, LAISSEZ-FAIRE

I have tried by the use of the above catch words to indicate that one of the most controversial and divisive subjects in the Black-Jewish dialogue has come about because the issues have been generally poorly defined, and catch words have been used in place of logic. No one opposes equal opportunity: How can she?

No one really believes that under so-called laissez-faire—a regulation free society—merit always triumphed either at the Harvard Admissions Committee or at the Chase Manhattan Bank. But quota is a chilling word to a Jew and the prospect of hire by quota for all types of jobs at all levels should be frightening to anyone who rides over a bridge built by engineers, up an elevator checked by technicians, submits to anaesthesia or pays money to go to a university.

Nature has not been overly generous—not, at least, since before Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden and ordered to work

and sweat. If mankind is to be fed, sheltered, clothed and its dependents cared for the world needs increasingly all the fully developed skills of all of its people. Let there be no impediment to development or placement on the grounds of race; let there be careful reexamination of all traditions in respect of entrance and qualification to opportunity; let there be affirmative efforts to move the disadvantaged forward, with "disadvantaged" defined without regard to race, color, creed or national origin. For 89 years, from 1865 to 1954, people such as those on this Dais fought to make this nation's economic, social and political eyesight color and religious blind and urged the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution as support for this egalitarian principle. I think that anyone who, on the grounds of expediency, opportunism or frustration, seeks today to justify the classification of Americans on the grounds of race is making a serious strategic mistake which, if successful, may some day haunt us all.

Finally, on this point, I believe that the degree and intensity of affirmative action should depend on the history and pattern of discrimination in the particular profession, industry or institution involved. The remedy should be of a dosage applicable to the *malaise*. On such grounds perhaps the plumb-ers may be properly the subject of more vigorous efforts than the United automobile workers.

Ultimately, an overpopulated hungry and depleted world is going to require the full efforts of all of its people at their highest performance levels—a necessity which meets also the demands of justice.

CRIME IN THE STREETS

No issue provokes more emotions, creates more fears, and evokes more racist feelings than urban violence. This is surely not an issue in which there is any special Black-Jewish relationship except that of proximity in certain communities. The victims of urban crimes of violence tend disproportionately to be Black and the incidence of violent crime is growing faster (but from a lower base line) in the suburbs than in the central city. If violent crime in which the Black man is involved has any confrontational implications, it must, at least on statistics, be perceived primarily as a Black attack on Black. The 1973 FBI Uniform Crime Reports lists Blacks as victims of 52% of the murders in the U.S. and as perpetrators of approximately the same percentage of homicides.

I am not attempting to analyze the root causes of rising crime except to assert that it is not manifest of racial feeling and certainly not of anti-semitism. But I am surely not attempting to minimize the dreadful effects that urban violence has had on race relations in general. Violence, as much as any other factor, has throttled down the engines of racial and economic progress and in some instances thrown them violently into reverse.

The violence of which I speak may well have social and economic roots. But in the words of the Black intellectual, Orlando Patterson: "Gone now are the epic riots which at least had some meaning and reflected a certain hope, even in their flames, since they were at least spontaneous group expression of outrage and clearly recognizable deprivations. The mood of violence has shifted from the collective to the individual level, from the socially understandable to the level of private criminality."

And here I might add that individual criminals who find it convenient or stimulating to band together under an imposing shibboleth or banner do not reverse that process . . . crime is always a non-negotiable demand for society's capitulation.

Now private criminality no doubt has its own causes and explanations, but no society

that wishes to remain such can let the search for a long range cure interfere with the ability of the state to protect the victims from the victimizers. The America we have cherished will not be the same if we have to wait until its social inequities are straightened out before criminal violence is brought within tolerable limits.

In the fight to drive the rate down to these limits, police, courts, jails all have their place, but tonight I would like to suggest another weapon—perhaps as powerful as any and the least used of all—peer and community resistance, and condemnation.

Whatever else private criminality is—and that is what Patterson called it—it is often associated with the private acquisitive instinct whether the person is robbed on a street or in a nursing home. Nursing home operators who steal and are exposed, as they should be, lose caste and status in their communities. Community pressure against them may ultimately be one of the strongest weapons in the arsenal for the reform of the nursing home industry.

I know firsthand that violence on the campus stopped when some faculty and student leaders decided that enough was enough. Though the worst and most disgraceful phase of the United States involvement in the Southeast Asian war occurred during the Christmas bombing of 1972, scarcely a bottle was thrown into a single window in an American university.

University presidents in 1969 could stand up to the student arsonists and murderers, but this did no good as long as some faculties and student leaders could only bring themselves to deplore violence in the context of an expression of a profound and sympathetic understanding of the causes that supposedly provoked it. Violence-prone students got the message loud and clear. The signal was implicit—condonation accompanied by a mild tap on the wrist with a wink of tacit camaraderie. So the violence festered and grew and did not abate until peer moral and common sense pressure changed the mood of the community and then it stopped. And there may be some parallels in this experience with the current wave of urban violence: When a community has had enough; when it wishes to fully cooperate with the police and the courts; when it truly wishes to become its neighbor's keeper; when it speaks through its natural leaders—and this must include its elected officials—and says it has had enough, the rate may well taper off.

I am not asking—no fair man could—that community leaders relent one whit in their attacks on poverty, ignorance, disease and racism, but let none ever couple these in discussing private criminality so that the signal of indignation is confused by overtones of condonation. . . . Let us never again offer a sociological flag as refuge for the scoundrel.

The problems of the mid-1970s are not those of the mid-1960s. I am not optimistic about the same things in the 1970s as I was a decade ago. The problems are different, the mood is changed, the evils to be overcome are even more complex and intractable. Yet I still am optimistic and hopeful. If one values a society, as I do ours, despair is a closed option no matter how difficult our problems may be or how seductive are the Siren songs of cynicism. Rather, one must work to improve and change. An America which faced the cataclysmic fall from opulence, optimism and innocence in the '30, then experienced a dreadful generation of war, and then overcame the legalized racism of 300 years and has just accepted defeat in an unjust war with a sigh of national relief, surely has the energy and maturity to solve its present quotient of problems.

BASIC QUESTIONS IN OIL PRICING LEGISLATION

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, members of the Energy and Power Subcommittee under the able direction of Chairman JOHN DINGELL have been studying the issue of oil pricing in great detail for several months. I would like to share with other Members of the House what I feel are the eight critical questions which surround the issue of oil prices. These eight questions formed the basis of my inquiry into the subject; determining the best response in each area will, I believe, make clear to Members the course we should follow with respect to the price of oil. I should like now to pose these questions and discuss each briefly:

BASIC QUESTIONS IN OIL PRICING LEGISLATION

1. *Maximum Production:* What price and tax incentives are required to maximize domestic petroleum production?
2. *World Price and Foreign Supply:* What pricing and tax policy is most likely to achieve the greatest overall success in lowering world petroleum prices?
3. *Conservation:* What pricing and tax policy is likely to produce needed conservation with minimum amounts of economic disruption?
4. *Consumer Protection:* What pricing and tax strategy can achieve 1, 2, and 3 above, without imposing intolerable burdens on consumers?
5. *Employment:* What pricing and tax strategy can achieve its goals while maximizing opportunities for domestic employment and stable economic growth?
6. *Administrative Efficiency and Simplicity:* What pricing and tax policy offers the prospect of maximum production, conservation, consumer protection and economic stability with the least amount of administrative cost of complexity and economic dislocation?
7. *Political Viability:* Given the urgency of putting into effect a national energy policy, what pricing and tax strategy holds the greatest promise of winning the early approval of the Congress and the Executive, and the support of the consuming and producing public?
8. *Oil Company Profits and Industry Structure:* What regulatory and tax strategy will serve to maximize industry competition and minimize opportunities for market manipulation by the industry?

MAXIMUM PRODUCTION

U.S. production of petroleum has been declining rapidly in recent years. There is general agreement that virtually all of the cheap and readily accessible oil and gas has already been found. While the exact extent of price elasticity with respect to energy supply remains a subject of debate, there is nearly universal agreement on three points:

First. Currently, domestic production is declining and will continue to do so in the immediate future. However, substantial increases in supplies from new exploration and from enhanced recovery might well be brought on by higher prices. For example, both private and public estimates suggest some 50 to 60

billion barrels of additional oil may be derived from more expensive tertiary recovery techniques alone. Exactly what price levels will bring on each of these sources remains in doubt. However, experts at both the Brookings Institution and FEA, for example, suggest that by 1985 a \$12.50 as opposed to a \$8 domestic price would result in some 4 million additional barrels of domestic production daily.

Second. If choices are to be made between expensive foreign oil and equally expensive domestic oil, then there is greater economic benefit to be derived from the employment and investment associated with the domestic oil production. This is especially true if one's goal is to avoid dependence on foreign oil beyond certain levels.

Third. Even in the face of artificial prices generated by the OPEC cartel, the price mechanism and market forces will produce a more efficient allocation of resources than will a regulatory mechanism; governmental policy goals in this area are best administered through the tax system. It should be understood that, on this question, price controls are a second-best alternative.

WORLD PRICE AND FOREIGN SUPPLY

Two basic schools of thought exist regarding how to influence the world oil price. One school contends that the current world price is essentially a "political" price administered by the OPEC cartel and relatively immune to economic forces. The other contends that the world price for oil is a product of both economic and political forces. For those holding the latter view, a further disagreement exists with respect to whether greater influence can be achieved through a determination to hold domestic prices down or through a policy of allowing them to rise.

If the world price is subject to economic influences, and if higher domestic prices can cause greater production and conservation in the United States, the combined effect should be a downward pressure on world oil prices due to reduced demand for foreign oil.

If, on the other hand, the world price is now more subject to "political" than economic influences, the case can be made that adoption of a strategy of higher domestic prices linked with the mandatory conservation measures now likely to be enacted would constitute a strong signal to other oil-producing nations that we have the political will and strength to impose sacrifices on ourselves and resist the pressure to pay higher prices on larger and larger amounts of foreign oil. Moving to a strategy of higher domestic oil prices will make clear that unless world prices drop, the global surplus will grow and revenues of OPEC and other producers will decline.

CONSERVATION

Whether or not the price mechanism can or should be used as a conservation device is a matter of considerable debate. Yet most economists are in agreement that permitting the price of domestic petroleum products to reach the world price level would produce some domestic

energy saving, especially within the industrial sector where a number of industries have already shown a marked capacity to respond to higher prices by increasing efficiency. For 1985, for example, FEA analysis projects a difference in consumption level on the order of millions of barrels per day, depending on whether prices are at \$7 or \$11 per barrel.

The principle that price can and should be used as a conservation device has already received endorsement by the Ways and Means Committee with its gasoline tax. The potential for conservation achieved through price strategies is demonstrated not only by the experience of other countries—especially in Europe—but also by the dramatic response of American consumers to the lower operating costs of foreign automobiles.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

One of the most difficult aspects of the debate over price policy for oil is the seeming dilemma that the cost of more expensive energy typically is most heavily borne by the lower-income individuals and the marginal institutions least able to pay. Conservation brought on by higher prices will, in the absence of offsetting measures, impact disproportionately on low-income consumers. Their discretionary spending on energy is relatively small; but energy as a necessity takes a far greater part of their disposable income.

Since most measures now under consideration contemplate some increase in energy costs, the issue seems to be how best to offset these costs for unprotected and highly vulnerable consumers. Proposals calling for controlled prices at higher levels fail to make any provision for the consumer; this is especially true where such higher prices are permitted for larger and larger amounts of previously controlled oil. While it is nearly impossible—and perhaps undesirable—to completely offset higher prices for low-income consumers, a well-designed tax and rebate system could serve as a major balancing factor.

EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC IMPACT

A price strategy should include among its goals the avoidance of unemployment and economic dislocation, reduced migration of investment capital, and the elimination of excessive payments for imports. Alternatives now under consideration differ significantly in their potential impact in each of these areas. Phased decontrol and/or higher taxes promise not only to stimulate new jobs in exploration and production, but also would reduce import-related losses of capital and redirect consumer spending into less import-dominated sectors of the economy. Estimates are that as many as 250,000 additional domestic jobs which would result from higher domestic energy production and redirected consumption.

To a limited degree these goals might also be realized under a system of regulated prices. Yet in each case there would be a requirement for additional regulation and administrative mechanisms to control the movement of capital. The differences in the effect of price strategies on employment and economic dislocation relate directly to the issue of administrative efficiency discussed below.

ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

Marked differences in administrative efficiency and complexity exist between a system of price controls and a system of taxes administered on market sales. The current two-tiered system for oil prices and the attendant system of refining entitlements would become more complex and less efficient under the more elaborate system of controlled prices now proposed by some. While these proposals represent an improvement over the status quo because of their stimulus to new production and conservation, these gains are significantly undermined by a yet more dense set of price tiers and attendant requirements for offset agreements. The Wall Street Journal recently set these costs at a level near \$10 billion for the current, more simple system. While no one should believe that a windfall profits tax on oil revenues would itself be a simple thing, such a tax would permit the elimination of a substantial set of administrative procedures now required by the FEA. Under price controls the cost of these administrative procedures and inefficiencies must be added to the costs which consumers ultimately pay. Under a system of market prices, taxes, and rebates, the existing IRS bureaucracy assumes the responsibility.

POLITICAL VIABILITY

Widespread agreement exists on the need for a rapid establishment of a comprehensive energy policy. Guidelines with respect to oil and gas prices lie at the core of such a comprehensive policy. Delay in resolving the pricing issue occasions delay in every other facet of energy planning.

In choosing between pricing strategies, therefore, every consideration should be given to selection of a price strategy which can win support in both Houses of Congress and within the executive branch. It is abundantly clear that any policy calling for an open-ended continuation of oil price controls and allocation will encounter stiff resistance from many quarters of Capitol Hill, and in all likelihood will encounter at least an initial veto at the White House. Such a delay would be justified to avoid the flat-out deregulation advocated by the President, but phased deregulation linked to a strong windfall profits tax represents an alternative pricing strategy which omits the drawbacks of the President's plan and which could command the early support of both the Congress and the Executive.

OIL COMPANY PROFITS AND INDUSTRY STRUCTURE

Closely related to the questions of administrative efficiency and consumer protection is the question of what levels of profit are appropriate for the domestic petroleum industry and the question of what relationship exists between industry structure and energy prices. Monopoly pricing by vertically and horizontally integrating companies constitutes a potential for inefficiency, market interference, and withheld supply which is at least as serious as the inefficiencies and market interference brought on by Government regulation or cartel pricing by the OPEC nations.

How best to respond to these threats

through either antitrust action, altered tax policies, or Government oversight actions constitutes a central part of an overall national energy policy. What remains is that the industry cannot be depended upon to police itself with regard to either monopoly pricing or hoarding of supplies.

COMMUNIST TACTICS AND THE DOMINO THEORY IN LAOS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Southeast Asia, if they have done nothing else, should have put to rest two very popular but totally specious myths of recent years.

The first is that coalition governments in which Communists take part can endure. The sad reports from Laos give the lie to that argument anew, although it must be said that almost 60 years of empirical evidence should have disposed of it long ago. Ever since the ill-fated Mr. Kerensky attempted to form a coalition government in St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1917, the record clearly shows that not one such coalition has survived for very long.

This historical record has grave implications for us today, not only in Asia, but in such places as Portugal as well, and those who concern themselves with American foreign policy would do well to bear it in mind.

The second myth is that the domino theory was foolish and invalid. Indeed, we now see that it was both wise and operative. The domino theory said that if one of the nations of Indochina fell, the others would not be far behind.

Indeed, they were not; only days separated the tragedies of Phnom Penh, Saigon, and Vientiane. Are there more dominoes in the line? There is no reason to think not, and indeed, the Thais, a sagacious people who have preserved their independence when their neighbors have not, are girding and posturing for just such an eventuality.

In an editorial yesterday, the Chicago Tribune recounted the recent history of Laos, and its implications for us today. For the edification of my colleagues, I ask that that editorial be printed here in the RECORD:

FOURTEEN YEARS IN LAOS

The 14-year-old coalition government of Laos has gone the way of every coalition government in which the Communists have taken part: It has become a Communist government.

The chief remaining anti-Communist cabinet members have resigned and fled to Thailand; the capital city of Vientiane is occupied by the Communist Pathet Lao troops; and the neutralist premier, Prince Souvanna Phouma, has warned his people that it is necessary to look at the facts and "reach an accord with history."

It was on March 23, 1961, that the late President Kennedy announced his determination to "support the goal of a neutralist and independent Laos" and warned that "if the

Communists were able to move in and dominate this country, it would endanger the security and the peace of all of Southeast Asia."

Later that year the three rival princes—right-wing, Communist, and neutralist—agreed on a neutralist government and on Souvanna Phouma as premier. Averell Harriman, American delegate to the Geneva convention at which the agreement was reached, insisted that this would not mean the loss of Laos to Communism.

Despite another coalition agreement in 1973, the inevitable has happened—theo the sequence mentioned by Mr. Kennedy has been reversed. Instead of precipitating the fall of Viet Nam and Cambodia, the peaceful fall of Laos was precipitated by the military collapse of the other two.

But in fact the formalities in Laos merely recognize the fact that the Communists have controlled the countryside for years. One of Souvanna Phouma's former aides is head of the Pathet Lao army, and his half-brother is political leader of the Communists. The coalition government in Laos survived for 14 years only because, for nearly half of that time, it has been little more than a paper government.

So now we go back to President Kennedy's script, and the next domino in line is Thailand. The Thais have seen what happened in South Viet Nam and in Cambodia, and are hastening to deal with the Reds thru negotiation rather than thru the threat of force.

It's true that the collapse of Cambodia and South Viet Nam was dramatic and costly in every way; but the collapse of Laos is likely to prove just as final. And the Thais will find little comfort in noting that in the same 14 years it took for the Communists to win control of Laos, they have virtually won American acceptance of their conquest of another country half way around the world. . . .

WE CANNOT TOLERATE THE SEIZURE OF OUR SHIPS

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States must not tolerate the seizure of our ships on the high seas. If we dawdle, we will signal our adversaries that we are indeed helpless. While efforts to recover the *Mayaguez* by diplomacy are an appropriate first level of response, if this fails in short order we must move directly to its aid.

I would propose that due notice be given the Cambodian pirates as follows. Tell them that within 72 hours we will expect the *Mayaguez* to be returned with the crew unharmed and cargo intact. Thereafter, our forces will proceed to secure control of the vessel and tow it away.

We shall clearly inform them so that there be no misunderstanding: If they scuttle our freighter, we will be compelled to retaliate by sealing off all their harbors; if they kill or injure any of the crew of the *Mayaguez*, we will be compelled to retaliate in kind by bombing their military bases. They must understand that further rash actions will have severe consequences.

If we fail to deal firmly, we will have to expect repetitions of such foolishness

in the future. It is the spineless foreign policy stance of the liberal majority in Congress that has tempted this outrage in the first place.

HEAD START MARKS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate National Head Start Day, commemorating the 10th anniversary of this very successful program to aid young children from poor families.

This effort to give the underprivileged special health care and educational opportunities prior to their formal entrance in the first grade has served more than 5 million children during the last decade. It was an integral part of President Johnson's war on poverty, and this is one "war" which I believe that the great majority of Americans feel we must pursue to a successful conclusion.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to those who have worked long and hard to make this venture a success, especially those more than 100,000 volunteers—many of them parents—who are now active.

The Hays County Citizen has done a retrospective article on the Head Start program in the county. I would like to insert this for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY—LOCAL CENTERS WILL OBSERVE NATIONAL HEAD START DAY

(By Melissa Millicam)

Two Hays County Head Start Centers will celebrate the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the program as National Head Start Day is observed May 14 across the country.

One of president Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty" programs, the Kyle Day Care Center and the Henry Bush Child Development Center in San Marcos have given hundreds of local children a better chance to make it in school. Their first "graduates" are now teenagers in junior high school.

Much has changed over the years as the program became more refined, but not the dedication and hard work of staff and the community in making both programs successful.

The Head Start programs are now funded by the Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and administered by the Community Action. Head Start Director John Roberts also guides similar centers in Lockhart and Blanco.

SHRIVER VISITS KYLE PROGRAM

One of the first centers to open was the Kyle Day Care Center in June, 1965, the year that Head Start was established under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The public schools operated the eight-week summer program in which 51 youngsters participated, under the direction of Ernest Kimbro. The short summer session was aimed at giving children from low income families a start before they entered public school and in the first few years had general goals of developing children's curiosity, self-image, self-discipline and helping Spanish-speaking youngsters grasp the English language.

Other early directors were Jim Matlock and Mrs. Riso Milhollon.

In 1966 the program was spotlighted with a visit from Sargent Shriver, then national OEO director, and a delegation of OEO officials, including San Marcan Bill Crook, then the regional OEO director.

During the fact-finding visit, Shriver interviewed teachers, parents and children alike to learn how the program was progressing.

The Head Start program operated at the Kyle Elementary School at first and later was moved to a building at St. Anthony's Catholic Church.

In 1969 Dora Rodriguez, the present director, joined the program as a teacher aide, after her son enrolled in Head Start. She later became a teacher and finally director of the center.

Also that year the program was expanded from a summer program taking in a large number of children to a year-around full-day center working with a smaller number but on a more intensive basis. The director that year was Mary Cariker, followed in 1970 by Betty Sue Crain, and finally in 1973 by Ms. Rodriguez.

"The goals now are aimed at developing the whole child—physically, emotionally, socially and intellectually." Ms. Rodriguez noted. Entering at age 3, a child may spend two years in the program before going on to kindergarten.

Both centers use "behavior modification"—emphasizing the positive instead of the negative—in highly individualized teaching of prereading, math and handwriting, as well as in organized play, developing individuality and social activities.

Since 1969 the Kyle Day Care Center has served 105 children and 65 low income families with 20 children enrolled this year.

The program is a community-based project with help coming from many quarters. Among those are the Catholic church, providing the building without charge; volunteers from the Baptist Church, who work with parents and help with eye glasses and examinations; special services provided by the schools for handicapped children; the county commissioners for giving sand and gravel; the Kyle City Council, which helped dig a new gas line; Tenorios Grocery, for providing supplies; the school pre-employment program which provides high school students as aides; the San Marcos health clinic; CETA, which provides three workers; Southwest Texas State University, for help in speech therapy; and parents, who add many volunteer hours to the program.

Other workers at the center are Oralla Sandoval, teacher, Ida Lois Drensen, cook, Antonio Aguirre, janitor and Gloria Mosqueda, driver.

SM CENTER SERVES OVER 400 CHILDREN

The Henry Bush Child Development Center opened in 1966 as a full-day program, initially called the Mary Street Day Care Center. The program got off the ground as the result of a survey conducted by the Community Action Agency, then directed by Margaret Herrera.

When the survey showed a need for a place to care for young children while their mothers worked, a committee of interested citizens was formed. Included in that first committee were Mrs. Bob Cooper, Mrs. Joe Rodriguez, Mrs. Frank Villanueva, Minnie Flores, Catherine Hardeman, Elida Mendez, Mrs. James Smith and Henry Bush as chairman.

As the program was organized the Presbyterian church board made available the parsonage rent free where the center has grown ever since.

The Mary Street Day Care Center opened its doors Oct. 3, 1966 with 10 children and four staff members, including Belle Townsend, who has been director since it opened.

Esperanza Hernandez and Olivia Ybarra, both teacher aides, were also on the original staff and have continued there for the nine years it has been open.

Henry Bush was one of the most active supporters of Mary Street Day Care Center, from playing Santa Claus for the children to guiding the center's board. When he died in November, 1969, the center was renamed the Henry Bush Child Development Center in his memory.

Since 1966 close to 400 three and four year olds have been served by the program, which has the same kind of goals as the Kyle Center. Nutritional needs are also met as the children are provided with breakfast, lunch, and an afternoon snack.

Parents are also very active in the program, electing representatives to a policy council which reviews the budget and checks the center's policies.

The program has outgrown its facilities at the parsonage on Mary Street, and the Presbyterian Church has continued its assistance by providing extra room in the church itself. This year 39 children are enrolled in the program. "If it weren't for the church letting us use the building, we would have to cut back to 20 children," Ms. Townsend noted.

Other workers at Henry Bush are Eufrasia Espinoza, teacher aid, and Jane Hernandez, cook.

The Henry Bush parents may plan a "homecoming" of sort for its graduates in observance of National Head Start Day next Wednesday. Otherwise, it will be learning and playing as usual in both programs. Both centers, however, always welcome visitors.

HEW SACRED COW

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past some people have characterized the defense budget as being a sacred cow in our society. The defense budget was supposedly immune to legitimate criticism and to needed spending cuts.

If that ever was the case, it is clear that America has a new sacred cow—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Not only is its budget shrink-proof, HEW is devouring an ever larger proportion of our national budget with every passing year.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, HEW will have spent \$109.9 billion. This is \$301 million a day, 365 days a year. More than a third of our entire national budget will have been consumed by HEW.

And HEW expenditures are growing at a truly alarming rate. If its expenditures grow at the same rate as they did in the past decade, HEW spending will go over the \$500 billion mark by 1985. This would be far in excess of our present total national budget.

The Congress, moreover, seems unwilling to take the actions necessary to bring HEW spending under control. H.R. 6573, the fourth budget rescission bill, is a prime example of what I am talking about.

The administration has proposed rescissions involving four HEW appropriation accounts. These rescissions total

\$238,323,000. The Committee on Appropriations approved \$17,873,000 of this total. That is only 7 percent of the amount requested.

It is time that the Congress made the budget-cutting decisions that our current economic situation demands. HEW spending must be reduced. If we fail to act this sacred cow will devour our Nation.

EDWARD F. (PETE) KENNELL,
CHAIRMAN OF THE ALBANY
HOUSING AUTHORITY AND DEPUTY
DIRECTOR OF THE ALBANY
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day in Albany, N.Y., there departed suddenly and prematurely from our midst one of the city's outstanding public servants, and one of our great leaders in the fight for improved racial understanding and equality. I refer to Edward F. Kennell, known to his friends as "Pete."

Pete Kennell has been the chairman of Albany's Housing Authority and at the same time deputy director of the Albany Urban Renewal Agency. In this dual capacity Mr. Kennell largely has presided over the remarkable transformation that has taken place in Albany in recent years, tearing down dilapidated slums and building in their place hundreds of new, modern housing units for our low-income and disadvantaged families.

Pete Kennell, a graduate of Harvard College, was active in many other civic enterprises in the Albany area. His departure leaves a very large, gaping hole in our community fabric; his unusual energy, his balance, his dedication, and his keen mind have all been assets that we can ill afford to do without today in any city in the fight for better racial understanding, harmony, and progress.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a news article from the Albany Knickerbocker News of April 21, 1975, an editorial from the Albany Times-Union of April 23, 1975, a letter-to-the-editor of the Knickerbocker News of May 2, 1975, and a copy of the program of the community memorial services for Pete Kennell, including a listing of his personal background and accomplishments:

[From the Albany Knickerbocker News, Apr. 21, 1975]

"MAN OF BALANCE" MOURNED; EDWARD KENNELL "MAN WHO KNEW HOW TO DEAL WITH POLITICIANS, PEOPLE AND GET THINGS DONE"

(By Joann Crupi)

"You can hear him all day long talking in that loud voice of his to people on the phone or people who came into his office," one Albany City Hall aide said. "He was busy all day long with people who wanted housing or a job or help getting into school."

He was Edward F. Kennell, chairman of the Albany Housing Authority's (AHA) board of directors and deputy director of the Albany Urban Renewal Agency.

Mr. Kennell, 59, died Friday. Funeral services were to be conducted today at the Wilborn Temple in Albany.

His wake Monday at the Morning Star Missionary Baptist Church in Albany was crowded with friends and local officials.

Outside the church, an Albany policeman directed vehicles and pedestrians along congested Quail and Spring streets. Inside, women with white uniforms and tags marked "usher," led visitors to seats or standing room in the tiny church. At the front of the church lay Mr. Kennell's casket, with an arch of funeral wreaths overhead.

Mourners heard a series of eulogies on Mr. Kennell's generosity, spirit and work in Albany's black community.

Among the speakers were David Riker, director of the Albany Urban Renewal Agency; Joseph Laden, AHA executive director; Joseph Leone, former chief of the Albany Urban Renewal Agency and current director of the New York State Association of Renewal and Housing Officials; Sam Johnson of the Albany Inter-Racial Center; Leonard Weiss of the Albany Interfraternal Council; Lawrence Burwell of the Albany Urban League and the Rev. William Roland of the Albany Interdenominational Ministers Conference.

Burwell spoke earlier Thursday about the impact Mr. Kennell, a native of Boston and graduate of Harvard and Fisk universities, had on Albany.

"Ed Kennell had the greatest impact of any black person in this community I've known since being here for 10 years," Burwell said. "His impact was in housing, health, education, welfare and employment. And that doesn't count the one-to-one relationships he had with people."

Mr. Kennell was "still a social worker at heart," even after he left the job he held for 16 years as director of the Albany Inter-Racial Center to become deputy director of the city urban renewal agency in 1961," Burwell said.

"He had the balance to deal with politicians and people," Burwell added. "He knew how to get things done, how to get through the maze."

Mr. Kennell once said his role within the administration of Mayor Erastus Corning was "race relations." In that role, he had his share of critics.

But that was all muted as Mr. Kennell was mourned.

Survivors include his widow, the former Phyllis Grady; a daughter, Jacqueline; a son, James, all of Altamont; his mother, Mrs. Janice Kennell, and his sister, Donalda Kennell, both of Nashville, Tenn.

[From the Albany Times-Union, Apr. 23, 1975]

MR. KENNELL, PUBLIC SERVANT

The untimely death of Edward F. Kennell last Friday ends the career of one of the most tireless workers for the improvement of Albany.

Mr. Kennell was the first black to be named commissioner of any upstate housing authority. He was appointed in 1947 by Mayor Erastus Corning. He became chairman of the Albany Housing Authority last January. In another role as deputy director of the Albany Urban Renewal Agency, Mr. Kennell also had labored for years for the city's redevelopment programs and housing projects.

His community service did not stop with his official municipal positions, however. Mr. Kennell was 1975 chairman of the United Way campaign of the Albany area, and he had been director of the Albany Inter-Racial Council. In all of his community service he was known for the energy and verve he brought to the tasks before him.

Mr. Kennell will be missed by the city gov-

ernment as well as the entire community. We join in sympathy to family and friends.

[From the Albany Knickerbocker News, May 2, 1975]

EULOGY FOR MR. KENNEL

To the Editor:

People come and go and most times little note is taken of their passing by any other than the immediate family. All too seldom is a community blessed with the presence of an Edward F. Kennell, whose death has created a void which may never be replaced. The City of Albany has lost one of its most dedicated and productive citizens.

This decade has witnessed an era of the disclosure of the lack of understanding and appreciation of human dignity. One of the foremost advocates of the unfortunate and oppressed was Ed Kennell. Known affectionately by his friends as "Pete," he worked selflessly and steadfastly to give aid, succor and understanding to countless numbers of needy people in our city. He was constantly at work raising funds to help with housing, food, education, clothing and all human needs, in a quiet, dignified and gracious manner. His personality was gentle, never seeking the limelight or recognition for himself. He chose to do God's holy work with dignity and grace. He was a gentle man whose purpose was to help others. His labors were of love. It was not possible to refuse a request from Ed Kennell, for he sought not for himself, but always on behalf of others.

Those whose lives were touched by Ed Kennell are better people. Our community is a better place in which to live because he was part of it. May his memory be as a blessing for all of us, and may we best honor him by pledging ourselves to continue his work.

LEONARD A. WEISS.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR EDWARD FRASIER KENNEL

SPECIAL MEMORIAL SERVICES AT THE MORNING STAR MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH, ALBANY, N.Y.

Presiding: Rev. M. S. Hunter.
Organ Prelude.

Special Memorial Services: Beta Pi Lambda Chapter, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity.

Resolutions

City of Albany, New York, Hon. Erastus Corning, 2d, Mayor.

Albany Boy Friends, Louis Johnson, Herbert L. Bryan.

Albany Urban Renewal Agency, David F. Riker, Director.

Albany Housing Authority, Joseph Laden, Exec. Dir.

N. Y. S. A. U. R. O., Joseph Leone.
The Group, Mrs. Geraldine Jefferson.

Inter-Fraternity Council, Leonard Weiss.
Advisory Council, State Division of Human Rights, Mrs. Wardell Robinson.

M. C. Lawton Civic and Cultural Club, Mrs. Lucretia Diggs.

Albany Inter-Racial Council, Samuel Johnson.

Urban League of Greater Albany, Lawrence Burwell.

N. A. A. C. P., Dr. Harry Hamilton.
The Ministers' Alliance, Rev. William Roland.

The Albany Girls' Club, Mrs. Ruth Walsh, Dr. Sybil Hoyle.

The United Fund, Mrs. Ersa Poston.
The Harvard Club, Richard Goodman.

Musical Selection, Julian Parrish.
Benediction.

MEMORIAL SERVICES AT THE WILBORN TEMPLE, FIRST CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST, ALBANY, N.Y.

Presiding: Rev. M. S. Hunter, Pastor, Morning Star Missionary, Baptist Church.

Organ Prelude.
Processional.
Invocation.
Scripture Lesson: 4th Chapter, Gospel of St. James.
Musical Selection: The Choirs.
Obituary: J. W. Jennings.
Solo: "Just A Closer Walk With Thee," Artis Kitchen.
Eulogy: Rev. M. S. Hunter.
Benediction.
Recessional.
Interment: Graceland Cemetery, Albany, New York.

Bearers

Active: Bernard Bryan, Herbert Bryan, William Hoyt, Clifford Johnson, Louis Johnson, Jesse McElevane, Junius Reese, Walter Yarbrough.

Honorary: John Brown, Alan Bush, John E. Haith, David Harris, Joseph Laden, Joseph Leone, Homer Perkins, David Riker, Kenneth Vaughn.

Music under the direction of Mrs. De-matress Taylor.

EDWARD FRASIER KENNEL

Born: October 24, 1915, Boston, Massachusetts.

Relatives: Edward Kennell, father, Mary Jane Kennell, mother, Harriet Kennell, step-mother, Donald K. Ryan, sister, Cecil M. Ryan, brother-in-law, Cecil J. Ryan, nephew.

Graduate: Boston Latin School, Fisk University, Harvard University.

Family: Married June 6, 1943 in Schenectady, New York to Phyllis Grady Kennell, Jacqueline Kennell, daughter, James Kennell, son.

Occupation: Chairman, Albany Housing Authority, Dep. Dir., Albany Urban Renewal Agency. Former Executive Director, Albany Inter-Racial Council.

Affiliations: Morning Star Missionary Baptist Church, Albany Boy Friends, Beta Pi Lambda Chapter, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, N.Y.S. Ass'n of Urban Renewal Officials, The Group, Inter-Fraternity Council, Citizens Advisory Council, State Division of Human Rights, Urban League of Greater Albany Area, N.A.A.C.P., The Albany Girls' Club, The United Fund, The Harvard Club, The Albany Area Chamber of Commerce.

Died: Friday, April 18, 1975, in Guilderland, New York.

SHARED EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES, INC.

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in light of the intense interest that our Nation has placed on career education; and in light of the problems facing young people in obtaining the necessary skills to adapt to today's changing society, I would like to call attention to a career education program which was initiated and fostered by the Western Electric Co. in Boston.

This program called Shared Experience encourages learning through a personal one-to-one association between a student and professional sponsor in a career area of a student's choice. A program coordinator interviews the students to determine their fields of interest and then attempts to match them with ap-

propriate sponsors from the business and professional worlds.

Since its inception—September 1971—4 years ago, the Western Electric Co. has provided the staff, facilities, and resources in matching approximately 500 students from 11 colleges and universities in the greater Boston area. Based on extensive feedback from students, sponsors, and college administrators across the country, the Shared Experience concept has been incorporated into Shared Educational Experiences, Inc. in order to expand this cooperative education venture nationwide. It is hoped that SEE, Inc. will become a national model of an effective career education program, and that the efforts of the Western Electric Co. will be an example to other corporations in recognizing their role in the area of career education.

THE DELUSION OF DÉTENTE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fall of South Vietnam, at almost the same time that the Communists were gaining victory in Cambodia, followed quickly by the purging of non-Communist elements in the government of Laos, provides some crow to eat for those who scoffed at the so-called Domino Theory. But these events also have called into question our entire foreign policy, based as it is on the illusion of détente with the Communists.

We are familiar with the effects of the Communist victory in Southern Asia. The governments of Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, are publicly "reassessing" their foreign policies, presumably pondering whether they should follow the lead of Laos, and become prospective dominoes before they are pushed.

On the other side of the world there is an ironic situation in Portugal. Commander Jesuino, Portuguese Minister of Information, is in the United States seeking "understanding." Secretary Kissinger is reportedly miffed, both at Jesuino, and at U.S. Ambassador Frank Carlucci, for advocating some understanding of this government. Secretary Kissinger disapproves of Portugal for allowing too many Communists in their government. How can he possibly be surprised, either at Portugal or Carlucci, when he has been relentlessly promoting détente for as long as he has had any influence in the government? Why is it acceptable for Secretary Kissinger to seek "understanding" and mutual agreements with the brutal masters of the Kremlin, but not acceptable to seek understanding of a government which has not yet turned completely to communism?

The San Diego Union of May 3 has printed an excellent editorial calling for a reappraisal of détente from yet another perspective—the disastrous effect which détente has had on NATO and the

Atlantic Alliance. The editorial concludes, pointedly:

Détente, it is plain, has helped our enemies and has done us no good whatever. Furthermore, it has shaken the confidence of our allies. Now, in the wake of Vietnam, we would be well advised to ask ourselves if it is not, in the long run, better to have a meaningful détente with our friends than a worthless détente with our enemies.

I endorse those thoughts, and commend this editorial to my colleagues.

THE "DELUSION" OF DÉTENTE

As we raise our eyes from the embers of Vietnam and look in other directions we must concur with the wag who said, "The whole world is a rat race and the rats are ahead."

A case in point is NATO, the grand alliance that has held Soviet imperialism at bay for 25 years. Now, NATO is in trouble, partly because of the dynamism of Soviet diplomacy and the size of the Soviet's military buildup, and partly because of misplaced American priorities as to the relative importance of the thing we call "détente."

The Soviet power has grown with almost dramatic speed. The Russians are spending more on military defense by far than the United States, and their progress is almost terrifying. They have developed a massive and modern fleet, and are procuring the bases necessary to make it a worldwide strategic force.

The NATO European command is now faced with a formidable force of 26,000 Warsaw Pact tanks, an array of tactical nuclear weapons and armies at least twice the size of the NATO forces.

NATO, itself, is in tragic disarray. Great Britain is impoverished, suffering brutally at the hands of a leftist government that is disinterested in defense. Portugal is turning slowly leftward, as is Italy. Greece and Turkey, former stalwart anchors of the NATO flank on the Mediterranean, are totally disenchanted. Turkey can no longer be regarded as a United States base in that area and Greece, suffering brutal internal political and economic problems, is about to leave NATO completely.

It is against this backdrop that the United States should hasten to reexamine its attitude on détente.

If our interest in mollifying the Soviet Union through détente suggests a corresponding disinterest in our relations with NATO, the alliance could very well collapse, with the NATO nations trying, one way or another, to accommodate with the Soviet Union.

It is time for the leadership of our country to see détente as an abstraction, simply a theatrical camouflage on the Soviet Union's part, for pursuing its political war.

Stripping off the camouflage, we see that détente did not keep the Soviets from arming the North Vietnamese in violation of the Paris Peace accord. It did not cause the Soviets to work for peace during the October, 1973, Middle East war. It has resulted in the two Strategic Arms Limitation meetings, SALT I and SALT II, which actually limited nothing and, since the Soviet Union is ready and willing to spend far more on arms than is needed for defense, it has moved her clearly into the position of No. 1 in the nuclear world. In that world, it might be observed, being No. 2 is not better than being No. 20.

Détente, it is plain, has helped our enemies and has done us no good whatever. Furthermore, it has shaken the confidence of our allies. Now, in the wake of Vietnam, we would be well advised to ask ourselves if it is not, in the long run, better to have a meaningful détente with our friends than a worthless détente with our enemies.

CALL FOR REOPENING OF INVESTIGATION OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN KENNEDY

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was visited by several students from the University of Maryland who represented many of their peers who are concerned about the Warren Commission and the investigation into the Kennedy assassination. Members of the Organization of Students To Investigate the Investigation of the Kennedy Assassination, Mr. Floyd Lamore, Mr. Michael Diamond, Ms. Terri Weifenbach, Mr. David O'Neill, Ms. Maryann Hainley, Mr. Daniel Kinder, and Ms. Christina Mazzanti presented me with a petition from the University of Maryland containing 1,175 signatures in support of resolutions before this House calling for the reopening of the investigation of the assassination of John Kennedy.

These students are sincerely concerned that the FBI, the organization investigating the assassination, had a "predilected opinion of the outcome of their investigation." The students believe that the Warren Commission decided to withhold and suppress evidence contrary to the predilected opinion of the FBI. It is the coverup aspects of the assassination investigation that are of the greatest concern to these students, and I share this concern.

In support of their belief that some coverup existed in the investigation, the students presented me with a copy of the transcript of the executive session of the Warren Commission of January 22, 1964. I would like to include for the RECORD this portion of the transcript, along with the accompanying petition from the Organization of Students to Investigate the Investigation of the Kennedy Assassination.

Mr. Speaker, these students are taking their summer to work on a petition survey of Prince Georges County, Montgomery County and the counties comprising the district of our distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL SARBANES, in an effort to further determine the beliefs and concerns that exist on this subject. They are also planning a symposium to be held on the University of Maryland campus, tentatively scheduled during the second week of June. This symposium will be made up of experts in the field as well as concerned citizens and Members of Congress.

Mr. Lamore and his fellow students have emphasized again and again that it is the coverup aspects of the assassination investigation that are of major concern to them. If the FBI, the CIA and the Secret Service are not doing their job, and if, in the process, they covered up their mistakes, the American people should know about it.

Mr. Speaker, I support these and other efforts to answer the many puzzling questions that have arisen around the

investigation of the Kennedy assassination, and I applaud the efforts of the Organization of Students to Investigate the Investigation of the Kennedy Assassination.

The January 22, 1964, transcript of the Warren Commission executive session and the petition of the organization follow:

To: The Honorable Gladys Noon Spellman, Congresswoman, 5th District, Maryland

We the undersigned, do hereby Petition the Honorable Gladys Noon Spellman, Congresswoman from the fifth district of Maryland, to support in particular, House Resolution No. 204 and in general, a full and open investigation by either body of Congress on the Kennedy Assassination. The essence of House Resolution No. 204 is to reopen the investigation of the assassinations of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy. Its sponsor is Representative Gonzalez of Texas.

We think the Warren Commission was inaccurate, dishonest and incomplete in their investigation, findings and their conclusion that there was no conspiracy and that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in assassinating President Kennedy. We question the "lone assassin" theory in light of previously suppressed and/or ignored evidence; evidence which plainly suggests more than one gunman and thus a conspiracy.

House Resolution No. 204 is in rules committee at this time and we would appreciate your efforts to support this resolution and follow its progress through till a vote before the House.

As your constituents, we most humbly appreciate your attention on this petition and being familiar with your record of involvement, feel that you will take an active position of approval of the resolution.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1975.

Mr. HAROLD WEISBERG,
Route 8,
Frederick, Md.

DEAR MR. WEISBERG: Some years ago you requested a copy of a transcript of the executive session of the Warren Commission of January 22, 1964. At that time, as we informed you, there was no transcript of that session. A transcript of the reporter's notes for that session has been prepared and is now available for research. Enclosed is a copy of the transcript.

Sincerely,

MISS JANE F. SMITH,
Director, Civil Archives Division.

TRANSCRIPT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY OF JANUARY 22, 1964

Gentlemen, I called this meeting of the Commission because of something that developed today that I thought every member of the Commission should have knowledge of, something that you shouldn't hear from the public before you had an opportunity to think about it. I will just have Mr. Rawkin tell you the story from the beginning.

Mr. RAWKIN. Mr. Wagner Carr, the Attorney General of Texas, called me at 11:10 this morning and said that the word had come out, he wanted to get it to me at the first moment, that Oswald was acting as an FBI Undercover Agent, and that they had the information of his badge which was given as Number 179, and that he was being paid two hundred a month from September of 1962 up through the time of the assassination. I asked what the source of this was, and he said that he understood the information had been made available so that Defense

Counsel for Ruby had that information, that he knew that the press had the information, and he didn't know exactly where Wade had gotten the information, but he was a former FBI Agent.

That they, that is, Wade before, had said that he had sufficient so that he was willing to make the statement.

FORD. Wade is?

A. The District Attorney.

FORD. Carr is the Attorney General.

BOGGS. Right, of Texas.

RAWKIN. I bought that to the attention of the Chief Justice immediately, and he said that I should try to get in touch with Carr and ask him to bring Wade up here, and he would be willing to meet with him any time today or tonight to find out what was the basis of this story. I tried to get Carr and he was out campaigning in Texarkana and so forth, and so it took us quite a while to get back to him and talk to him. I just got through talking to him and he told me the source of the information was a member of the press who had claimed he knew of such an agent, that he was an undercover agent, but he now is coming with the information as to his particular number and the amount he was getting and the detail as to the time when the payments started. Wade said he as well as him did not know the name of the informant but he could guess who it was, that it was given to his assistant, and he was sure that he knew, and he said he was trying to check it out to get more definite information. Carr said that he could bring Wade in some time the first of the week, but in light of the fact that it was this man of the press and that they did not think it would be broken by the press immediately, although there had been all kinds of stories down there but Carr said there were some 25 to 40 different stories about this being the case admonishing the press themselves, but this was the first time that he got something definite as to how they were handling it or how it could be handled by himself. But I was concerned of an undercover agent. He thought that the press would not bring the story without some further proof, and they are working on that now, he said. So he thought that if he brought Wade back on Monday or Tuesday, that that would still take care of any major problem. When he first told us, he said the press had it and he was fearful because he hadn't even gotten this from Wade. He got it from another man that the press would bring it before we could know about it and the Commission would be asked all kinds of questions without having information about it. Now he said Wade told him that the FBI never keeps any records of names.

Mr. Boggs. Wade is the District Attorney for Dallas County?

RAWKIN. Right.

Q. And the other man, Carr, is the Attorney General?

A. That is right.

Q. And the other people who have knowledge of this story?

A. He indicated that the press down there had knowledge of this story, and that the information came from some informant who was a press representative, and he, that is, Wade, could guess who it was but his assistant knew and he never asked him. They were trying to get more explicit information.

A. Lee, would you tell them?

Mr. DULLES. Who were you talking with when you got this information, Wade himself?

A. I was talking with Carr.

BOGGS. There is a denial of this in one of these FBI records, as you know.

A. Yes.

COOPER. In this file we had yesterday, one of the lawyers for this fellow who claims to represent—

Boggs. Thornhill, I think.

COOPER. Oswald or one of them, Ruby, told about this, do you recall it, he said it was being rumored around.

RAWKIN. Yes, it was being rumored that he was an undercover agent. Now it is something that would be very difficult to prove out. There are events in connection with this that are curious, in that they might make it possible to check some of it out in time. I assume that the FBI records would never show it, and if it is true, and of course we don't know, but we thought you should have the information.

A. Lee, would you tell the gentlemen the circumstances under which this story was told?

A. Yes, when it was first brought to my attention this morning—

BOGGS. What time was this, Lee?

A. 11. 10.

BOGGS. That is after the Ruby episode of yesterday?

A. That is right.

Q. Yes.

A. And Mr. Carr said that they had used this saying before the Court that they thought they knew why the FBI was so willing to give some of these records to the Defense Counsel, and they were * * * to the Defense Counsel being able to get the records and asking the Court to rule that they couldn't get them.

Q. That is, the District Attorney was?

A. That is right, and he said a number of these records were furnished by the Texas authorities, and that they should not be given up to the Defense Counsel, and that the reason he thought that they were so eager to help Ruby was because they had the undercover, that Oswald was the undercover agent and had the number of his badge and so forth, he was getting two hundred a month and so forth, and that was the way it was explained as his justification to the Court as a basis for determining the records and that that was the excuse the FBI, the reason the FBI had for being so eager to give the records up. That is the way it was developed. Now Mr. Jaworski, who is associated with the Attorney General working on this matter was reported to you before, and, * * * Story, I don't talk to Story about it but I did talk to Jaworski and he said he didn't think Wade would say anything like this unless he had some substantial information back of it, and thought he could prove it, because he thought it would ruin many in politics, in Texas, to be making such a claim, and then have it shown that there was nothing to it.

A. And Jaworski is an able lawyer, mature and very competent. We have complete confidence in him as a person. Now that is the evaluation of the situation.

FORD. No. He hasn't made any investigations himself?

A. No, he has not.

FORD. Has Wade or anyone connected with Wade?

A. No.

DULLES. Talking about Story, just a few minutes ago just telling him I wasn't going to be down in Texas, I had told him I was going to be down at the time, he didn't indicate that he had anything of any importance on his mind. Maybe he won't offer it to him obviously.

RAWKIN. I don't know that it was even brought to his attention.

DULLES. I don't believe it was, now. Of course, he is not in the hierarchy.

A. Well, I think they were planning on telling the Attorney General and Jaworski.

FORD. How long ago did they get a feeling that there was some substance to the rumors that apparently had been—I just assumed, and I didn't ask them that, that Carr called me and seemed to be in a matter of great urgency at 11:10 this morning, and that he

was fearful that they would bring in the papers before we would even get to know about it, and that is the way he was talking and acting about it.

COOPER. He felt there was . . . He didn't know the name of the informant?

A. No, he did not.

Q. What then would lead him to think it had substance?

A. Well, he said that the reason he thought it might have substance was because Wade had heard these rumors constantly, and his assistant had gotten this information from the informant as to a definite badge number, and the amount and the date.

COOPER. How would you test this kind of thing?

A. It is going to be very difficult for us to be able to establish the fact in it. I am confident that the FBI would never admit it, and I presume their records will never show it, or if their records do show anything, I would think their records would show some kind of a number that could be assigned to a dozen different people according to how they wanted to describe them. So that it seemed to me if it truly happened, he did use postal boxes practically every place that he went, and that would be an ideal way to get money to anyone that you wanted as an undercover agent, or anybody else that you wanted to do business that way with without having any particular transaction.

FORD. There might be people who would see what was going on with that particular box, because the postal authorities do watch, they have means of watching in many places that no one could see. They can watch the clerks as to what they are doing in these boxes, and they can watch the individuals that are going in and out. They do that only when they have an occasion to be suspicious, but they might, in watching for somebody particularly, they might also see other things that they just have to note. That is a possibility.

DULLES. What was the ostensible mission? I mean when they hire somebody they hire somebody for a purpose. It is either . . . Was it to penetrate the Fair Play for Cuba Committee? That is the only thing I can think of where they might have used this man. It would be quite ordinary for me because they are very careful about the agents they use. You wouldn't pick up a fellow like this to do an agent's job. You have got to watch out for your agents. You have really got to know. Sometimes you make a mistake.

FORD. He was playing ball, writing letters to both the elements of the Communist parties. I mean he was playing ball with the Trotskyites and with the others. This was a strange circumstance to me.

DULLES. But the FBI get people right inside you know. They don't need a person like this on the outside. The only place where he did any at all was with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

BOGGS. Of course it is conceivable that he may have been brought back from Russia you know.

A. If he was in the employ from 1962, September 1962, up to the time of the assassination, it had to start over in Russia, didn't it, because didn't he get back in February? When did he get back here from Russia?

A. I think it was February; February of this year.

Q. Of '62. Was it of '62?

A. Oh yes, that is right, it was '62.

DULLES. They have no facilities, they haven't any people in Russia. They may have some people in Russia but they haven't any organizations of their own in Russia.

A. Yes.

DULLES. They might have their agents there. They have some people, sometimes

American Communists who go to Russia under their guidance and so forth and so on under their control.

COOPER. Of course there are rumors all around Dallas, of course the FBI is acquainted with rumors too.

A. One of the strange things that happened, and it may have no bearing on this at all, is the fact that this man who is a defector, and who was under observation at least by the FBI, they say they saw him frequently, could walk about the Immigration Office in New Orleans one day and come out the next day with a passport that permitted him to go to Russia. From my observations of the case that have come to us, such passports are not passed out with that ease.

DULLES. Mr., I think you are wrong on that.

A. I could be.

DULLES. Because the passports are issued valid for anywhere except specified countries. There is a stamp as I recall that says not good for Communist China, North Vietnam, and so forth. For a long time they had on the stamp not good for Hungary. But any American, practically any American, can get a passport that is good for anywhere. An American can travel and Russia is one of the countries that you can now travel to.

A. Well, maybe you can.

DULLES. You can get them quick.

A. I think our General Counsel and I both have some experience in cases that have come before our Court which would indicate that that isn't exactly the fact.

DULLES. I think in the State Department. . . .

A. They have great difficulty, some of them, in getting a passport to go to Russia.

BOGGS. Particularly for someone who has any Communist. . . .

A. Oh, yes.

DULLES. Is there any evidence the State Department has that record in the files? I don't think that record has ever turned up.

COOPER. They admitted there wasn't any.

A. What record, that he was a defector?

DULLES. Yes, I don't think the State Department or in the Passport Bureau, there was no record. It didn't get down to the Passport offices. That is one of the things we ought to look into.

A. The State Department knew he was a defector. They arranged for him to come back.

DULLES. But it don't get . . . passport files or the passport records. They are issuing hundreds and thousands of passports. They have their own particular system.

A. Yes.

DULLES. They don't run around from time a man comes in. If they don't find any clue, and they don't according to our record here they don't find any warning clue in his file—they should have a warning clue in his file but as I recall they don't.

COOPER. That is what they admitted, that they had not supplied the warning.

DULLES. And the Passport Office don't on its own usually go around and inquire. They wait until it is assigned there. Then they follow it up.

COOPER. This may be off the point a bit, but as I re-read the report, the chronology of the FBI checks on Oswald, they knew that he had gone to Texas. They learned from Mrs. Payne: they knew where Mrs. Oswald was living. They talked with her. They knew where he was working.

BOGGS. Sure. That is all in the file.

COOPER. I know that. I say they knew where he was working.

BOGGS. I am sure you went over that material that we received a few days ago. You will find the report from the FBI dated back last summer, and months before that and then months after that, why some agent would make a report on it.

A. I thought first you should know about it. Secondly, there is this factor too that a consideration, that is somewhat an issue in this case, and I suppose you are all aware of it. That is that the FBI is very explicit that Oswald is the assassin or was the assassin, and they are very explicit that there was no conspiracy, and they are also saying in the same place that they are continuing their investigation. Now in my experience of almost nine years, in the first place it is hard to get them to say when you think you have got a case tight enough to convict somebody, that that is the person that committed the crime. In my experience with the FBI they don't do that. They claim that they don't evaluate, and it is uniform prior experience that they don't do that. Secondly, they have not run out all kinds of leads in Mexico or in Russia and so forth which they could probably—it is not our business, it is the very —

DULLES. What is that?

A. They haven't run out all the leads on the information and they could probably say—that isn't our business.

Q. Yes.

A. But they are concluding that there can't be a conspiracy without those being run out. Now that is not, from my experience with the FBI.

Q. It is not. You are quite right. I have seen a great many reports.

A. Why are they so eager to make both of those conclusions, both in the original report and their experimental report, which is such a departure? Now that is just circumstantial evidence, and it don't prove anything about this, but it raises questions. We have to try to find out what they have to say that would give any support to the story, and report it to you.

COOPER. Sure.

A. I think it was in October.

RAWKIN. They had a report on many, they had an agent go and see him when he was in prison.

BOGGS. In New Orleans?

A. In New Orleans.

Q. Right.

A. And he lied to them before the police. He said his wife was a Texas girl, and he married her in Texas, and a whole string of stuff, and in Dallas they had a report prior to that that was definitely contrary to it.

BOGGS. The fellow Butler, who works for the profit organizations that Dr. Oxnard heads to disseminate and tie Communist propaganda to Latin America, is the one who confronted him on the streets in New Orleans. I know Butler. He is a very fine young man. It was . . . Butler says that this was the first time that they established that he had been in Russia and that he had defected at one time and then returned. You have that undoubtedly in your files, that film, that tape that was made and borrowed in New Orleans?

A. Yes.

BOGGS. Of course on that tape—I listened to that tape—he gives the normal Communist line, reaction to everything.

A. That is right.

Q. The same old stereotyped answer?

A. Yes.

COOPER. How do you propose to meet this situation?

BOGGS. This is a serious thing.

FORD. Who would know if anybody would in the Bureau have such an arrangement?

A. I think that there are several. Probably Mr. Belmont would know every undercover agent.

Q. Belmont?

A. Yes.

Q. An informer also would you say?

A. Yes, I would think so. He is the special security of the division.

DULLES. Yes, I know.

A. And he is an able man. But when the Chief Justice and I were just briefly reflect-

ing on this we said if that was true and it ever came out and could be established, then you would have people think that there was a conspiracy to accomplish this assassination that nothing the Commission did or anybody could dissipate.

BOGGS. You are so right.

DULLES. Oh, terrible.

BOGGS. Its implications of this are fantastic, don't you think so?

A. Terrific.

RAWKIN. To have anybody admit to it, even if it was the fact, I am sure that there wouldn't at this point be anything to prove it.

DULLES. Lee, if this were true, why would it be particularly in their interest—I could see it would be in their interest to get rid of this man but why would it be in their interest to say he is clearly the only guilty one? I mean I don't see that argument that you raise particularly shows an interest.

BOGGS. I can immediately—

A. They would like to have us fold up and quit.

BOGGS. This closes the case, you see. Don't you see?

DULLES. Yes, I see that.

RAWKIN. They found the man. There is nothing more to do. The Commission supports their conclusions, and we can go home and that is the end of it.

DULLES. But that puts the men right on them. If he was not the killer and they employed him, they are already it, you see. So your argument is correct if they are sure that this is going to close the case, but if it don't close the case, they are worse off than ever by doing this.

BOGGS. Yes, I would think so. And of course, we are all even gaining in the realm of speculation. I don't even like to see this being taken down.

DULLES. Yes, I think this record ought to be destroyed. Do you think we need a record of this?

A. I don't, except that we said we would have records of meetings and so we called the reporter in the formal way. If you think what we have said here should not be upon the record, we can have it done that way. Of course it might. . . .

DULLES. I am just thinking of sending around copies and so forth. The only copies of this record should be kept right here.

BOGGS. I would hope that none of these records are circulated to anybody.

A. I would hope so too.

RAWKIN. We also give them to you Commissioners. Now if you don't want them, those are the only ones who get them but Sides himself: off the record.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, one of the great spiritual leaders of our century, Jozsef Mindszenty, died at the age of 83 in Vienna. Cardinal Mindszenty spoke out against both Nazi and Communist oppression even when it placed him in grave personal danger. The Nazis arrested him, because he protested the annihilation of Hungarian Jews. The Communist government jailed him and convicted him of treason in 1949, because of his opposition to the authoritarian and atheistic regime.

Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the 1949 "treason trial" in Budapest and

Cardinal Mindszenty's gaunt appearance after weeks of Communist brutality. One of the lessons which we in the West learned from the cardinal's trial was that the so-called "people's republics" of Eastern Europe in no way represent fairness or justice. The Hungarian Government revealed itself for what it was: A tightly-ruled authoritarian regime. It showed the extent to which elemental human freedoms can be debased. Freedom of speech, religion, and assembly—all taken for granted in the United States—were easily trampled by the Hungarian Communists in 1949.

Cardinal Mindszenty is dead, but as a lonely and courageous religious leader, standing isolated in the courtroom, speaking against tyranny of the left as bravely as he had against tyranny of the right, he will be remembered by all who cherish freedom.

LULAC HOLDS STATE CONVENTION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 through May 25, the League of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, will convene for their 27th annual State convention in Long Beach, Calif.

Under the coordination of LULAC's Paramount Council, presided over by Margaret Pacheco, the LULAC convention will gather to perpetuate concepts which are the foundation of this fine organization's purpose—to instill in its members the democratic principle of individual political and religious freedom, the equality of social and economic opportunity, and to strive toward development of an American society where the cultural resources and integrity of all people are recognized to be a necessity for a worthwhile, meaningful, and enriched civilization.

The growing importance of the Latin American people in our country makes it essential that every citizen have an understanding of the cultural and spiritual origins we share with these great people.

I am especially pleased that in my State of California, LULAC councils have generally been in the forefront of initiating programs capable of implementing the ideals of their beliefs.

The first council organized in California was headed by Jess Vela in 1927 and was based in Orange County. The spirit that Vela's efforts produced soon spread to Los Angeles, Norwalk, Downey, Paramount, Long Beach, San Pedro, Gardena and countless other cities throughout our State.

LULAC's immediate goal in California is to rectify the employment problem faced by Spanish-speaking citizens. During the past several years, a LULAC committee, headed by Frank Galaz of the Gardena council, and Fidel Gonzales, past State chairman of LULAC, exposed various examples of discrimina-

tion against Latinos by many of California's major employers. They are presently taking the necessary legal steps to solve these problems.

In addition to working on fair employment practices, LULAC has been working toward greater educational opportunities for Latin Americans, for often it has seemed that higher education was beyond reach of the Latin American society. Through individual efforts, and the assistance that LULAC Educational Service Centers provide, Latin American people now have educational opportunities and resources available that they were deprived of for so many years. These new centers work to develop new levels of awareness in an attempt to motivate students in meeting the community's needs and solving problems one might have from an educational standpoint. The centers which operate in California work together and coordinate their efforts throughout California to reach as many Latin American youths as possible.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the accomplishments LULAC has attained. Their active participation in the betterment of life for their people is indeed a noble contribution to our Nation. Their concern in the areas of housing, health, the media, economic development, civil and women's rights are admired by all who share a sense of equality and compassion for our fellow citizens.

I am particularly pleased that in my congressional district, individuals such as Isaac De La Rocha from the Long Beach Council, Joe Sanchez from the Greater Long Beach Council, Jay Leon of the Gardena Council and Victor Valdez of the San Pedro Council have played such a vital role in the development and implementation of LULAC programs.

We are sure that with the dedication of these people, the 27th annual LULAC State Convention will serve as a prologue of further accomplishments for this organization.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert into the RECORD the official LULAC code:

Respect your Citizenship and preserve it; honor your country, maintain its tradition in the spirit of its citizens and embody yourself into its culture and civilization.

Be proud of your origin and maintain it immaculate, respect your glorious past and help to defend the rights of all the people.

Learn how to discharge your duties before you learn how to assert your rights; educate and make yourself worthy, and stand high in the light of your own deed; you must always be loyal and courageous.

Filled with optimism, make yourself sociable, upright, judicious, and above all things be sober and collected in your habits, cautious in your actions and sparing in your speech.

Believe in God, love Humanity and rely upon the framework of human progress, slow and sound, unequivocal and firm.

Always be honorable and highminded; learn how to be self-reliant upon your qualifications and resources.

In war serve your country, in peace your convictions; discern, investigate, meditate, and think, study, at all times be honest and generous. Let your firmest purpose be that of helping to see that each new generation

shall be of a youth more efficient and capable and in this let your own children be included.

NEW YORK—THE STATE OF THE CITY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, New York City faces a grave fiscal crisis and has appealed to the President for help. If the administration insists on a blueprint for future action before agreeing to assist New York City, an excellent basis for discussion can be found in a series of editorials currently appearing in the New York Times.

Yesterday, I inserted the first three editorials in this series—"The State of the City"—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and today I wish to bring the fourth to the attention of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

Today's installment discusses housing and energy. The Times editors make the essential point that even with an equitable and realistic regulation of rents "a considerable expansion in Federal rent subsidy, rehabilitation and construction funds will be needed to assist renters with low and moderate incomes."

The editorial follows:

STATE OF THE CITY: HOUSING AND ENERGY

"The time has come for the city or state to take over all rent-controlled apartments. We are not asking for any cash, just mortgages covering the condemnation value of our property."

That statement of surrender comes from the chief spokesman for owners of 900,000 New York City apartments seeking to get out from under the vagaries of rent control, rising real estate taxes, high fuel and utility charges and kindred afflictions of infinite variety.

In terms of equal desperation tenants complain that decent housing is unobtainable at rents any but the wealthy can afford—and much of it is shoddy at any price. Even where apartments are built with exemption from municipal taxes, they now come in at monthly rents of \$125 a room or higher, triple or quadruple what used to be considered a tenable middle-income figure.

Uncollected realty taxes are expected to total a quarter-billion dollars this year, and landlords shrug off the scheduled 10 per cent increase in the tax rate July 1. "The money just isn't there to pay it," is their almost unanimous comment. Savings banks squirm as defaulted mortgage payments reach astronomical totals, but they do not foreclose for fear of even more staggering losses if the banks become owners. Abandonments at the rate of 30,000 per year convert entire neighborhoods into wasteland; arson in abandoned apartments is a growing menace.

At least 30,000 new or substantially rehabilitated family units annually for the next decade is the officially calculated housing need for this city. Yet public and private rehabilitation—and there are some brave efforts in this direction—is near a standstill. Many existing low-rent housing developments are fear-swept jungles. Federal rent supplements offer a glimmer of hope—a dim glimmer.

THE EMPTY SKYSCRAPER

In the soaring skyscrapers that are the external symbol of New York's commercial

greatness more than a tenth of the space is vacant—a total of 27.5 million square feet of unfilled offices. By cutting rents to half or less their original level, operators of shiny new towers in midtown Manhattan made a modest dent in their backlog of surplus space in the last year, but much of their gain was at the expense of Lower Manhattan buildings.

The twin peaks of the World Trade Center, with two million of their nine million feet still unrented, are monuments to unplanned expansion—misplanning by the Port Authority of reserves that should have gone to mass transit but that were used instead for unfair competition with commercial builders. As if all this were not dismaying enough, the combination of municipal tax policy and of quest for speculative advantage has put a premium on the destruction of sound and often handsome buildings in prime sections of the downtown district. The owner comes out ahead by paving over the vacant property as parking lots; the city is left with an ugly ruin.

The only palliative currently being applied is the promising, though still decidedly limited one, of rehabilitating commercial and loft buildings for residential use, an approach that has worked well in SoHo and a few other areas. A more expansive application of the same principle to brand new construction is getting municipal encouragement through tax abatement for structures that heap luxury apartments on top of commercial floors, shops and showrooms; but this is only for the rich.

It is evident that the city's need for livable housing for middle-class and low-income families will never be met by such methods. The overwhelming immediate need is to preserve and upgrade the existing stock of sound housing, not to let more and more buildings sink into decay, mortgage and tax default, and total abandonment.

The many months it took to get a feeble bill for a passalong of skyrocketing fuel costs through the City Council, despite consistent pressure from Mayor Beame, provides fresh proof that rent policy is too close to the ballot box to be safely left to political decision. The present creaky control structure, a patchwork carried over from World War II, ought to be replaced either directly by the State Public Service Commission or by some counterpart agency.

In recent years the P.S.C. has proved an independent watchdog in policing utility rates; gone is the subservience it once showed to the big power companies and to the Bell System. Similar independence is needed in the housing field if some element of equity and realism is to characterize determination until over-all supply of housing is adequate to allow deregulation.

Even with that, a considerable expansion in Federal rent subsidy, rehabilitation and construction funds will be needed to assist renters with low and moderate incomes. Preferential loans and special mortgage terms, backed by governmental guarantees, can do much to encourage conversion of marginal rental units to cooperatives and condominiums. Unlocking the door to new construction at reasonable rents depends on action by the building unions and employers to ease restrictive work rules and to avoid another round of inflationary pay boosts in talks now under way.

HIGH COST OF ENERGY

The high cost of shelter for householders and business alike is pushed higher still by electric rates well above those that prevail in any other community. No city is more dependent on electric power than New York, making Consolidated Edison, the monopoly supplier, as vital an element in the well-being of the metropolis as City Hall.

The dependence is far from a happy one, though the company's managerial competence has improved enormously since a sys-

temwide power failure blacked out the city and Westchester County almost a decade ago. High costs are inescapable in an underground distribution network that is eight times as expensive to install and repair as overhead lines would be. More than half of Con Edison's bill to its customers directly reflects outlays for fuel and taxes.

A coordinated interdepartmental approach is needed to the economic, environmental and technical problems this giant utility presents, but the Lindsay administration's attempts along this line accomplished little and the Beame administration is not even trying. Responsibility for holding down light and power costs has fallen back primarily on the P.S.C. and the State Power Authority. The most that seems in immediate prospect is a more rational rate structure aimed at discouraging the present profligate waste of energy and at cutting Con Edison's long-term need for new generating equipment.

HUSSEIN OFFERS ISRAEL PEACE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, King Hussein of Jordan gave one of the most important foreign policy addresses of this decade. Speaking at the Citadel Military Academy in Charleston, S.C. he stated publicly, perhaps for the first time, the absolute willingness of the Arabs to make peace with Israel. The significance of what he said cannot be overstated. Using his own allusion, King Hussein "bit the bullet" for the Arab peoples. He publicly abandoned, on behalf of the Arab nation, decades of enmity for the Israelis and offered them precisely what they have rightly sought for so long—the opportunity to live in peace and security in their national homeland.

Whatever mistrust the Israelis may have for some Arabs, they should, I believe, recognize King Hussein as a straightforward neighbor. It was Hussein who, rather than appease fanatical elements within the Palestinian movement, crushed their insurgency, and thereby made Israel's borders vastly easier to defend against terrorist attacks. It was Hussein who attempted to forestall the October 1973 War against Israel, and withstanding enormous pressures from Egypt and Syria, yielded only a token force to the battle in the last days of the war.

It is King Hussein who offers what he says may be the last chance for peace, and perhaps is.

In an extraordinary public admission, one which must have taken enormous courage, Hussein stated flatly that the Arabs have changed their position. Speaking explicitly for Egypt, Syria, and Jordan he categorically stated:

We accept the conditions for peace that have been laid down—recognition of Israel, nonbelligerency, Israel's right to exist within recognized borders, and our willingness to make and support a final peace.

All of these we accept on condition that Israel withdraw from all Arab territory and recognize the legitimate rights of Palestinians in their homeland. It is as simple as that.

His thinly veiled reference to Egypt's Nasser and Syria's Jedd, who have now been replaced by "enlightened new leadership," amounts to a repudiation of past policies of hatred and attempted destruction of Israel.

In fact, it is apparent from King Hussein's speech that the Arabs are willing to eat a good measure of crow if that will help to bring about peace. And it is also apparent that before he spoke he must have cleared every word of his speech with Presidents Sadat and Asad.

What more can the proponents of peace in the Middle East reasonably demand than that which was offered on behalf of all Arabs last week? What more will the United States insist upon as it tries to establish a formula for a lasting peace?

In House Concurrent Resolution 192, which I introduced on March 24, 1975, I set forth the basic principles which I believe to be essential to peace in the Middle East. The statement of King Hussein at the Citadel is wholly consistent with those principles. Because of the importance of the King's statement, and the growing urgency between Arabs and Israelis, I insert the text of King Hussein's remarks at this point so that every Member of Congress might have an opportunity to read them:

ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY KING HUSSEIN OF THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN, AT THE CITADEL, THE MILITARY COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MAY 6, 1975

Mr. President, members of the faculty, the Corps of Cadets, and distinguished guests.

As a former Cadet and an alumnus of Sandhurst, I was especially pleased to be invited here to The Citadel, and doubly appreciate the honor you have bestowed upon me. I am not really an academic type and I feel hesitant sometimes about accepting a degree. But among you, I feel right at home.

I recognize that the System of The Citadel which begins at the "Gate"—from "Knob" status to distinguished graduate—imposes certain restrictions, restrictions that may on rare occasions be broken. With vivid memories of my own days as a cadet, I shall now, Mr. President, invoking the traditional privilege as a Chief of State, ask that amnesty be granted those cadets undergoing confinement or tours of penalty.

By the nature of my position, I have had to become, you might say, something of a military strategist and a political scientist. So, although I have not had the benefit of instruction from your distinguished faculty, I might be able to pass some of your courses, maybe even enough to earn a degree. I'm happy, however, not to be put to the test.

Today I am indeed proud to become an alumnus of The Citadel.

While I was a cadet at Sandhurst, I was involved in an episode which I still vividly recall.

After a night out in London, I returned to the college to find fire trucks just leaving the campus, having been summoned by a prankish fire alarm. The next morning at an early parade, the college commander demanded that the officer cadet who rang the alarm should step forward. When no one volunteered, the entire college was confined to barracks until the guilty party confessed.

This seemed a bit unfair to those of us who had not been in the college when the alarm rang, and especially to me because I had the opportunity to try out a new racing car at the Goodwood track that very day.

After brooding on this for some time, I asked permission to see the college commander. When I was permitted into his

presence, I saluted sharply and blurted out, "I did it, sir."

"You did what?" he asked.

"I rang the fire alarm, sir."

He paused for a moment, and then said, "How could you? You were on leave in London."

"That's true, sir. So were many others."

He smiled slightly, and then said, "I see your point, Hussein."

Within an hour, I was something of a hero to all those who were released from confinement to barracks because they hadn't been in the college when the alarm rang. I'm sure, General Seignious, that you would have agreed with the commander's decision not to inflict mass punishment.

I did try out that car, by the way, but never did race it. The garage, under orders I suspect from the Jordan Embassy, never tuned it up sharply enough for Goodwood racing. Probably just as well.

The duty to set right an obvious wrong is an obligation we all recognize, whether it be in a military school, or in relations between nations. It is at the heart of the concept of Justice.

It is also, Mr. President, at the heart of the Great Issue I wish to discuss today—War or Peace in the Middle East.

There are few problems on the planet Earth more demanding of the collective wisdom of mankind than a just settlement of the difficulties that have arisen between the Arab Nation and Israel. Although the Arabs comprise many States, they do form one Nation, in that they share the same language, religion, tradition, culture, history and geographic area. It is in this sense that I use the term.

The drama of this conflict between the Arab Nation and Israel, with its attendant human suffering, has unfolded in a grim 30-year tragedy. We have witnessed Act I—the founding of Israel; and Act II—the Wars, 1956, 1967, 1973. Today we are observing the formulation of Act III—the ultimate conclusion. Shall it be peace, the peace we all desire—or a violent catastrophe, possibly involving the entire world in armed struggle and suffering?

How did the problems and misunderstanding of the first two acts occur? And what can we all do to insure the Third Act will not enlarge and perpetuate the tragedy? My views are those of one who has been both an observer and a participant in this human experience for the past 23 years and whose country has been in the forefront of the conflict from its beginning. It is against this background that I would like to assess the events and developments of the recent past, consider their impact, and develop some conclusions.

As you know, the state of Israel came into being in 1948 after the British decided to give up their Palestine mandate, and the United Nations passed a resolution partitioning Palestine. Between November 1947, when the UN vote was taken, and May 1948, when the mandate ended, there was fierce terrorist activity, and the first Arab-Israeli war was fought thereafter. The result was that when the truce was signed nearly 800,000 Palestinians were driven from their homes or had fled because they could not live under Israeli rule.

For nearly 20 years, most of the displaced Palestinians lived in refugee camps in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and the Gaza Strip. There were frequent incursions over the border by Palestinians and fierce reprisals by the Israelis. Bitterness and hatred grew stronger with every passing year. Cease fire agreements were made and broken, while both the Arabs and the Israelis kept building up their military strength.

In June, 1967, the "Six Day War" erupted between Israel and three Arab states—Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. At its conclusion, the military capability of the three Arab

states was utterly destroyed, and Israeli forces were occupying territory in all three countries—the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt, the Golan Heights of Syria, and the West Bank of Jordan, including the old city of Jerusalem.

In November of that year, the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution—No. 242—designed to form the basis of a solution. Its preamble stated a basic principle written into the charter of the United Nations—that no nation may acquire the territory of another nation by force. It then proceeded to outline the conditions that were to be accepted by both sides. They included: Arab recognition of Israel; an end to belligerency; the right of Israel and the Arab states to live within recognized borders; the freedom of passage through the Suez Canal; a just solution of the Palestine problem; and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab territory they had captured and were still occupying.

The terms were accepted in principle by all. But then began the challenge of implementing the peace.

That was in 1967—eight years ago. What has happened since then?

The United Nations has repeatedly confirmed the terms of the resolution, and repeatedly sent conciliatory missions to the area. Nearly every major nation has offered to mediate, and the problem has been on the agenda of half a dozen summit meetings. Unfortunately, all of them failed. There was no progress on any point, and Israel continued to occupy Arab territory.

Then occurred the October War in 1973, which in 30 days, in terms of military equipment, was the most costly war ever fought.

After a cease fire had been arranged, there began a series of diplomatic interventions by the United Nations and the great powers. The United States and Russia sponsored a conference at Geneva that quickly adjourned. Once again, nothing seemed to be working.

Then in mid-1974 began one of the more remarkable events in diplomatic history—the "shuttle" diplomacy of your Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger. He did succeed in arranging a separation of forces in the Sinai Peninsula, and the Golan Heights. But when he returned recently to seek a further separation of Egyptian and Israeli forces, he found their positions had become irreconcilable, and departed for home, a greatly disappointed man. That he did not succeed has been called by some a failure.

If there was a failure it was not Dr. Kissinger's. No man has worked more tirelessly, more valiantly, with greater patience or greater dedication, than your Secretary of State in trying to resolve the issues which divide the area. He must be commended for his efforts and be urged to continue them and, indeed, under President Ford's leadership, to redouble them.

The failure of the negotiations reflected a failure by Israel to jettison an already discredited policy—a failure by Israel to re-examine and reject its notion that security derives from holding the territory of its neighbors. In fact, it is Israel's continued embrace of that notion that prevents it from realizing its security goals.

What I have said so far has dealt with history. What of the future?

As a true friend of the United States—and happy to be accepted as one—I believe I can contribute helpful and somewhat different points of view on the Middle East problem. These are views which I have expressed to your President, the Secretary of State and members of the Senate and the House. I think it was particularly opportune to have exchanged views with your leaders at a time when they were conducting a serious reassessment of United States policy for the Middle East, and to learn that our respective views are not very far apart.

Although the area has been an unending

battlefield, a scene of interminable chaos and tragedy and is now in yet another state of crisis, I am convinced the prospect of peace in the Middle East still exists and in some respects may be closer than it has ever been before. Significant changes have taken place which give new hope.

Perhaps the greatest single new hope for peace stems from the historic change in the Arab position. And I have asked your leaders to recognize this in their reassessment. In the years before, and immediately after the 1967 War, we were in no mood for anything but retribution. We refused to recognize the existence of Israel, much less negotiate with her. Since then there has been time for reflection and growth in the Arab world. Greater strength has produced greater confidence. Heightened responsibility has brought a broader maturity. With enlightened new leadership in Egypt and Syria we have reassessed our policy. Realistic and constructive new attitudes and measures have been adopted. As a result, starting with our cautious acceptance of the 1967 UN Resolution, today we in Jordan, as well as in Egypt and Syria, are ready, even eager, to make peace. We accept the conditions for peace that have been laid down—recognition of Israel, non-belligerency, Israel's right to exist within recognized borders, and our willingness to make and support a final peace.

All of these we accept on condition that Israel withdraw from all Arab territory and recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinians in their homeland. It is as simple as that.

There have been other important recent changes in the Arab world. They do not affect our attitude toward seeking peace with Israel, but they increase the urgency of something being done about it. Although the Middle East has always been a key area in international military and political strategy, it has now become a major center of economic power. Because of this the stakes are immeasurably higher in this crisis than before, and the urgency for solution has never been greater.

For most of the 20th century, and until very recently, the Arab Nation was generally ignored by the International Community. We had little voice or influence in the affairs of the world. The remarkable change which occurred within the past five years has now placed us prominently on the world stage. The Arab Nation has become the principal source of supply for the world's energy needs. Its energy resources have provided it with financial means rivalling the great industrial nations. Its rate of economic and industrial growth exceeds that of the other areas of the world. Future projections are even more impressive.

The old political order is being replaced by a new economic order of world importance. Peace is essential if the opportunity to share this prosperity is to be realized.

These changes which have occurred in the Arab world are truly of historic proportions and they will require equally historic decisions. Unfortunately, the decision most vital to everyone involved is not one which the Arab Nation can make. It is a decision for Israel. The decision, at long last, to return all territories she occupied by force and make peace. Despite the changes within the Arab world since the 1967 War, Israel has not budged from the territory she took then or the policies she has followed since that war. You have an expression in this country, "to bite the bullet" and that is what Israel must now do—"bite the bullet," and withdraw from Arab territory. That, I know, will be a major decision for Israel to make. Israel has demonstrated it can wage war, yet security eludes her. It may take more courage on the part of her leaders to make peace than to provoke war. Courage is the test of leader-

ship. Withdrawal is the key to both peace and the real security Israel's leaders claim they so ardently desire.

Israel claims that her overwhelming concern is fear for her security. On analysis this is difficult to reconcile with reality at this point in history. If I may paraphrase a quotation from one of your former Presidents, in my opinion, the only thing Israel really has to fear is fear itself. She unfortunately appears to have confused fears of the past—in other times and other places—with her security for the future. Old Jerusalem is not the Germany of World War II and Palestinian refugees are not the Nazis of Hitler. Prior to 1948, Arabs and Jews lived side by side in harmony as friends and neighbors for centuries. Perhaps, the fact that many of the founders of Israel and many of its present leaders and citizens were persecuted in Europe by Europeans, and are alien to the Middle East and its people, explains in part the attitudes of Israelis and their supporters. But European persecution in the past cannot justify the denial of rights to other peoples in 1975. Today, right now, there are thousands of families, men, women, and children, in my Kingdom who were born and raised in the holy city of Jerusalem, but are barred from returning to the holy city. Yet, refugees to Israel from Poland, East Germany, the Soviet Union and other corners of the world live there and claim it as their exclusive home. Is it not reasonable that we find this difficult to accept?

I have suggested that Israel is confusing her problems of security today with haunting fears from the past when she should be exploring the promises of the future. More concretely, her concept of military security has become antiquated—a fact this audience should appreciate. To contend, in this modern military age of sophisticated weapons and supersonic speeds, that long-term security can be measured in territorial miles may be a good propaganda ploy—or, as some have suggested, a guise for permanent expansion—but it has no military validity. Travelling under this false badge of security, Israel now occupies ten times the territory she was originally given. I am sure the United States, private citizens as well as government, did not intend that the billions of dollars which have been poured into Israel, out of compassion, would be used to conquer and occupy new lands. Yet that is what has happened. The United States bears a special responsibility in this regard for you are Israel's major ally and her most important benefactor. If condition for peace is withdrawal, should not a condition for assistance be the same?

You must help Israel realize that she will only have true security when her neighbors are willing to live in peace with her. That is what the Arab States are offering her now. An offer, despite her protestations of peace, which Israel refuses to accept. It is a dangerous and disturbing situation. For if, as we have recently observed, Israel would not bring herself to relinquish a few miles in the Sinai, despite Egyptian concessions and your strong urgings, how can we expect her to withdraw from the rest of the lands? Eight years ago I said, Israel could have territory or she could have peace, but she could not have both. I can only add that if she continues to persist in her present occupation policy she could end up with neither.

Nations have been at crossroads many times in their history and as often as not have chosen the wrong road. The Middle East is littered with lost opportunities for peace. The crossroad we now face is an important one because the stakes have become so high that to choose the wrong road this time could be catastrophic. And there is no assurance that if we miss this opportunity there will be another. Time could not be more critical. The area is too volatile, the alternatives too limited and the pressures too

great and uncontrollable to permit the present condition of "no war—no peace" to survive for long.

As has been so often the case in this century, the role of the United States once again is crucial. I am grateful you are reassessing your policy in the Middle East. I think it is vitally important that your Congress and the President join together in the policy to be followed for it is essential to your greatness and your credibility that you speak to the world with one voice on matters of basic policy.

I would hope that yours is not the only other reassessment. The Arab States have reassessed their policy. It is now time for Israel, as well, to reassess her policy. In fact, it is crucial to the problem—and it is the response Israel gives that will determine the answer to our question—War or Peace in the Middle East?

May God guide us all in our efforts to insure that it is Peace.

ENDING THE RECESSION IS NOT ENOUGH

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article by Walter Heller, "The Dangers of an Upturn," appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, May 13.

In that Op. Ed. piece, Mr. Heller makes the point that simply ending the recession and beginning recovery, if that involves no more than continuing the current depressed level of economic activity, is simply not acceptable as a goal for economic policy.

Reducing inflation is not the paramount goal at this time; ending the individual and social disasters caused by high unemployment is the goal we should all be seeking. If we can reinvigorate our economy, we will have more than adequate time to deal with the possible attendant problems of inflation which might be caused by true recovery, perhaps a year or a year and a half from now.

Given the importance of the prescriptions he outlines for the Congress with regard to the economic policy we should be developing, I would like to insert Mr. Heller's article in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

THE DANGERS OF AN UPTURN

(By Walter W. Heller)

That much heralded business upturn, not far off, will be the economic non-event of 1975. For while *business* will turn up, unemployment will hang high and unused capacity will be huge. The great danger is that Messrs. Burns and Simon, gaining aid and comfort from the upward *direction* of activity, will ignore the abysmal *level* of the economy and press their Holy War against inflation with recovery-aborting fervor.

Right now, we are in the darkness that comes just before the dawn. Unemployment is still rising, to a peak between 9% and 10%. Much consumer demand is being met from inventories instead of new production. Prospects for autos and housing range from feeble to anemic. Plant and equipment outlays are still being marked down.

But as the 1975 tax cuts pour into the economy, as inventories are drawn down and production steps up to meet the consumer

demand, and as the pace of government spending (especially on defense) picks up, the economy should begin a rebound. Starting by July or August, it should carry real GNP upward at a 6%-7% pace in the second half of the year.

Still and all, the dawn will break cold and grey for the unemployed. The jobless rate will hover near 9% throughout 1975. And this year's rebound will not become next year's recovery unless the forces that are turning the economy around are buttressed by monetary and fiscal policies for sustained expansion.

Before tossing our hats in the air at the first signs of an upswing, we should reflect a moment on the path of the stimulants that will bring it about:

Tax cuts. After pumping money into the economy this quarter at a \$50 billion annual rate, the injections will drop to a \$15 billion rate in succeeding quarters. (In contrast, the 1964 tax cut, in today's terms, would have produced a sustained \$26 billion rate of injection.)

Budget stimulus. Even assuming expenditures in the neighborhood of \$365 billion in fiscal 1976 and continuation of about \$12 billion of the tax cuts next year, the budget will swing significantly toward restriction (by some \$10 billion to \$15 billion in full-employment terms between the first half of 1975 and the first half of 1976) at a time when recovery is still in its early stages.

Money supply. After the temporary current spurt in money supply growth, the Federal Reserve will be tempted to go back to its "standard" 6% growth target. If it does, this alone could condemn us to a paltry 4%-5% rate of increase in real GNP in 1976.

Inventories. The big spur to production implicit in the drop in inventory liquidation rates from a peak of perhaps \$20 billion to the neighborhood of zero by the end of the year is hardly likely to be sustained via inventory accumulation in 1976.

THE WHIPLASH OF RHETORIC

Yet under the whiplash of the Ford-Simon-Burns rhetoric, even the *prospect* of an upturn is being used to mobilize the nation's continuing fears of inflation in a campaign against more expansionary budgetary and monetary policy. The upturn itself will give aid and comfort to that campaign. The forces then arrayed against vigorous policies for expansion would indeed be formidable:

The Federal Reserve, still smarting from charges of election-year overexpansion in 1972, will let its deep-seated anti-inflationary bias be its guide.

The White House, following its inherent economic conservatism, seems ready to settle for a mild expansion and slow absorption of the unemployed.

Congress, intimidated by scare-talk about deficits and inflation and determined to demonstrate its fiscal responsibility under the new budget procedures, is likely to be imprudently "prudent." That is, in guarding against the distant threat of renewed inflation, it seems unwilling to deal boldly with today's deep recession.

This dangerously timid and restrictive mood—which, if it persists, could lead us from the 1974-75 recession, after a brief spurt, into a 1976 stagnation—seems to be rooted in neglect of some factors and misperception of others.

First, in its blind preoccupation with inflation, it seems to forget that (a) the ferocious inflation of 1973-74 is rapidly ebbing, (b) there is no reason to expect the forces that generated over one-half of that inflationary upsurge—two years of disastrous crop failures, a quintupling of oil prices and dollar devaluation—to recur during the expansion of the mid-1970s, and (c) a miserly monetary policy and restrictive fiscal policy would blunt both the upswing and productivity that can help us subdue inflation in the short run and the expansion of savings

and capital spending that can forestall shortages in the longer run.

Second, in assessing the economy's capacity to absorb stimulus, we seem to forget that (a) this recession is twice as deep as any previous postwar recession, (b) while real GNP has dropped 8% in the past 18 months, potential GNP has also been rising (by 6%, if we use trend growth), thereby idling about \$200 billion of our annual productive capacity, and (c) American industry is now operating at only two-thirds of capacity. It remains a chilling reality that three consecutive years of 7% real growth would still leave unemployment at more than 6% and that present policies provide no assurance that even 7% growth will be maintained in 1976.

Third, even the redoubtable John Dunlop, in expressing the fear that bottlenecks in primary processing industries will abort recovery, seems to forget (a) that operating rates in primary processing industries are running below 70%, and (b) that many of the 1973-74 shortages reflected a frenzied flight into commodities—partly protective, partly speculative—as much as, perhaps more than, a genuine scarcity of materials for productive use, and (c) that many of these materials are only now being disgorged in 1975's massive inventory liquidation. True, that inventory liquidation makes the huge idle capacity today somewhat deceptive. But inventory gorging and hoarding also blew the bottleneck problem in 1973-74 out of all proportion.

Fourth, two major misapprehensions about the budget continue to plague the country and inhibit the Congress. One myth is that the huge federal budget is somehow the result of government profligacy. The facts are that (a) nearly \$60 billion of the projected 1976 deficit is due simply to the ravages of recession (about \$45 billion of reduced revenues and \$15 billion of increased unemployment costs) and (b) the \$4 billion overestimate of offshore oil lease revenues and a \$6 billion or so underestimate of domestic expenditures bring Mr. Ford's deficit to some \$70 billion—small wonder that Republican Senator Bellmon angrily accuses the White House of "phony" budget numbers.

A companion myth is that civilian spending is the main source of upthrust in the federal budget today. But it is defense purchases, already running several billion dollars above projections, that are programmed (according to the Special Analyses section of Mr. Ford's budget) to rise some \$25 billion, at annual rates, in the next five quarters. Leaving aside the energy program and the rise in unemployment benefits, the Ford budget for fiscal 1976 projects an 11% increase in defense expenditures, 9% for income security, 6% for income security, 6% for health and zero for education, manpower and social services.

THE COST OF STAGNATION

Fifth, those who shrink from vigorous expansionary policies are also forgetting the huge costs of continued stagnation, not only in the human terms of intolerably high unemployment and intolerable losses of output, but in terms, already mentioned, of the productivity advances and capital formation foregone in a stagnating economy.

Is this an argument for pulling out all the stops? No, but it is an argument for stopping all the pulls—the downward pulls of niggardly monetary policy, a fading tax cut and parsimonious budget policy.

The Fed should lose no time in assuring the country that it will accommodate expansion, even if this means going beyond the newly declared 5% to 7½% monetary growth range, as it surely does.

The Congress should move promptly to make crystal clear, preferably by early reen-

actment, that the \$12 billion to \$13 billion of tax cuts beyond the rebate, Social Security payments and housing credit will continue in 1976.

Congressional spending and deficit targets should be adjusted to allow an added \$5 billion to \$10 billion for recovery programs targeted to areas of high unemployment and effective only as long as national unemployment exceeds a triggering level, e.g., expanded unemployment compensation and public service jobs and a new program of counter-cyclical assistance to hard-hit state and local governments, all of which would gradually self-destruct as the economy regains its health.

A year from now will be plenty of time for another look at expansionary policies. Even if we follow a resolute program of expansion, one that would boost real GNP at an 8% annual rate, we would still find the U.S. economy in mid-1976 with 7½%-8% unemployment, with output running some \$125 billion below its potential, and with shortages and bottlenecks still no threat. That will give us plenty of time to review the bidding and determine whether, when, and how restraint should be applied. To do it at the first sign of an economic upturn would be an abject confession of economic bankruptcy.

The danger of an upturn, then, is that the Burns-Simon axis will mistake the warm and gentle zephyrs of the rebound for the gathering winds of a new inflation—to be leaned against in the best (or worst) Fed tradition and to be used as a club against bold congressional action. The consequence? The rebound may never become a recovery. If the White House and the Fed, hypnotized by the fear of inflation, quickly turn from expansion to restriction, they will snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

AMERICA'S 21 MILLION ELDERLY MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES DESERVE THE HIGHEST QUALITY NURSING CARE

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 7000, to amend the Medicare Act to require the Social Security Administration—SSA—to continue to recognize the nursing cost differential which is presently used in determining the reasonable cost of providing nursing care for our older Americans.

I was deeply concerned to learn that the SSA is proposing to eliminate this nursing differential factor in providing quality care for the Nation's senior citizens.

In my own 34th Congressional District in California, we have nearly 44,000 citizens of retirement age who depend on our Federal Medicare program to meet their continuing health needs.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Congress have an obligation to assure that this congressionally-mandated Federal health care program for older Americans continues to maintain the very highest standards of quality care for our senior citizens who have worked and contributed to the program and who now have a right to expect the

best medical care our Nation's health delivery system can offer.

Instead of reducing the quality of care in the Medicare program and cutting out vital nursing services to our elderly citizens, the SSA should be busy finding ways to improve the quality and upgrade the standards of care provided these older Americans.

If this proposed elimination of the nursing salary differential is implemented, the additional cost to health care institutions of providing the needed extra nursing services will simply have to be shifted to other private patients receiving care in the same institution.

This, however, would be clearly contrary to the congressional mandate as expressed in the Medicare law, Public Law 89-97, which states that—

The costs with respect to individuals covered by the (Medicare) insurance programs . . . will not be borne by individuals not so covered . . .

If SSA intends to go through with their proposal, they will be doing what Congress has specifically prohibited them from doing: shifting, according to SSA's own estimates, some \$120 million of Medicare costs annually to non-Medicare patients or to hospitals. Such a proposal would be inequitable, arbitrary, and, in my opinion, clearly unlawful.

It is certainly ironic that SSA itself, in its Medicare regulations published in 1971, recognized the inequity of its present proposal when it stated:

It is appropriate that the greater costs of providing these (inpatient routine nursing care) services, which are attributable to caring for (Medicare) beneficiaries . . . be recognized by the program and its reimbursement.

A graphic example from my own Congressional District in California of some of the most serious adverse effects of SSA's proposal to eliminate the Medicare nursing cost differential has just been brought to my attention.

It has to do with the Long Beach Memorial Hospital Medical Center, one of the outstanding health care institutions in the Nation, which is not only the largest nongovernmental hospital in California, but also prides itself on having rates lower than any other community hospital in any large city in California.

Mr. Millard J. Hines, a prominent business and civic leader in southern California for many years, president of Industrial Paper Distributors, Inc. of Long Beach, and a member of the finance committee and the board of trustees of Long Beach Memorial Hospital, is so deeply concerned about the harmful effect of this SSA proposal that he has written a letter to President Ford strongly urging him to take a personal interest in the matter and asking that he use his authority to see that this proposal is withdrawn.

Mr. Hines has taken the liberty of sharing his fine letter to the President with me, and I would like to include pertinent sections of the letter at this point in the RECORD:

It is as a private citizen and businessman that I am writing this letter to strongly protest the ill advised and unlawful proposal to eliminate the 8½ percent Nursing Salary Cost Differential for aged Medicare patients.

It is a fact that the failure of Medicare and Medicaid to pay just costs for hospital care provided the aged and indigent at Memorial will result in a loss in excess of \$3 Million for the current fiscal year. If this newly conceived, grossly unfair, arbitrary and unilateral action is implemented, Memorial will lose another \$100,000 this year.

In a not-for-profit hospital like Memorial this means that rates charged other patients must be increased once again. This continued shifting of additional Medicare costs to the private patient ultimately will bankrupt the non-profit community hospitals in this nation. This, in turn, will result in higher costs to government and dangerous reduction in the quality of care provided Americans.

In an inexplorable act dating back to 1969, the Social Security Administration eliminated the 2 percent overall allowance for such increased costs as inflation and in its place gave the hospitals the 8½ percent Nursing Salary Cost Differential. Because aged Medicare patients required above average routine nursing care, research studies at that time at Memorial showed that the 8½ percent Nursing allowance was in fact substantially lower than the 2 percent overall allowance and markedly lower than the cost of providing additional routine nursing care for the over 65 patient. Local studies revealed that aged Medicare patients, in fact, received 20 percent more nursing care than other patients.

Further, it was made indelibly clear in 1969 that if any change in the 8½ percent figure were considered that the adjustment would be based upon further research. This has not been done. It should be done. It is appalling that government would attempt to eliminate this differential without so much as a single study or other credible evidence showing that it should be modified in any fashion.

To be certain that you would not think that this protest is coming from a hospital that is making excessive charges, I would like to point out that Memorial is not only the largest non-government hospital in California, but in addition, has rates lower than any other community hospital in any large city in California. The development of quality care at low cost has been possible because of the unselfish dedication and generosity of the citizens of our city. We think this local, grass-roots support is the heart of America's health care delivery program. We strongly oppose irresponsible proposals such as this because they undermine our efforts and move us closer and closer to expensive, low quality hospital care. This, I am confident, you also oppose.

Mr. Speaker, I have also received an excellent letter from Mr. John Brewer, executive vice president of the Hospital Council of Southern California. Mr. Brewer's letter strongly supports the statements Mr. Hines addressed to the President. I would like to include a portion of Mr. Brewer's letter in the RECORD:

Our 250 hospitals in the Hospital Council of Southern California are extremely concerned in regard to the proposed deletion of the 8½ percent nursing salary cost differential for Medicare patients.

In Public Law 89-97 (Medicare Law) Congress mandated that Medicare costs be borne by the Medicare program. The termination of the nursing differential violates this congressional intent, for it will shift Medicare program costs to non-Medicare patients, an amount SSA estimates at \$120 million per year. If SSA enacts this proposal, it will force hospitals to increase their charges to non-Medicare patients as their only means of recovering their losses. We do not think

this is desirable or in the best interests of hospitals or the public.

Equally concerned with the far-reaching adverse ramifications of the Social Security Administration's proposal are the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, whose general counsel, Arthur B. Rosenfeld, addressed a strong letter of protest to the Commissioner of Social Security, from which I quote:

Experience shows that elderly patients need more routine nursing care than younger patients. A recent study conducted at the Hayward, California hospital of Kaiser Foundation Hospitals concluded that Medicare beneficiaries require 14 percent to 18 percent more nursing care than non-Medicare patients. There can be no question that a differential is still appropriate.

The general principle of reasonable cost reimbursement in the Medicare Program is that "the share of the total institutional cost that is borne by the program is related to the care furnished beneficiaries so that no part of their cost would need to be borne by other patients." "Conversely, costs attributable to other patients of the institution are not to be borne by the program." Unless it can be shown that Medicare beneficiaries do not need more routine nursing care than other patients, elimination of the routine nursing salary cost differential violates this principle. The fact is that Medicare beneficiaries need and receive proportionally more routine nursing care than other patients.

Mr. Speaker, another outstanding health care leader in my home State is Mr. Samuel J. Tibbitts, president of the Lutheran Hospital Society of southern California. In his recent letter to me, Mr. Tibbitts has well summarized the major objections to SSA's proposal to terminate the nursing salary differential for elderly Medicare patients:

The nursing differential is required to reimburse our hospitals for the disproportionately large amounts of routine nursing care required by these patients. To compensate for this additional burden on our nursing staffs, we allow all our hospitals a 22 percent additive to their staffing requirements in routine care areas for patients over 65 years of age.

We continue to recognize an even greater staffing burden as the age level of patients rises. Since 1966, the number of patients over age 75 has increased considerably in our hospitals.

In summary, it is evident that aged Medicare patients constitute a real additional burden on the total resources of our health care institutions, and ignorance of that fact may lead to the deterioration of the quality of patient care.

I have also received a letter from Mr. William M. Whelan, executive vice president of the California Hospital Association, on this important matter. I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a portion of Mr. Whelan's fine letter:

There is no question that hospitals will develop serious financial problems if in fact the differential is to be eliminated. Elimination of the differential will clearly require California hospitals to shift costs to direct payers, impede their ability to provide charity care, force the elimination of vital community services and could bring financial insolvency to hospitals that are just now able to break even.

The nursing care differential is now paid

only where it is required, in the routine nursing care area for Medicare beneficiaries. If Medicare is to function appropriately and in accordance with the intent of the Medicare Law, it is only right that Medicare continue to pay its rightful share of hospital costs and, thus, not eliminate the nursing salary cost differential.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the very concise and well-reasoned letter of protest on this subject written to President Ford by Mr. John Alexander McMahan, president of the American Hospital Association:

APRIL 21, 1975.

President GERALD R. FORD,
The White House,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of this country's hospitals, and the patients they serve, I urge you to direct the Social Security Administration to withdraw its proposal to terminate the nursing salary cost differential for aged Medicare patients. (40 Federal Register 14934, April 3, 1975.)

The Congress has mandated that Medicare costs are to be borne by the Medicare program; Medicare costs are not to be shifted to non-Medicare patients or to providers of health care. The Medicare law, P.L. 89-97, clearly states that "the costs with respect to individuals covered by the [Medicare] insurance programs . . . will not be borne by individuals not so covered . . ." (Section 1861 (v) (1). Emphasis is mine.)

By proposing to eliminate the nursing salary cost differential for aged Medicare patients, the Social Security Administration (SSA) apparently intends to do what Congress has expressly forbidden it to do: it proposes to shift, according to its estimates, \$120 million of Medicare costs per year to non-Medicare patients or to hospitals. Such a step would be inequitable and unlawful. Non-Medicare patients and the hospitals of this nation can ill afford to assume the financial burden of the Medicare program.

SSA has recognized that aged Medicare patients require greater than average amounts of routine nursing care. Indeed, this fact of hospital life has been an important feature of the Medicare program since July 1, 1969. Because "of the above average cost of inpatient routine nursing care" furnished to aged Medicare patients, the Medicare regulations have provided an 8½ percent salary cost differential on routine nursing provided to these patients. (See 36 Federal Register 12606, July 2, 1971.) These regulations say:

"Studies have indicated that aged patients . . . on the average, receive inpatient routine nursing care that is more costly on the average per day basis than the average of the remainder of the adult non-maternity patient population. It is appropriate that the greater costs of providing these services, which are attributable to caring for [Medicare] beneficiaries and which are sufficiently supported by studies, be recognized by the program and its reimbursement." (Emphasis again is mine.)

What SSA acknowledged in 1971 remains true today. Aged Medicare patients continue to require disproportionately large amounts for nursing care; they continue to incur greater than average routine nursing costs. Yet SSA now proposes to terminate this necessary 8½ percent nursing care differential—without apparent benefit of a single study or a single fact which justifies such action.

SSA offers three explanations for its proposal. (40 Federal Register 11934, April 3, 1975.) However, not one of the explanations

is relevant, let alone a justification of the action which SSA proposes.

First, SSA notes that since 1972, Medicare benefits have been extended to certain disabled persons and to persons with end-stage renal disease, beneficiaries who are not aged, and who may not require above average routine nursing care. The Medicare program has been so extended. But SSA appears to overlook the fact that only care for aged beneficiaries—and not these new Medicare beneficiaries (save a few maternity or pediatric patients)—qualifies for the nursing care differential. Moreover, these new Medicare beneficiaries constitute a very small portion of the Medicare population. There are about 21.4 million aged Medicare beneficiaries, less than 1.8 million disabled Medicare beneficiaries, and only about 21,500 end-stage renal Medicare beneficiaries.

Second, SSA suggests that aged Medicare patients now receive more treatment in intensive care, coronary care and other special care units, where the higher unit nursing costs for such patients are built into the reimbursement formula for treatment in such. However, the existing regulations expressly take this into account: no routine nursing care differential is now paid for such patients. The growth of special care units provides no justification to eliminate the routine nursing care differential with respect to aged beneficiaries who continue to receive treatment in regular care facilities. Indeed, the vast majority of aged Medicare beneficiaries are still treated in such facilities.

Third, SSA claims that the 1972 changes in Medicare cost apportionment requirements somehow eliminate the need for the nursing care differential. To the contrary, the 1972 changes in cost apportionment—which require separate calculation of routine cost and special care unit cost—assure that the nursing care differential is paid only for routine nursing care of aged beneficiaries. This refined application of the differential is hardly a reason for its elimination. It is an additional compelling reason for its retention.

In short, the nursing care differential is now paid only where it is required, that is, to reimburse hospitals for the disproportionately large amounts of routine nursing care required by aged Medicare beneficiaries. If the Medicare program is to function in accordance with intent of Congress and the Medicare law, if Medicare is to pay its rightful share of hospitals costs, then this differential must be retained.

When the nursing care differential was first adopted, SSA proposed to undertake further studies "to ascertain what variations in differentials should be established" in the future and "to obtain other pertinent data on nursing care costs" in order to assess the continued appropriateness of the 8½ percent factor. 20 C.F.R. § 405.430(c)(1). SSA stipulated that such studies would be a condition precedent to any modification of the differential. To our knowledge, SSA has not conducted any such studies. The American Hospital Association stands ready to cooperate with SSA in planning and executing such studies. But AHA and its members cannot accept elimination of the differential without so much as a single study or other credible evidence showing that it should be modified in any fashion.

On behalf of the hospitals of the United States, I respectfully urge you, Mr. President, to withdraw this baseless, unlawful proposal. Because of their interest, I have taken the liberty of sharing this letter with Caspar W. Weinberger, James B. Cardwell and James T. Lynn.

Sincerely,

[s] JOHN ALEXANDER McMAHON,
President.

Finally, I want to print the full text of my bill, H.R. 7000:

H.R. 7000

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the continued application of the nursing salary cost differential which is presently allowed in determining the reasonable cost of inpatient nursing care for purposes of reimbursement to providers under the Medicare program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 1861(v)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and (ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(ii) provide in any event for the allowance of an inpatient routine nursing salary cost differential of at least 8½ percent, as a reimbursable cost of inpatient nursing care, in recognition of the above-average cost of furnishing such care to aged patients, and (iii)".

ESEA 10 YEARS LATER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, with scarcely a notice, the Nation has quietly slipped by a significant anniversary. Ten years ago this April the Congress and the President enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—ESEA. Even in the midst of Vietnam, budget deficits, and high unemployment, it is worth asking ourselves whether this landmark education bill is succeeding and what we have achieved with the \$17 billion appropriated under ESEA over the past decade.

In a financial sense, ESEA's contribution to education has been modest, amounting to about \$40 per year per pupil, about 3 percent of the total school budget each year. But the number of dollars is not the only determinant of impact. I have come to believe that ESEA has had an impact far beyond its dollars, with an enormous multiplier effect throughout education.

In the past 10 years a remarkable consensus has emerged about the Federal role in education that almost causes us to forget the virulent conflicts over the church-state relationship, desegregation, distribution formulas, and fear of Federal control of education that prevented passage of any large-scale Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for many years. Today renewal of the ESEA is never in doubt—it passed the House of Representatives in 1974 by the lopsided vote 328 to 26—reflecting the consensus that, although aid to education is no panacea, the Federal Government has a role in helping local school districts cope with special national problems, such as the educational problems of disadvantaged children, education is basically a local function, and Federal dollars and direction should be limited. The ESEA is no longer viewed as a high-risk experiment but as a solid block in the Nation's educational superstructure.

ESEA has highlighted the special needs of children and insisted that em-

phasis in education be on the child. That may seem simplistic, but it may be the most enduring contribution of the ESEA. In these past years, we have drastically changed the focus of education away from school buildings, teacher problems, and school administration to the question of how to enable millions of children to perform better in school and how to equip schools and teachers to help them. "Instead of blaming the children for failing to fit the school, ESEA asked the schools to fit the child, to assess the particular needs of their students, and to devise individualized and effective prescriptions for them," writes Samuel Halperin, one of the architects of the act.

The ESEA has had other benefits, too. It energized the movement toward equal educational opportunity with special provisions for children of migrant workers, juvenile delinquents, children who speak one language at home and another at school, and preschool children. A basic principle behind ESEA is that disadvantaged children are entitled to above-average educational expenditures. The ESEA has also involved parents and the community in the schools through the use of parent advisory councils and other mechanisms, and it has promoted cooperation between public and nonpublic schools by centering funds in the public schools while insisting that they had an obligation as public trustee for all children.

ESEA has also promoted an emphasis on better evaluation of educational programs to assure that public funds result in advances in learning. The emphasis of the ESEA on measuring the educational outcome of educational programs by academic performance has added impetus to the improvement of the evaluation and accountability of the programs. ESEA has strengthened State educational agencies in every State, which have become better staffed and more professional. State departments of education have added over 2,000 needed staff members and increased planning, training, evaluation, and management systems.

The critical test of ESEA, of course, is whether it has helped children learn. No final answer can be given to that question because the factors in a child's education are too complex to single out any one factor for credit. But tests do show that today's young readers, for example, seem better, on the average, than those of previous years.

ESEA has also had its problems. Academic achievement is not rising everywhere; some of the money has not been well spent; the needs of many children are not being met; and some provisions of the act, such as the provision to establish national education research laboratories, have not worked well. But, on balance, the 10th anniversary of ESEA is worth noting. The act has had some impressive achievements. It has gained broad acceptance and, though it may not measure up in all respects to some of the claims of its staunchest supporters, the evidence is looking better all of the time.

This newsletter was written on the basis of an article by Samuel Halperin, entitled "The Great Education Act: ESEA 10 Years Later."

ENGINEERS ACCEPT LOWER WAGES TO INCREASE JOBS

HON. RAY THORNTON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great strengths of America is the willingness of its people to share in overcoming difficulties.

Last month, the 2,500-member Operating Engineers Union, Local 382, agreed to reduce wages in order to help reduce the costs of construction projects and get jobs started in Arkansas. This action reflects a genuine concern by working people that we must find ways of improving employment opportunities for our unemployed. I wanted to share the report of this story which appeared in the Arkansas Democrat, and I hope it will encourage us to establish programs to put our unemployed to work without requiring them to bear the whole cost of our faltering economy:

UNION LOWERS WAGE SCALE

With the approval of about 100 of its 2,500 statewide members, the Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO, Local 382, has executed an agreement lowering members' wage rates.

The agreement was announced Friday by V. H. "Bill" Williams, the union's business manager, and Ray Spillers, chairman of the Labor Committee of Associated General Contractors of Arkansas.

Williams said he initiated the wage-reducing agreement to create more jobs.

The reductions range from \$2.82 an hour to \$1.24 an hour, dropping rates from \$9.20 to \$6.38 at the top level and from \$6.40 to \$5.16 an hour at the bottom level.

The lowered wages will help reduce construction costs and make it easier for contractors employing union members to win construction contracts over those who hire nonunion workers, Williams said.

The new rates apply only to work done under construction contracts obtained by contractors after Friday's announcement. Work being done under existing contracts will not be affected.

The union membership includes operators of cranes, draglines, bulldozers, shovels, motor patrols, end loaders and backhoes for such site preparation work as clearing, excavating, grading and compaction.

However, many operators of such equipment do not belong to the union. That—along with a general slackening in construction—has helped put union members out of work.

Williams said he figured 20 to 25 per cent of the union's members were out of work because of the construction slowdown.

"Your contract wage rate may be \$10 or \$12 an hour, but that doesn't mean anything if the contractor isn't competitive and there isn't any work for our members," Williams said in a prepared statement.

"We went to the contractors asking for this agreement," he said. "We believe it makes sense to help the contractor be more competitive and get work started rather than have our people out of work drawing no pay."

He said it was obvious to him that "the wage rates had priced our workers out of jobs because the contractor couldn't perform the work on a competitive basis," and he asked for authority to negotiate lower wage rates.

"It is my responsibility to keep these people working," Williams said.

The union's 15-member executive board approved, Williams said.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He said about 100 union members who attended two meetings where the question was considered gave the question unanimous voice-vote approval each time.

Spillers said the action by the union "could be a landmark decision for Arkansas and this part of the country." He praised Williams for a "bold step."

"I believe it will motivate other labor leaders and workers to join with contractors in helping reduce the costs of construction projects and get jobs started," Spillers said.

"A substantial amount of new construction work is held up because of the tremendous escalation in cost," he said.

He said the contractors respected the union for taking the initiative in helping contractors to be more competitive. The action, Spillers said, "will put people back to work."

Though apparently not the first time ever for a union and an employer to agree on lower wage rates in Arkansas, this agreement is the first wage-lowering contract to be reported in recent history.

The new agreement, like the one it amends, will expire April 30, 1976.

Newsmen attempted to determine how much of a construction cost reduction might be traceable to the lowered wage scales.

One contractor at the news conference said that recent bids on a Fort Smith contract for construction of a Whirlpool factory included \$140,000 bid for site preparation work. That bidder indicated this amount could be reduced by \$10,000 if nonunion workers were hired. The nonunion rates are roughly comparable to the rates of the new agreement, he said.

REMARKS OF VA ADMINISTRATOR RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress face a daily struggle to keep big Government responsive to the needs of individual Americans.

But we are not the only arm of the Government faced with this problem. One of the largest personal service agencies in the Federal Government is the Veterans' Administration. Each of our constituencies are tiny in comparison to the VA's which numbers more than 29 million veterans of all wars. If you add the close relatives of these veterans, you find that the VA provides services that touch half our Nation's population.

Staying responsive to the needs of such a vast number of people is a massive job by any standard. The chain of command is a long one, running from the Administrator here in the Washington central office to the individual VA employee who makes personal contact with veterans.

Obviously any operation of that size has imperfections and people are quick to point them out. Yet despite these problems, the Veterans' Administration does an outstanding job handling thousands, sometimes even millions of veteran-connected cases daily.

Today I would like to call your attention to the remarks given by Richard L. Roudebush, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at the VA's 16th Regional Management Institute on April 24.

I think they will give you some insights into how the VA maintains its re-

sponsiveness and remains a credit to the Federal Government:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

The fact that this Regional Management Institute has been an annual feature for sixteen years says a great deal about its value to the Veterans' Administration and is a positive commentary on the way it has been conducted.

This is a prestigious event. You know of the reputation it has gained over the years and of the attention given it by Central Office and throughout VA. This Institute has been important for the last fifteen years and it has been productive.

But I think that now, in the sixteenth year of its existence, there is an even greater need for the study of good management practices in VA and that there are even more compelling reasons for each study to produce tangible results.

If Congress provides the funds we have requested, you and I will have administrative responsibility in a sixteen and one-half billion dollar enterprise starting the first of July.

This is such a large sum of money that I have it underlined here on my speech copy. It is too large an amount for any of us to really comprehend . . . yet you and I and others throughout VA are going to be asked to allocate it properly and spend it wisely next fiscal year.

Just five years ago, when the Tenth Regional Management Institute was conducted, Administrator Don Johnson spoke at this banquet and noted that VA was making plans for an eight and one-half billion dollar budget.

Now I don't suggest a strict relationship between the size of our budget and the state of our managerial skills. I don't even know for sure what measurements we could apply to see if management is twice as good as it was five years ago.

I am sure that it is not twice as good and I don't think we could reasonably expect it to be.

But I am equally sure that as more of the resources of our government . . . more of the taxpayers dollars . . . go into this huge agency of ours that administrative skill becomes more important and administrative accountability more critical.

I am not speaking just of top management within VA, although I know that my own responsibility increases as VA grows, and I know that it is to top management that Congress and the public look in event of administrative breakdown.

I am speaking also of the many employees to whom top management tasks fall at all levels of VA operation, of those who make decisions regarding programs and operations throughout the system.

The American people are paying more for their government than ever before and it follows that they are entitled to more administrative skills and the greater productivity that will result.

And . . . while I am on the subject of money . . . I hope that those in charge of your sessions have emphasized the point that professional pay calls for professional performance and that individual levels of efficiency that were appropriate and tolerable ten, or even five years ago are in many cases no longer acceptable.

I think it is also good to remind ourselves that while operating funds for VA have gone up steadily, year after year, this is a trend that is not necessarily irreversible. We may be called on to do more with less and we must develop the ability to do so.

But money, with all its implications . . . more money, less money, the need to spend wisely, the need to earn our salaries . . . is not the only reason that this is a particularly important time to stress better management within VA.

We serve more veterans and more veterans' dependents today than at anytime in the past and prospects are that our clientele will continue to grow.

The fact that we also have more employees to provide this service does not, I believe, diminish the need for higher standards of achievement on the part of each employee. This is true because we are also being called on to administer a greater number of programs and they are programs of a more complex and more sophisticated nature.

As new concepts concerning needs of veterans in this changing world emerge and as new methods of meeting these needs are perfected, there must be an accompanying evolution of management methods to accommodate to these developments.

This is not new to you, of course, and it is not news to VA. VA's ways of administering help have changed constantly and stress has always been put on improvement.

But it seems to me that we are today at a crossroads of events and influences that will make the future considerably different from the past.

The Vietnam War has ended but has left a large number of veterans who need assistance of various kinds. Veterans of World War II and Korea are reaching the age where more and more of them will need medical care and financial help. Over one million World War I veterans and even a few Spanish American War veterans are still with us and have special needs.

Not only are there more veterans living today than at any time in our history but they have a wider range of ages than ever before and their needs are equally diverse. And, because people live longer now, there will for the foreseeable future be a large veteran population ranging from young to very old.

There are also the needs of the dependents of all these veterans to consider.

Further, we are changing our ways of doing things as we learn more about the requirements of those we help and as we institute the more complex and more sophisticated programs I have spoken of.

Management needs have changed as we have moved away from the old practice of providing a hospital bed for every veteran with medical problems and have opened outpatient clinics, made arrangements for home care, helped states build facilities and have otherwise offered a variety of health services.

Management needs have changed as we have gained the ability to save lives and to restore usefulness with more advanced medical techniques.

Management needs have changed as we put Vet-Reps on college campuses, provided free long-distance telephone service for our veterans, put mobile vans on the road, put into service new methods of data retrieval and as we have done the countless other things that make VA today so very different from the VA of just a few years ago.

Management needs will continue to change as programs are altered and improved, as those to whom our mission is directed change and as the society of which they are a part changes.

There is another side to all this, of course, and perhaps it is more positive. The other side is that our service has been able to change and improve because we have improved our management skills . . . and that this process will continue.

Both sides describe the usefulness of this institute. You are here to learn how to meet changing conditions. And you are here to learn how to make constructive changes of your own.

But maybe I speak too much of change. Certainly there will be no change in the mission of our agency and I hope there will be no deviation in the loyalty and dedica-

tion that VA employees have traditionally shown toward that mission.

And certainly there must be no change in our recognition that we are here . . . first, last and always . . . to provide service to veterans and their survivors and dependents.

Service is . . . and has got to be . . . the guiding principle of VA because it is all we have to offer.

Good administrative policies and good administrative practices . . . at any level, at your installation or in Washington, in your office or mine . . . are good only if they produce good service at the only level where service exists . . . at the meeting place between a VA employee and the veteran or dependent who needs our help.

The ultimate test of good management, and the only worthwhile test, is how effectively our veterans are taken care of.

VA is an agency that deals entirely with individuals, their plans and their problems. Our business is conducted, generally, through a matchup of one veteran and one public servant.

If the employee fails, it does not mean that all of VA fails, but it does mean that our effectiveness has been diminished and it does add up to failure in the opinion of the veteran.

I know you are aware of the consequences of such a breakdown in the fulfillment of our responsibilities and don't need them spelled out for you. But I hope you are more than just aware of these consequences.

I hope you are skillful in describing them to those you supervise and skillful and insistent in helping them to correct practices that may lead to our giving less service than we should or giving it less effectively.

To me, these are management skills and they make you extremely valuable to VA if you have them.

I hope you can go one step further in this direction. I hope you can help the people you work with to see the great significance of what they are doing . . . help them to see the great force for good that they may be both for the individuals they assist and for society.

It is on such on-the-job self respect by large numbers of employees that the morale of an agency is built. It is from individual pride and satisfaction that agency pride develops.

I have a strong feeling that if you can help build respect, pride and esprit de corps among your associates many of your management problems will take care of themselves.

ABOLISH EPA AND OSHA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our deteriorating economy is the result of the fiscal, monetary, and regulatory policies of the Federal Government.

Deficit spending as a fiscal policy necessitates expanding the money supply by means of the Federal Reserve System and the consequence is inflation and rising prices.

On top of this the Government adds its avalanche of regulations, which restrict freedom of action, stifle initiative, and outlaw innovation—all the conditions necessary for the rapid adjustment and growth of the economy.

The fiscal and monetary policies are designed to bring the economy to its knees—the regulatory policies, to keep it there.

Two regulatory agencies that are most effective in stifling economic growth are the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA. The following excerpt from an article by Allen Fulford, which appeared in the April 23, 1975, issue of the Southeast Farm Press, demonstrates how these agencies affect just one segment of our economy—agriculture.

Project this to all aspects of the economy and you can see why, if our economy is to survive and remain productive, these and other such agencies must be abolished.

The article follows:

[From the Southeast Farm Press, Apr. 23, 1975]

EPA AND OSHA COSTING FARMERS

(By Allen Fulford)

Well, we just heard that USDA is cutting off funds for the control of the fire ant.

One of the reasons given is that the EPA will not allow but one application of mirex every 12 months.

USDA says to effectively control the fire ant an area must be treated at least three times, six months apart. They say efforts based on one application every 12 months are token at best; and therefore a waste of money.

ANOTHER ROUND

Chalk up another round for EPA. How many rounds will it take before EPA scores a knockout punch? EPA and OSHA have already put this nation on it's knees. How much can we take before being flattened?

EPA and OSHA regulations have probably contributed more to inflation than any other single factor including the increased price of imported crude oil, yet our national news media, public watchdogs that they are, refuse to even approach the truth about EPA and OSHA.

CONSUMER UNAWARE

The average American had no idea that Congress was even thinking about the current Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act that EPA now administers and the creation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

I believe that if the average American knew what these two agencies were doing he would demand that they be abolished or their absolute power be curtailed drastically. But the average American is not going to know because the national news media is not going to tell him.

They would rather report scandals like Watergate, what the bird watchers in New York thought about killing those birds in Kentucky or maybe that some freak from the concrete abyss of Chicago thinks about putting a safe insecticide like Mirex out in Georgia to kill a pesky fire ant. Personally, I would like to see some of these self anointed experts on our environment forced to stand in a bed of fire ants about five minutes. But that's not likely to happen either.

WRITE LETTERS

What can farmers do then? Write letters. Sound simple? It is. But how few letters our lawmakers receive from their constituents. One Senator told a friend of mine that he figured one letter represented the views of 50,000 people.

That was based on the average number of letters he received on each bill that he voted on. Very few farmers realize the impact that just one letter has. It is way past time farmers

let themselves be heard and not just talking to each other at country stores and other gathering places.

NIT-PICKING

dustry people concerning nit-picking rules. Some of the facts related to me by in-and regulations they are forced to adhere to by EPA are enough to create a national scandal.

Rules and regulations are passed on to industry without any regard to cost or possible consequences. These added costs are passed on to the farmer but he cannot add these costs to his selling price; he has to take what the "Market" is. But you can bet EPA and OSHA's influence is reflected in everything he buys—equipment, repair parts, pesticides, tools, fertilizer, etc.

LABEL COSTS

Talk to any basic manufacturer about the cost of getting a label for a pesticide starting from scratch. I wonder sometimes why they even try.

Last spring I was talking to the office of one of our Georgia Lawmakers about the re-entry standards being proposed for cotton by EPA. They were trying to keep anyone from going into cotton fields until seven days had elapsed after applying Parathion. I inquired how EPA could ignore expert testimony given at hearings all over the U.S. and still propose such ridiculous regulations. His answer was, "Mr. Fulford, this crowd is doing just as they damn well please."

LICENSE REQUIREMENTS

Well, I believe him. Farmers are really going to believe, too, when they get through going to school and taking exams for a license to apply pesticides. That's right. In case you haven't heard, anyone who applies a restricted use pesticide after October 21, 1976 will have to be certified. That means every farmer in our country.

Imagine if you will, farmers everywhere sitting in classrooms attending classes on pesticides and then taking an exam to see if they are qualified to apply them. Sound ridiculous? It is, especially, in view of the excellent safety record farmers everywhere have in the application of pesticides.

Can you imagine how much this venture is going to cost? how many wasted hours? the red tape? the bureaucratic lollygagging and just plain needless effort that will be expended by this monster created by congress?

TO LIVE IN AMERICA BE A REAL AMERICAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, consistent with the House debate on the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time, an article by Michael Killian of the Chicago Tribune, May 4, which with a light touch, dramatizes some of the objections we heard on the floor today from Members who, for various alleged reasons, opposed this bill.

The article follows:

TO LIVE IN AMERICA BE A REAL AMERICAN (By Michael Killian)

Seeing the generous American spirit in action is enough to warm the cockles of the heart.

To about 212 degrees Fahrenheit.

Consider the response of so many of our glorious elected leaders to the decision to allow between 50,000 and 70,000 South Vietnamese refugees to immigrate to the United States.

You would have thought the South Vietnamese were black welfare mothers trying to crash the Daughters of the American Revolution.

A proposed resolution welcoming the refugees was resolutely voted down by a margin of 7 to 1 in the Seattle city council. Other politicians in such enlightened provinces as California yelled and screamed about how the South Viets would bring in strange jungle diseases and take away American jobs.

Instead of congratulating President Ford and the Pentagon on their last-minute rescue or some 6,000 refugees from Peoples' Liberation beheading squads, the carping liberals on Capitol Hill complained that Ford violated their precious War Powers Act in doing so.

What are a few heads when it comes to the sanctity of liberal legislation? Besides, most of those refugees really aren't "people," but merely members of the South Vietnamese middle class.

Such hypocritical knavery is to be expected of elected leaders, especially those on Capitol Hill. But I wondered if they truly

reflected the attitudes of the millions of average Americans who have made our country what it is today.

To find out, I set forth with a tape recorder. To get a truly representative response, I also borrowed my neighbor Mad Marvin's time machine. Here is the transcript:

Q. Mr. Lopez, are you opposed to the immigration of South Vietnamese refugees to the United States?

A. Sure, man. They just gonna bring in diseases and take away our jobs. We got a recession here and we oughta take care of our own first. I got it bad enough makin' payments on my motorcycle. Why they want to come to America, anyway? Why don't they stay in their own place?

Q. Mrs. Bernstein, are you opposed to the immigration of Cuban refugees to the United States?

A. Yes! They'll come in here with their cigar leaves and ruin Miami. They don't even speak English. If they don't like that Castro of theirs, that's their problem.

Q. Mr. Antonelli, are you opposed to the immigration of Jewish war refugees to the United States?

A. You betcha. We fight the war for them; what more do they want? I didn't build no concentration camps. They just come in and take our businesses. I work hard for what I got. Send them to Palestine where they belong.

Q. Mrs. Kosinski, are you opposed to letting more Italian immigrants into the United States?

A. I am. They shiftless and gangsters and smell up the neighborhood with their cooking. We got a nice neighborhood. We work hard for our houses in steel mill. No Italians!

Q. Mrs. Kelly, are you opposed to letting Polish refugees immigrate to the United States?

A. Sure, that I am. They may be Catholic, but they don't speak English. They don't know how to vote. 'Twasn't easy for us, you know. We're not going to give up what's ours to any Poles.

Q. Mr. Haynesworth, are you opposed to allowing Irish immigrants into the United States?

A. What, those drunken bog-trotters? They need not apply. We didn't cause their potato famine. If they have no potatoes, let them drink whisky. But not here. America for the Americans.

Chief Running Fox, are you opposed to letting English immigrants settle in America?

A. Me opposed. No English. America for Americans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 15, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Edward H. Porter, Hughes United Methodist Church, Wheaton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank You for the blessings of community whereby Your gifts feed us, teach us, defend us, and enrich us in many ways.

We pray for our Nation—assist its residents to enlarge their responsibility for one another. Help its leaders to lead wisely. Bring us all to a deeper devotion to the common good.

Give health of body, mind, and spirit to the Members of this Congress. Sustain them in the anguish of difficult decisions, the rigor of hard work, and the role of dedicated servant.

Help them to trust in You in the times of turmoil and testing knowing that the hands into which we commit ourselves are tender and dependable. 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. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of a revised edition of the House document, "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution

providing for the printing as a House document of the hearings and panels of the Select Committee on Committees; and

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the booklet entitled "The History and Operation of the House Majority Whip Organization—94th Congress."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1509. An act to prohibit pyramid sales transactions, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. John Nicholas Brown as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution au-