

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Brock) proposes an amendment:

On page 1, line 7, insert the following: "It is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Rules and Administration shall conduct a tally of all precincts in which there was a change in the count for either Mr. Wyman or Mr. Durkin from the election night totals to the recount totals."

And strike the existing text on line 7 through 12 of pages 1.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Does the Senator desire to ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment tonight?

Mr. BROCK. No, I do not.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Does any Senator wish to debate the amendment tonight?

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senate will resume consideration of the New Hampshire election dispute. The question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. Brock.

A live quorum probably will ensue after the two leaders, or their designees, have been recognized under the standing order.

Rollcall votes are expected on tomorrow.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:08 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Saturday, June 21, 1975, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 6) 1975:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Daniel J. Boorstin, of the District of Columbia, to be Librarian of Congress, vice Lawrence Quincy Mumford, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA HONORS
PAUL ROGERS; GRADUATES
100,000TH

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, graduation exercises at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Fla., were marked by the graduation of the 100,000th graduate of this great institution, the conferring of an honorary doctor of law degree on our friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL ROGERS, and an outstanding commencement address by Congressman ROGERS.

Congressman ROGERS was cited by his alma mater particularly for his contributions in the field of national health legislation. In this his 11th term in the Congress, he chairs a particularly vital subcommittee having jurisdiction over legislation dealing with health manpower, mental health, drug abuse, and the Food and Drug Administration.

His distinguished career includes a leadership role in the enactment of the National Cancer Act, the National Heart and Lung Act, and the Clean Air Act.

As an alumnus, Congressman ROGERS was particularly pleased to be present as a graduate accepted the 100,000th graduation certificate from the University of Florida. The ranks of Florida graduates extend to all corners of the globe and their record of service to humanity in all walks of life has been exemplary.

In congratulating our colleague, I would like to commend to you his remarks. They are as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA

President Marston, distinguished faculty, ladies and gentlemen and most importantly—graduates... It is an honor to be present today as each of you receives recognition of your abilities and hard work by receiving your degree. Congratulations to you—to your families who have been supportive of your efforts—and to the President and this distinguished faculty of one of the outstanding universities of our nation. You enhance the stature of the University of Florida and will

continue to as you assume your place in community and national life.

To return to one's alma mater is nostalgic—and stirs memories of the years spent here—but it is also invigorating to sense the excitement of the anticipations of the future—particularly at a graduation.

As you graduate—this nation is fast approaching its bicentennial year—200 years as a democracy.

It is appropriate I think, to take note of what was said at a commencement exercise in 1775: 200 years ago.

Samuel Johnson, told the class of 1775 at Kings College, now known to us as Columbia University, the following—

"Happy yourselves you cannot be, without knowledge and virtue. These must therefore, still be the great pursuit of your lives. You must not therefore now lay aside your Looks, but still, as far as the business of life will permit, be continually building upon the foundation already laid. And that you may be virtuous as well as knowing, devote yourselves to a steady course of diligence, and renounce all idle companions, and vicious company, and be perpetually upon your guard against all temptations to intemperance and lewdness, to luxury and excess, and all untoward mischievous and unreasonable passions."

In contrast, the humorist and writer Art Buchwald told a graduating class just recently, quote: "We are handing you a perfect world, now don't mess it up."

Of course, Buchwald humorously suggests that the world is less than perfect, and I would add, I think there never was a more appropriate time for the eternal message of commencement—that you have a great task before you.

As there is a beginning and an end to life, there is a beginning and an end to an individual's contributing years. Some start earlier and some stay longer. But graduation from college is usually the commencement of the college trained individual's contributions to society.

And I would say that I sincerely hope that you as individuals do not see your education simply as an item of currency. For to use education as a tool solely for personal gain is to devalue the currency of an education.

Many today feel that there are no more "New Frontiers" to bring challenge to their lives. Yet, even casual notice reveals current problems and challenges which make even those of current a fledgling and new nation 200 years ago pale by comparison.

Take the question of environment. In 1775, the blacksmith at his forge was the heavy in-

dustry, the local woodlot was the power plant, and natures call for one's horse was the transportation pollution.

Today the question is whether our environment can indeed survive it. When a citizen of 1775 looked to the sky, he wondered if it would rain or not. Today we face problems of acid rains, of polluted air and the possibility that we may be destroying the ozone layer of the atmosphere which protects the entire earth from the sun's radiation.

The challenge is—will society be willing to pay the price and sustain the effort just recently begun, for cleaning up the environment. The technology is here; the question is commitment—individual as well as national.

Basic to the quality of life is one's health. Citizen circa 1775 was lucky to live past age 40. His health was his own worry, and each family took care of its own, young and old alike. No great medical centers. No nursing homes. Today we look upon health as a right. The government has taken a leading role in addressing that problem, and is on the verge of establishing a national health insurance program—one will be set forth in 1976. A national shortage and maldistribution of doctors and nurses and better delivery of health services challenges all who are interested in the health field.

Food, the physical sustenance of man, is a timeless problem. The main difference between citizen 1775 and us today is the variety and quantity.

Today, we face not the old question of simply feeding our people as in 1775. Rather we face the question of our moral responsibility of leadership in a hungry world. Half the people on this earth go to bed hungry. The question you face today is how to help these people best. Not to decide is to decide.

And then there is energy. In 1775, when energy was needed, down came a tree. For the next 100 years our timberlands served as an ample supply to our already energy-intensive society.

By 1850, 91 percent of our energy came from wood. Now we are dependent on petroleum, with about 35 more years of oil left, no other sources yet ready to take its place and the foreign owners of most of it willing to send Western industrial society down the tube at \$15 a barrel.

As you know, Congress is presently grappling with this problem. Alternative energy sources are being developed. But the answer will not be found just in laws that will be written, because the problem is, I think, fundamental to our approach to life.

For too many years we have crammed unlimited resources and energy into an eco-

conomic machine and delighted at the end result—a continually enlarging gross national product.

We have defined the "good life" in terms of greater acquisition of energy intensive, resource-depleting, short lived goods. And we call it a "standard of living".

We have millions of cars—which don't last, are repaired, but not for long, and in the meantime pollute.

We also have more televisions, more radios, more plastics, more throw away containers, more aerosol spray cans, more electric pencil sharpeners than any other nation.

In other words, is *more* always good? Is this to be equated with quality of life? I think not.

I have a sense that the thinking of the young people today runs contra to the equating of materialism with quality. In the not too distant future I think we will see beginning an awareness of the fact that our lifestyle in America must change to meet the times—just as our lifestyle has changed in the past to meet demands. Your leadership will be needed.

I have touched on some of the problems facing us today, challenges which make life exciting—complex as they are. Each graduating class, each new generation, has faced problems which indeed seemed more difficult, more pressing than the one preceding it.

We all have benefited and, I am sure, take pride in the past accomplishments of our nation. But as we enter the third 100 years, we and particularly you, have tasks to be tended to and solutions to find.

My charge to you—is a recognition that our heritage and indeed our future demands the active participation of all of us. I am confident of your abilities and therefore confident in the future of this nation—I know you are equal to the task.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. JULIUS SUTTO
OF SAGINAW, MICH.

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, devoted service to Government is an admirable quality. Saginaw County in Michigan has been privileged for the last 27 years to have a man in office who has demonstrated such devotion. Mr. Julius Sutto has served Saginaw County in many ways in the past quarter decade. He was first elected as the supervisor of Spaulding Township in 1948, and held that office until July 1, 1964, when he became the first county controller. He will be retiring from that position on July 1, 1975.

Julius Sutto has held several positions of fiscal responsibility. From 1959 until April of 1964 he was the chairman of the county commission's finance and salaries committee. In April of 1964 he became the chairman of the board, and he held this position until he became county controller.

Mr. Sutto has demonstrated his abilities in many ways. The most notable is the fact that under his control, the county never had a deficit budget. I am certain that Mr. Sutto is one of the most astute financial county administrators. I wish the Federal Government would be so lucky as to have a man of his caliber at its disposal.

He worked on many projects which

have benefited this most important area of the State of Michigan immensely. Julius Sutto provided the incentive needed to get improvements in the social services building. He worked to have a better facility for neglected children. He obtained juvenile and health centers, and arranged to purchase land needed for the county infirmary and mental health facility. He is a man with great concern for his fellow human beings. A very memorable feat was Mr. Sutto's work in the building of the new county courthouse. Almost single-handedly he had worked to invest for the best use the funds obtained by a bond sale, and worked to help move everybody into the new structure. Officials commended him as "dollar conscious" and being more responsible for the completed structure than anyone else involved with the project.

His accomplishments include improved community services. The equalization department, planning department, mental health services department of public works parks and recreation have all done more for the county under the watchful eye of Julius Sutto. The airport has also been tremendously improved, providing an incentive for businesses to locate in the area because of the quality of such transportation.

Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues can easily see why my personal friend has been such a credit to Saginaw County. I enjoy working with such individuals because their fiscal talents help maintain a healthy economy and governmental efficiency. I seek these goals for the Federal Government just as much as Mr. Sutto did for the county government.

Mr. Sutto has been previously honored for his service to the community. In 1967 he was declared an "Outstanding Civic Leader of America" by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He has also been named a lifetime member of the Michigan Township Officers Association.

Mr. Speaker, when Saginaw County loses Julius Sutto on July 1 of this year because of his retirement, it will be losing one of the most valuable administrators in its history. I ask you and all my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Sutto for his most generous service, and congratulate him on being a truly outstanding individual.

WILLIAM C. WALSH

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this week, western Maryland lost one of its most distinguished citizens with the passing of Judge William C. Walsh. Judge Walsh was known not only throughout the State of Maryland but in the wider political and governmental councils in this country. He was a close associate of my late father's, and I considered it a great honor and privilege to count him among my friends and my advisers. I extend

my heartfelt sympathy to his family and his many friends.

Judge Walsh attended St. Patrick's School in Cumberland, Md. and graduated from Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg. He then received a law degree from Catholic University Law School. Judge Walsh served on the Mexican border in 1916 and was with the AEF in France during World War I with distinguished service in the 29th Division.

He later served as city attorney for Cumberland and was appointed to the fourth judicial circuit bench in 1921. He later served as a member of the Maryland Court of Appeals. From 1931 to 1953, Judge Walsh was State insurance commissioner, and in 1935 he was elected State attorney general.

Judge Walsh served in many organizations including the Allegany Bar Association and a stint as president of the Maryland Bar Association. In Democratic politics, he served as delegate to national conventions in 1924, 1928, 1932, 1940, 1944, and 1964. He was a member of the board of regents of the University of Maryland.

Judge Walsh will be sorely missed by his family and friends. His efforts on behalf of his community and his pursuit of excellence in all his undertakings marked his entire career. His life could well serve as an example to all young people interested in the future of their society.

THE NEED FOR UNITED STATES TO
SPEAK UP FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most welcome developments of the past few years has been the lessening of tensions between our country and the U.S.S.R. But if détente is to have any lasting value, it must involve an exchange of ideas and values as well as machinery and grain. It should bring out the best in both countries, not the lowest common denominator.

For example, a country with our heritage of and commitment to individual rights and freedoms has an obvious moral responsibility to speak up and to work for the freer emigration of Soviet Jews. The number of Jews the U.S.S.R. has allowed to emigrate has fallen from approximately 35,000 in 1973 to slightly over 5,000 for the first 5 months of this year. It is estimated that there is a backlog of more than 140,000 Soviet Jews who have indicated a desire to emigrate—and that total grows by about an additional 3,000 each month.

The U.S.S.R. is not content with merely discouraging Jews from emigrating by subjecting them to unreasonable and arbitrary delays. It also systematically harasses and, in some cases, even imprisons Jews seeking exit visas. My constituents have brought two recent cases to my attention.

Gregori Hess and his family in

Minsk—his wife Elena and daughters Galia and Margaret—applied for exit visas to Israel. They have not received them. Recently they participated in a 3-day hunger strike protesting the sentencing of two other Soviet Jews—Boris Tsitlionok and Mark Nashpitz—to five years exile. Tsitlionok and Nashpitz received this punishment because they were peacefully protesting the treatment of other Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate.

Vladimir Lazaris of Moscow, his wife and his child, applied for exit visas. The wife and child were granted their visas and have left the country. Vladimir was denied his visa. Shortly afterwards he was dismissed from his job as a clerk in the patent bureau. Now he suddenly finds himself charged with treason and anti-Soviet propaganda.

These cases, unfortunately, are not isolated instances. The same theme of harassment is repeated thousands of times with different variations—a 7-year wait for a visa, suspension from a school while awaiting a visa, repeated threats, and so on.

Obviously, we cannot dictate the internal practices of the Soviet Union. But neither can we throw up our hands and turn away from the problems of the Soviet Jews. Martin Neimoller, a German theologian, described the potential danger of such indifference when he wrote of his own experience some four decades ago:

In Germany, the Nazis first came for the Communists, and I did not speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not speak up because I was not a Trade Unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I was a Protestant so I did not speak up. Then they came for me . . . by that time there was no one to speak up for anyone.

Whatever liberalization of Soviet policy we have seen in the past has been the result of world opinion. Only by speaking up in behalf of the Soviet Jews and pursuing all diplomatic alternatives can we mobilize world opinion and make the world a safer place for the Soviet Jews and for all people, of all religions and all nations, who value individual rights and freedoms.

CITY OF SANTA ANA HONORED

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today to inform my colleagues in the House of an honor that has been bestowed on the city of Santa Ana, Calif., which is the largest city in my district.

As many Members may already be aware, the California State Veterans Employment Committee gives a certificate of commendation to employers who make a special effort to hire veterans. Until now the awards have only gone to private sector employers. On June 2 of

this year, however, the committee awarded the certificate of commendation to the Santa Ana City Council for achieving a veterans hiring rate of 39 percent. I sincerely hope that other cities will follow the example set by Santa Ana, Calif., and make a concerted effort to "Hire a Vet."

UTILITY ADVERTISING COSTS
SHOULD NOT BE BORNE BY CONSUMERS

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, virtually everyday, the average consumer can pick up his or her paper or magazine and be greeted by full-page ads telling them that utility rates are the biggest bargain on record. These advertisements are paid for and signed by the utilities themselves. In addition to the fact that these ads are largely untrue, the consumer, in most cases, is totally unaware that he or she is paying for the costs involved, which are usually quite high. And, the private utilities benefit from this state of affairs because they deduct for income tax purposes the cost of advertising, promotional, and public relation campaigns.

The most recent figures available for advertising and promotion costs of private electric and gas utilities are the 1972 figures issued by the Federal Power Commission. They indicate that in 1972, over \$222 million was spent on only two reportable categories in the FPC accounting system. However, there are a number of other expenditures for advertising and promotion that cannot be isolated in dollar figures. It is safe to say that for every dollar reported, another dollar is spent. And, it is not unreasonable to project that the private utilities are spending approximately one-half billion dollars annually to promote themselves to the public, and deducting every penny. Further, these expenditures have been growing by quantum jumps each year.

Certainly, it is totally inconsistent to provide a tax deduction for advertising or promoting energy consumption at a time when energy costs are skyrocketing. Certainly, it is ridiculous for companies to promote energy consumption when we are faced with energy shortages. And, it is a travesty to allow those companies to deduct expenses for such advertising at the expense of the energy consuming public, for every cent of the vast promotion costs eventually ends up on the bills of consumers.

Only a few States require that advertising and promotional expenses be treated as nonoperating costs, thus preventing them from being used in computing the rate base that will determine consumer charges. Nonoperating expenses must, instead, be borne by utility shareholders. By forcing the utility to pay its own advertising and promotional costs through their shareholders, we could guarantee declines in the level of overall costs. Therefore, I have joined in the

cosponsorship of H.R. 6926, which would require just this; it would require electric and gas utility companies to pay their advertising bills out of profits instead of tax deductions or utility bills. It would prohibit them from passing the burden of costs to the customer.

Reduced utility company advertising is a growing national trend. New York, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma have already adopted general laws restricting utility ads. Eight more are probing the subject. Nineteen States have declared that at least a portion of advertising expenses are forbidden. Since, in a number of jurisdictions there has been voluntary compliance with public utility commission orders, this illustrates that Government initiative can be a major force in curtailing the abuses and benefits now enjoyed by public utilities in general.

The current advertising campaigns of utility companies represents a state of mind that in no way recognizes our present energy realities. The utilities obviously do not, or fail to understand that as they come forward consistently asking for increased rates, they are being outrageous and unreasonable. However, as long as our Government allows them to pass along expenses to the public, it will surely continue. As long as utilities are allowed to advertise at no expense to their shareholders, they have no incentive to do otherwise.

Advertising is usually used as a competitive tool. Yet, utilities are monopolies with no competitors. They are guaranteed a reasonable profit by law. Therefore, there should be no reason for these companies to advertise at all. The public needs their product and has no choice but purchase from them.

In the last year, the Nation's gas and electric consumers have been hit by unparalleled rate increases. Some cities have seen rates doubled. Although H.R. 6926 would not guarantee a sharp alteration of consumer bills, it would end the passthrough of costs to consumers and be a major step toward alleviating the growing number of complaints of the public. The bill, in addition, will not prevent advertising by utility companies. But it would require their shareholders to shoulder advertising costs.

I sincerely believe that H.R. 6926 is a commonsense protection measure. And, it is long overdue. We must understand that the average utility bill payer in this country has been confronted with an unreasonable and merciless drain on his or her income by the exorbitant utility bills. The least Congress can do is to aid the consumer by ending this senseless promotional game playing on the part of our public utilities.

THE DEATH OF RICHARD C. OSHLO

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, Richard C. Osho, a man who made many important contributions to his local community of

Council Bluffs, Iowa, and to his Nation died May 30 at the age of 54, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him.

A resident of Council Bluffs, Mr. Oshlo served as mayor and city councilman from that community. During World War II, he compiled one of the most brilliant service records of any American soldier.

Mr. Speaker, an article summarizing Mr. Oshlo's achievements appeared on May 30 in Council Bluffs' daily newspaper, the Nonpareil. In view of the fact that Mr. Oshlo, through his civic and military service, left us an important legacy, I would like to take this opportunity to share this article with my colleagues. The article follows:

CANCER CLAIMS LIFE OF RICHARD OSHLO

Army Reserve Col. Richard C. Oshlo, 54, former Council Bluffs mayor, councilman and building contractor, is dead.

Oshlo of 2228 Avenue B died Friday at the Veterans Hospital in Omaha of cancer. He had been ill two years.

He served as mayor in 1964.

He was the U.S. Army's youngest lieutenant colonel in World War II, and at 23 commanded an infantry battalion during the Italian campaign. He served as battalion commander in the Iowa National Guard before joining the U.S. Army Reserve School in 1969.

In July 1974 he received a Meritorious Service Medal for four years outstanding service as commandant of the 5049th U.S. Army Reserve School in Omaha.

Cl. Oshlo's military decorations include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with oak leaf cluster and "V" device, Combat Infantry Badge, Presidential Unit Citation and the Military Cross of Valor, presented by the Italian government.

Oshlo was president and owner of the Oshlo Construction Company since 1948. He was a director for Western Federal Savings and Loan Association, served as secretary and currently president of the 361st Infantry Association of World War II. He was a graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School.

Survivors include his widow, Doris; two sons, Richard Jr. of Washington, D.C., and Douglas, at home; daughter, Deborah, at home and a brother, Robert of Grand Island, Nebr.

ALL CREATURES GREAT AND SMALL

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 448 introduced by Mr. BELL to save the whale.

The needless and senseless slaughtering of whales by Japan and the Soviet Union must be stopped. We should cease buying Japanese and Russian goods in order to make these countries realize the seriousness of their actions, and the boycott should continue until this deplorable practice ends. Otherwise, the very serious possibility of extinction will become a sad fact if the rapacious harvesting of whales by these two countries is allowed to continue. Japan and the Soviet Union have openly ignored international conventions calling for a moratorium on whaling.

The real tragedy of this abhorrent whaling is its needlessness. All of the products produced from whales—pet-food, fertilizer, lipstick, shoe polish, lubricants, and soap—can be produced economically from other sources.

The United States outlawed whaling by Americans and placed an embargo on all whaling products in 1971. Mr. BELL's resolution calls for an embargo on all goods produced in part or in whole, or distributed by foreign enterprises that engage in commercial whaling.

The largest animal in the world will soon become a museum fossil like the passenger pigeon unless we stop its genocide. It is particularly appropriate to recall the poetry of Cecil Francis Alexander who wrote in 1848:

All things bright and beautiful,
All creatures great and small,
All things wise and wonderful,
The Lord God made them all.

DO NOT FORGET OUR MIA'S

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, despite the official end of our involvement in Vietnam, many of us have not forgotten the fact that we still have not received from the Government of North Vietnam satisfactory information regarding our men listing as missing in action. Therefore there are still thousands of Americans who have had no word of the plight of their friends and loved ones who are among the 1,300 MIA's.

On May 12, East Rockaway, N.Y., Post No. 958 of the American Legion adopted a resolution urging that our national flag be flown at half-mast on the last day of each month in honor of our MIA's until we have received definite word of their status.

To express my wholehearted endorsement of this resolution, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the flags on all Federal buildings be flown at half-staff on the last day of each month in honor of our MIA's.

At this point, I insert the resolution adopted by post No. 958:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are 1,300 men captured and missing in action in Southeast Asia and

Whereas, the Paris Agreement dated January 27, 1973 in Articles 8a and 8b of the Paris Agreement on the Laotian Protocol set forth the provisions in accounting for our missing in action and

Whereas, the demands of North Vietnam relative to the Saigon government have now been complied with and

Whereas, the war in Vietnam has come to an end and President Gerald Ford has stated that our military involvement has ceased and

Whereas, the search teams and other means of locating our captured and missing in action are no longer in existence and

Whereas, the families of our captured and

missing men are still suffering the torment of their loss and uncertainty and

Whereas, proper and fitting tribute should be paid to these valiant men;

Therefore be it

Resolved, by Post No. 958, The American Legion, Department of New York, at a regular meeting assembled in East Rockaway Post 958 on May 12, 1975, that our national flag be flown at half-mast on the last day of each month, until the captured and missing in action are properly accounted for and be it

Further resolved, That this resolution be adopted by the Nassau County Committee of the American Legion and be it

Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Department and the National Organizations for adoption by those bodies and if adopted, that the County, District, Department and National organizations publicize this resolution to the media and the Legion membership.

Attested to on this twelfth day of May, 1975.

ROBERT F. KEY,
Commander,
JOSEPH MARTINAITIS,
Adjutant.

INTRODUCING A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REDUCE RECESS FROM 10 TO 4 DAYS

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing a concurrent resolution to reduce the scheduled July 4 recess from 10 days to only 4 days, or from the end of business on July 3 to noon on July 8.

I do this on behalf of myself and 22 of my colleagues who think it is more important that the House of Representatives meet to deal with our Nation's energy and economic problems—rather than go on recess as scheduled from June 26 to July 8.

Like every other Member of Congress, I appreciate having the opportunity to return to my district during recesses.

In normal times, such recesses are in reality working days when many of us take the time to meet with constituents and discuss their opinions on the many matters pending before Congress.

However, these are not normal times, and our Nation is still beset with severe economic and energy problems.

In view of the fact that we have just returned from the Memorial Day recess, and can look forward to the traditional month-long August recess, I can think of no reason to justify taking a long July 4 vacation. We should remain in Washington to work on our energy and economic problems.

The Congress must face up to its responsibilities to the people of this country who elected it to serve them.

There are too many pressing problems before us which cannot wait, and to take a lengthy recess in view of them would be unpardonable.

Mr. Speaker, there is much talk in this country that Congress is ineffective

and can do nothing to begin solving our current dilemma.

We can only restore the people's confidence in the Congress abilities to deal with the Nation's problems by shortening the upcoming recess.

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 12, 1975, I initiated publication of a series of summaries of oversight activities scheduled for the 94th Congress, outlining the plan of the Committee on Science and Technology for discharging its responsibilities under the provisions of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

This is the seventh, and last, in the series on this subject and involves planned activities in the area of domestic and international scientific planning and analysis. In general terms, activities included under this category involve legislation and other matters relating to: survey, inquiries and special oversight into all nonmilitary research and development—excludes DOD and that falling under other subcommittees—analysis and advanced planning studies in all nonmilitary research and development; international technology transfer—includes economic effects—international cooperation in science and technology; special Federal-regional-State-local relations in science and technology—includes oversight of Federal-State research and development programs other than those of the Department of Defense or other subcommittees.

A summary of scheduled oversight activities in this area follows:

DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC PLANNING AND ANALYSIS
OVERSIGHT PLAN SUMMARY

Legislation under consideration

None.

Oversight

1. Surveys, Inquiries, and Special Oversight Into All Nonmilitary R&D:

a. *Scope of Special Oversight.* The Subcommittee feels that it should have a good understanding of just what the intent and purpose of the new "Special Oversight" amounts to. We will review the legislative history of the "Special Oversight" function through a staff study of the hearings, mark-up records, and reports of the Select Committee on Committees, and through briefings by the members and staff of the Select Committee, including its Chairman, Mr. Richard Bolling (completed). In order to benefit from the experience of the House Select Committee on Government Research (1964-5, Earl Elliott of Alabama, Chairman), the Subcommittee will review the hearings (2 vols.) and the 10 reports of the Elliott Committee.

b. *Survey of Laws on Nonmilitary R&D.* The rules of the House state that the special oversight function includes "review and study of all laws involving nonmilitary R&D."

CXXI—1270—Part 15

The Subcommittee will make a compilation of these laws.

c. *Federal Nonmilitary R&D.* For the purpose of getting a good overview of those Federal R&D activities for which the Subcommittee has special oversight responsibility, we will conduct a series of briefings and hearings on the total Federal R&D program (Phase I completed). Witnesses will include the Chairman of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, the Executive Secretary of the Federal Council, and the R&D officials of the major agencies engaged in the funding of research and development.

d. *Agriculture R&D.* As one of the specific, in-depth special oversight reviews, the Subcommittee proposes to conduct hearings on Agricultural R&D. The hearings will focus on the contribution American agricultural R&D is making to solving the world-wide food shortage and the long-range potential for increasing the resources of food and fiber. This hearing will be conducted jointly with the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology.

2. Special-Federal-Regional-State-Local Relations in Science and Technology:

a. *Criminal Justice R&D.* The Subcommittee will hold hearings on R&D in the field of criminal justice. A number of federal agencies have supported R&D in this field, and the Subcommittee would expect to focus further attention on this promising area of R&D.

b. *Information Exchange in Intergovernmental Science.* The massive R&D effort by the Federal Government produces a large number of reports and other results which may well be applicable to the solution of problems at the state and local level. The Subcommittee proposes to undertake hearings on this subject to determine whether information in this field is adequate.

3. Analysis and Advanced Planning Studies in All Nonmilitary R&D:

a. *Institutional Structure for R&D in Other Countries.* Useful lessons for the overall Government organizations for R&D may be learned from the way other countries have organized their R&D activities. The Subcommittee proposes to perform, with the assistance of the Library of Congress, a study of this subject for later review.

b. *Interdisciplinary and Inter-Agency Science Planning.* In order to avoid duplication and insure the best use of the available resources, a certain amount of planning for Government-wide R&D should be done. The Subcommittee will hold hearings to determine the extent to which such planning takes place and whether statutory strengthening in this area is called for.

c. *Impact of Science on Societal Goals.* An inquiry into the impact of science on the quality of life will be carried out. The focus of this inquiry will be the importance of continued rapid advances in science and technology in maintaining and advancing societal goals.

4. International Technology Transfer:

a. *Technology Transfer and International Trade.* The Subcommittee will initiate, through hearings, an overview of the broad trends in the transfer of advanced technology to foreign countries. Particular attention will be placed on the long term impact of such technology transfer on American science and technology.

5. International Cooperation in Science and Technology:

a. *Soviet-American Science Cooperation.* Since the former International Cooperation Subcommittee held hearings on this subject, a large number of new Soviet-American Cooperation agreements have been signed in such fields as cancer research, forestry research, etc. The staff will conduct a survey of these agreements and the activities being

conducted under them for subsequent review by the Subcommittee.

b. *Science In China.* A review will be initiated of the status of science in China, the extent of informal scientific exchanges that are now taking place, and the future expected potential of Chinese Science and its influence on science in the United States.

FREEDOM FOR SYRIAN JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 55 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle today joined Congressman SOLARZ and me in sending a telegram to President Ford calling on him to speak out in behalf of Syrian Jewry during his meeting here today with that country's foreign minister, Abdul Halim Khaddam.

We also sent a telegram to Foreign Minister Khaddam pointing out that the easing of emigration restrictions by his country would be recognized as a positive move toward peace in the Middle East and encourage better, more responsive United States-Syrian relations.

Our telegram to the President urged him to convey "the deep concern and interest of the American people and the Congress over the plight of Syrian Jewry and our desire that Syrian authorities allow those individuals who wish to emigrate from Syria to have the right to do so freely."

Foreign Minister Khaddam's visit follows the administration's decision to grant Syria a long-term loan of \$58 million to modernize and enlarge the Damascus water supply and for agricultural production.

In my view, this loan should be disallowed because it is both inconsistent with the United States basic traditions and beliefs, and contrary to the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 requiring that no assistance be furnished to any nation which denies its citizens the freedom of movement and emigration.

For the past several years, 4,500 Jews living in Syria have been the victims of numerous forms of discrimination, restrictions, arbitrary arrests, torture and general harassment. Forbidden to leave their country, Syrian Jews live as virtual hostages in their own land, in constant fear of the oppressive and suppressive policies of the Syrian Government. Moreover, in recent months the Syrian Jews' plight has considerably worsened. Indeed, as one observer noted, "a variety of harsh discriminatory measures continue to restrict the fundamental human rights of the 4,500 Jews in Syria, subjecting them to constant secret police surveillance and harassment, denying them educational and economic opportunities, and limiting their freedom of movement even within the country."

Yet, despite these repressive and rapidly deteriorating conditions, the Ford administration has callously chosen to

provide U.S. tax dollars to assist this repressive dictatorship.

The argument that U.S. aid to Syria advances the peacemaking process in the Middle East is totally without foundation.

In a region as fluid and unstable as the Middle East, a U.S. policy of aid to Syria at this time is tantamount to licensing further conflict. A U.S. capital expenditure for Syrian development frees Syria to invest still more of its own capital in war-making machinery.

This problem is particularly acute in light of the recent breakdown in the Arab-Israeli peace negotiations and a Syrian-Jordanian decision to establish a joint military command against Israel.

Similarly, implicit in the President's decision is an acceptance of the Syrian regime's domestic policies. This does little to resolve the emotional and psychological underpinnings of this long and bitter conflict.

Consequently, it is imperative that Congress, exercising its authority and the responsibility vested in it by part VI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, take prompt and decisive action disapproving the obligations and expenditure of funds for Syria at this time.

I have, therefore, joined with Representative SOLARZ and BINGHAM in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 312, a resolution to disapprove the obligation of \$58 million from the Middle East special requirements fund for certain projects in Syria as reported by the President to Congress under section 903(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Eye witnesses and other reliable sources have reported numerous discriminatory restrictions to which Syrian Jews are currently being subjected. The following is an updated listing of these restrictions compiled by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations:

Jews are forbidden to leave the country. They are not even permitted to join relatives in the United States, Canada or other countries far from the Middle East.

Jews still require special permission from the secret police to travel more than three miles from their homes.

A nightly curfew is still imposed on the Jews and they are subject to periodic roll calls.

Jews must carry special identity cards on which the word "musawi" (Arabic for Jewish) is written in large red letters across both sides of the card. Jewish bank accounts are similarly marked in red, as are Jewish homes in the town of Qamishli.

Jews are barred from employment in government offices, public bodies or banks. They have been arbitrarily dismissed from jobs without compensation and their license to conduct foreign trade revoked.

Jews are no longer able to obtain drivers licenses or to have telephones in their homes. (The only exceptions are doctors and a handful of merchants given preferential treatment.)

In the past few years only a handful of the many qualified Jewish students have been admitted to Syrian universities. As a result many young Jews are unemployed or eke out a living as peddlers.

Jews are forbidden to sell their homes or other real estate. The government takes over title to property of Jews who die if any heirs are no longer living in Syria. (In the case of

Moslem and Christian Syrians, the shares of heirs outside the country are divided among the family members remaining in Syria. It is only in the case of Jews that the government confiscates the property.) As a result, many Jewish families are reduced to poverty.

The Jewish schools have Moslem government-appointed principals and Jewish religious instruction is limited to four hours per week.

Military intelligence and secret police representatives frequently search Jewish homes. Jews are held for interrogations and tortured at the whim of the police.

The texts of the telegrams follows:

President GERALD R. FORD,
The White House:

We urge you to convey to Foreign Minister Khaddam of Syria, in your discussions with him today, the deep concern and interest of the American people and the Congress over the plight of Syrian Jewry and our desire that Syrian authorities allow these individuals who wish to emigrate from Syria to have the right to do so freely and to express their desire to do so without fear for their lives and property.

This request is particularly timely in light of the Administration's current decision to grant Syria a long-term loan of \$58 million. As you know, Section VI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 expresses the sense of Congress that such expenditure of funds be denied any nation refusing its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate freely.

HIS EXCELLENCY ABDUL HALIM KHADDAM,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic:

We want you to know of the deep concern and interest of the American people and the Congress over the plight of the Syrian Jewish community and our desire that Syria fulfill the obligation it assumed by signing the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. It is our hope that your government will allow those individuals who wish to emigrate from Syria the right to do so freely and to express their desire to do so without fear for their lives and property.

Such a step would be recognized as a positive move toward peace in the Middle East and encourage better, more responsive U.S.-Syrian relations.

The following Members of Congress signed the telegrams:

Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.).
Stephen J. Solarz (D-N.Y.).
Bella S. Abzug (D-N.Y.).
Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.).
Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.).
Mario Biaggi (D-N.Y.).
Jonathan Bingham (D-N.Y.).
Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.).
Don Bonker (D-Wash.).
John Brademas (D-Ind.).
George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.).
John L. Burton (D-Calif.).
Phillip Burton (D-Calif.).
James C. Corman (D-Calif.).
Philip M. Crane (R-Ill.).
Thomas J. Downey (D-N.Y.).
Don Edwards (D-Calif.).
Joshua Eilberg (D-Pa.).
Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.).
Hamilton Fish (R-N.Y.).
Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.).
Gilbert Gude (R-Md.).
Elizabeth Holtzman (D-N.Y.).
Edward I. Koch (D-N.Y.).
William Lehman (D-Fla.).
Elliott H. Levitas (D-Ga.).
Clarence D. Long (D-Md.).
Larry McDonald (D-Ga.).
Matthew F. McHugh (D-N.Y.).
Andrew Maguire (D-N.J.).
Edward Mezvinsky (D-Iowa).
Abner J. Mikva (D-Ill.).
George Miller (D-Calif.).

Norman Y. Mineta (D-Calif.).
Joe Moakley (D-Mass.).
John M. Murphy (D-N.Y.).
Richard L. Ottinger (D-N.Y.).
Claude Pepper (D-Fla.).
Thomas M. Rees (D-Calif.).
Frederick W. Richmond (D-N.Y.).
Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (D-N.J.).
John H. Roussetot (R-Calif.).
Jim Santini (D-Nev.).
Ronald A. Sarasin (D-Nev.).
James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.).
Richard T. Schulze (R-Pa.).
Paul Simon (D-Ill.).
Gladys Noon Spellman (D-Md.).
Steven D. Symms (R-Idaho).
Paul E. Tsongas (D-Mass.).
Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.).
Charles A. Vanik (D-Ohio).
Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.).
Lester L. Wolff (D-N.Y.).
John W. Wydler (R-N.Y.).
Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.).
Leo C. Zeferetti (D-N.Y.).

PRIVACY—REVISED

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, I had the privilege of witnessing an interesting and informative discussion before this distinguished Chamber, a discussion which should have meaning for every man, woman, and child in America. Several of my colleagues, in response to a special order sponsored by Mr. MOSHER and Mr. KASTENMEIER, offered their views on Federal Government surveillance of American citizens and, rightfully, spoke out against the continuation of this surveillance. The right of all Americans to the freedoms of speech and thought, as guaranteed by the Constitution, is too precious to sacrifice to the whim of either over-zealous or ill-intentioned Government leaders, agencies, or employees.

Unfortunately, however, there was no mention in that discussion of the contribution of ever-growing Federal bureaucracies to the diminishment of the right to privacy which is, of course, the adjunct of the freedoms of thought and speech. To Mr. MIKVA, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KOCH, and other colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle who participated in the discussion, I feel compelled to point out that each time you vote to expand the responsibilities of our Government, and thereby the number of Federal agencies and bureaucracies, so you chip away at the privacy and the freedom of all Americans.

As the Government grows—it now spends each year an amount that is equal to roughly one-third of the GNP—so does its intrusion into the lives of each and every citizen. Naturally, expenditures by private citizens on taxes go up, but so also does compliance with Federal rules and regulations. Such compliance may take place both in the home and at an individual's place of work. A recent example of how agency expansion can lead to unwarranted intrusion into the private realm is a case in which the

Environmental Protection Agency, in its zeal to enforce Federal pesticide laws, instituted a telephone "hotline" system. Via this phone system, an individual who suspects that another is misusing pesticides may call a toll-free number and report his suspicions. Then, the EPA will investigate. This kind of system is intolerable. But is there any reason why other Federal agencies may not sometime in the future follow the EPA's lead?

Of course, in order to secure compliance with its rules and regulations, the Government must keep detailed records and spend massive amounts on the collection of information. This record collection, in itself, can give rise to a number of problems. First, seemingly innocuous data on an individual may fall into the hands of someone who might have reason to suppress the rights of that individual. Second, agencies or bureaus whose function it is to secure information on certain individuals will naturally, as do all bureaucracies, seek to expand their authority and responsibility.

The ultimate result in this case could be the creation of false charges against a person or persons, or the "blowing-up" of a fairly unimportant issue, in order to justify the agency's own existence, or its request for additional funds at appropriations hearings. Finally, the cost of assembling computer systems in which to store information on individuals could necessitate or, at least, lead to any agency's increasing the scope of its data-collection system, in order to justify the cost of computerized equipment. This expansion in scope may not, in itself, be a bad thing; but the collection of information on a large scale could give an unscrupulous person or a Government trying to protect itself a firm grasp over the life of the citizen. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the computerization of personal data by one agency facilitates access to such data by another. In *Records, Computers, and The Rights of Citizens*, a book published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1973, it is noted:

Quick, cheap access to the contents of a very large automated file often prompts an organization or group of organizations to indulge in what might be called "dragnet" behavior (p. 15).

"Dragnet behavior" is defined, more or less, as behavior whereby one agency uses the resources of computers in other agencies to gain information regarding a citizen's past actions, rather than taking account of information submitted by the individual himself. In such cases, the privacy of the individual is compromised, because the Government has created a "public," though not necessarily accurate account of his life, and because surveillance via a review of computerized information is made much simpler.

While most of the data-gathering activities by the Government may be intended to serve the "public interest," we in Congress must be aware that our own actions here in Washington could, in the future, have very grave consequences. The more Congress spends in an effort to meet each and every need of our citizens, and the more agencies we see created to

fulfill Congressional intent, the greater the chance that an organization, through fulfilling its legislated function, will pry itself into the life of the individual.

Those to whom these remarks are addressed, and all who advocate Government solutions for every problem that an individual might have, will, I trust, consider the impact of their actions on our personal freedoms.

TRIBUTE TO P. S. 122—THE MAMIE FAY SCHOOL—50 YEARS OF PROVIDING QUALITY EDUCATION TO THE CHILDREN OF ASTORIA, N.Y.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to join with my many friends from Astoria in paying tribute to the Mamie Fay School which is celebrating the 50th anniversary of its founding. This is a very happy and proud time for not only the students, faculty, and administrators of the school, but the community of Astoria as well and for me as their Representative in the United States House of Representatives. There have been numerous celebrations and festivities to mark this important occasion. Yet perhaps the most significant gesture was made when the school administration chose to rename their school the Mamie Fay School after their beloved first principal.

On October 22, 1925 the Mamie Fay School—formally Public Law No. 122—officially opened its doors. It had actually been in operation for a month previously and in that short time their registration grew by 500 and the number of classes jumped from 27 to 37.

The Mamie Fay School in her early years met the challenges associated with being a new school in a rapidly growing community. The Astoria area grew in size and prominence in the early 20th century and rapidly became one of the most important industrial centers in the entire city of New York. The school grew equally as fast and the increase can be reflected in the following figures. In 1925, there were but 26 staff members; today there are more than 90 serving almost 1,500 students. The Mamie Fay School does show one decrease over time: Wherein 1925 the average number of students in a class was over 40, today the average class size is only 32, an excellent student-faculty ratio for an urban school.

Throughout her half-century history, the Mamie Fay School has been fortunate to have the highest caliber personnel serving on its faculty and administration. Their first principal, Mamie Day, for whom they named the school, served as principal from opening day in 1925 until her retirement in 1942. During her many years in education she gained the lasting respect of her students and her fellow educators. She was responsible for

organizing the first Greek-American school in a public school system to meet the demands of the large Greek-American community in Astoria. This effort gained her the prestigious Medal of Honor from the Greek Government. She also set up a school lunch program in Public School No. 122 before the idea even was considered by the New York City Board of Education. Finally, she was one of the early organizers of the Bureau of Child Guidance. I feel the school paid the most fitting tribute to this remarkable woman when they named the school she loved and served so well in her honor.

Presently, the Mamie Fay School is in the able hands of Principal Anthony J. LoCorto, a man whose dedication has continued to keep the Mamie Fay School one of the most respected schools in the entire city. He is assisted by assistant principals Norman Jerenberg, and Catherine Cannon. They are proud of Mamie Fay School's past but are more committed to insuring its continued success in the future.

In 50 years the school has graduated thousands of students, some of whom went on to become leaders in the community and the Nation. Mamie Fay graduates have contributed to all fields, from science and the arts to public service and sports. Some of their more famous alumni in the sports world include Billy Loes, pitching standout for the former Brooklyn Dodgers, Frank Fucarino, professional basketball star with Syracuse of the National Basketball Association, and Rudy Jezek, former Olympic sculling champion.

The Mamie Fay School is proud of its active Parent Teacher Association, which not only raises money for the school but consults regularly with the Principal about the curriculum. The recent elections for 1975-76 officers of the PTA produced the following results:

President, Marietta Haritonides; first vice president, Alicia Breitenbach; second vice president, Kathy Kontorines; treasurer, Ellen Popowich; corresponding secretary, Janice McGrouther; recording secretary, Penny Avallone.

I congratulate these individuals and am confident that they will continue to provide valuable assistance to the school in the years to come.

I extend my warmest congratulations to the students, faculty, and administration of the Mamie Fay School on their 50th anniversary. Their past success is well known, they can now embark on what I hope will be 50 more years of success and educational excellence.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD the names of the students of the Mamie Fay School who participated in a recent program marking their school's 50th anniversary. The names follow immediately:

OUR STARS

Amma Lee Cataldo, Dorian Torrecrossia, Glen Remtoop, Jack Lopez, Paul Katsaros, Maria Kehagias, Stacy Ziampuras, Sophia Keller.

George Columbus, Sandra Smith, Christine Davis, Rosemarie Simitian, Bridget Graham, Etelvina Marques, Arlene Porter, Marc Bader.

Jeffrey Dellapina, Gerald Nozilo, Roy

Standfest, Janice Hong, Anna Kleopoulos, Marcia Moraetis, Debra Picota, Lorena Salcedo.

Carol Xanthos, Anthony Caldarella, Kevin Friedel, Lazaro Lopez, Nick Politis, Michael Stafford, Mark Wood.

Michael Farina, Sherrill Golding, Kerry Lynch, Ida Scales, Filitsa Tampulos, Dwayne Johnson, Patricia Villa.

Frances Podimatis, David Duncan, Ernest Laurel, Jimmy Stroumbakis, Norma Dellapina, Denise Balcich, Sotiria Papadopoulou.

Veronica Caraballo, Helen Mintou, Lisa Kaeta, Gladys Bustillo, Bruce Whitfield, Gisela Sanchez, Donald Nozilo.

Gigi Dilomardo, Mario Bustillo, Dorcas Rivera, Athema Georclados, Omar Vendome, Themis Dilberakis, Liberty Mavrackakis.

Marylou Bakidis, Carmen Jimenez, Tanya Bentley, Anthony Balcich, Dino Hartofilis, Lupco Popovski, Tina Digilio.

Kallipe Kaouris, Karen McGruther, Janice Onorato, Frances Podimatis, Karen Scheneck, Richard Brown, William Ezzard.

James Lee, Gus Mantikas, Raymond Scheneck, Angelo Triolo, Andrew Zafferres, Robin Fessman, Nicole Haenny.

Lisa Major, Annette Scianno, Kim Tsiatsis, Chris Pangoureljas, Angelica Alvarez, Zinos Konstantiridis, Roberta Sirtori.

Vicky Anastasopoulos, Brian Ottey, Irving Wilson, Frencella Strickland, Carlos Sapp, Dino Depaolis, Carmen Sotomayor.

Andre Csizmadia, Dawn Major, Marisol Tenoris, Hilda Ortiz, Lisa Holderich, Kathryn Androus, Barbara Rodriguez.

Rosie McCall, Luis Garcia, Debbie Keller, Margaret Strong, Kathy Gostischa, Kyriaki Tsirikiki, Randy Estrado.

Emmanuel Arguelles, Steven Brown, Martin Higgins, Michael Popowich, Jean Finn, Christina Katsaros, Ginnette Mitchell.

Stacey Panton, Melissa Rufo, Jo Ann Surgeary, George Burleo, Henry Fernandez, Jose Leston, Carlos Mendoza.

Michael Scicolone, Scott Williams, Denise Balcich, Christine Kaouris, Sheila Hethington, Patricia Rufo, Heather Sheu, April Young, Perry Colon.

Loretta Negron, Arthur Polls, Ronald Holt, Mario Bustillo, Athina Collins, Bestna Rivera, Kathy Colombos, Antoinette Corcoran, Donald Reith.

JOHN BUCKLEY RETIRES AFTER DISTINGUISHED CAREER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest staff members this Congress has ever seen is retiring.

After more than 20 years of distinguished service as administrative assistant to Congressman DANTE FASCELL of Florida, John Buckley is leaving public service.

Those of us who have known this affable, energetic and gregarious gentleman are sorry to see him leave our midst and we are deeply concerned that his health has not been good for some time. We trust that the beautiful weather of our great State, where he will now reside, will be the tonic he needs.

John has about as many friends around here as any staff member I have known. He served as president of the Florida State Society and in that year, won a trophy as the Outstanding State Society.

Just prior to coming here with Congressman FASCELL, he served as one of nine State vice presidents of the Florida Jaycees. In typical fashion, he won the award given by that organization for the Outstanding State vice president.

Everything John attempted to do—he did it well.

He has the satisfaction of knowing that he has a host of friends and that our association with him vastly enriched our lives.

As he takes leave of Congress, I join with all those who would want to wish him well, years of good health and happiness. He has had a distinguished career and I know that our loss will be a gain for Dade County.

CONYERS CALLS ATTENTION TO THE WILMINGTON 10

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of Washington, D.C. declared Saturday, May 31, "Wilmington 10" day. The Wilmington 10 are: Rev. Ben Chavis, eight youths, and a mother of two. They were convicted and sentenced in October 1972 to a total of 280 years for burning property with an incendiary device and conspiracy to assault emergency personnel with dangerous weapons.

The Wilmington 10 case is similar to other cases arising out of the civil rights struggle the past decade, many of which unfortunately have gone unnoticed. This case has received national publicity because of the context of the indictments, questionable judicial proceedings and the severity of the sentences. It deserves our attention because it raises serious questions about our criminal justice system: for example, whether these and other defendants like them have received the full protection of their sixth amendment right to an impartial jury and have been informed of the accusations against them; of their eighth amendment right not to be burdened by excessive bail; and of their 14th amendment rights to equal protection of the laws and to due process.

The indictments of the Wilmington 10 grew out of a situation of extreme racial tension in Wilmington, N.C. The schools had been desegregated a short time. Black students were complaining of racial prejudice in the high schools, of the dearth of black teachers and coaches and of the lack of courses on black culture. Eight black students staged a peaceful sit-in after their request for a program memorializing Martin Luther King, Jr. was ignored by school officials. When these students were suspended, others decided to boycott the schools. The Gregory Congregational Church was the center of the boycott activity. On Thursday night, February 4, 1971, the Reverend Eugene Templeton, who is white, receive numerous anonymous phone calls from persons who threatened

to bomb the church. A group of black students were determined to defend the church and the surrounding community. Reverend Chavis, who was active in the North Carolina civil rights movement, was invited to Wilmington by black leaders. The black community held a march to protest conditions in the schools.

Beginning on February 5 and continuing several days bands of white men, organized through the Ku Klux Klan and another vigilante group known as "Rights of White People," roamed the streets of the black neighborhood. Community leaders called on city officials to impose a curfew, but they received no response. Sniping, arson and slayings occurred. Three white men were arrested for being "armed to the terror of the populace." A black youth was killed by police. A store was burned down. After a white man was killed and three others were wounded, National Guardsmen were called in and a curfew was imposed. The highly regarded Charlotte Observer reported these events. One year later Reverend Chavis and nine others who had occupied the church during this period were indicted.

I recently had the privilege of chairing public ad hoc hearings in Washington on the criminal justice system. The Wilmington 10 case was one of three cases discussed. The hearings disclosed disturbing aspects of the court proceedings. The two key prosecution witnesses were serving sentences for assault with a deadly weapon and armed robbery and had received favored treatment by the Government. The original jury of 10 blacks and two whites had been dismissed after the prosecutor became ill and the judge declared a mistrial. A second jury of 10 whites and 2 blacks was impaneled. The major prosecution witness attempted in open court to assault the chief defense lawyer, yet the latter was reproached for provoking the former. The judge refused to sequester the prospective jurors during the voir dire—ABA standards, call for such action under circumstances similar to those in the case—and refused to allow defense lawyers to probe for prejudices towards the defendants—even though some of the prospective jurors admitted to having them. The defendants were denied access to the pretrial statement of the key prosecution witness and were not told the names of witnesses prior to the day of their testimony.

Three weeks ago the North Carolina Supreme Court refused to review the Wilmington 10 case. The defendants are appealing their convictions to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Commission for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ with its financial support has enabled them to do this. It is not appropriate at this time to pass judgment on the case though in the interest of justice the Wilmington 10 case deserves to be fully aired. I wish to share with my colleagues a commentary on the case by Colman McCarthy published last year in the Washington Post. It has not lost its relevance for today:

AT JUSTICE'S EXPENSE

One reason citizens often have little chance against government persecution or

harassment is the lack of money. They are priced out of the justice market, its expense far beyond the savings of common citizens.

Government prosecutors have a deep till of public money to reach into—as exemplified in the run of peace movement trials, with convictions rare—but the lone citizen is on his own.

In June, in Wilmington, N.C., a case will be appealed that illustrates both the importance of a defense fund and the ordeals of a citizen when the state appears ready to use the law less for social justice than for political vengeance. The case—the trial of the Wilmington 10—might be dismissed as a fluke breakdown of North Carolina's legal machinery, except it is part of a pattern suggesting that harassment of black civil rights workers has high priority in a state that ironically boasts of its New South Image.

The central member of the Wilmington 10 defendants is the Rev. Ben Chavis. A young ordained minister with a chemistry degree from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, he is the Washington director of the United Church of Christ's commission for racial justice. The church itself is a denomination with a rich tradition of authentic social commitment.

Chavis is a native of Oxford, N.C., a fact which keeps him free of the "outside agitator" charge so often hung on civil rights workers. Nor have a number of other charges against Chavis stuck. In April 1968 he was charged in Charlotte with trespassing and held in \$200 bond; the charges were dismissed. In October 1970, he was charged in Henderson, N.C., for a faulty signal light (\$200 bond); the charge was dismissed. In April 1971 in Raleigh, he was charged with assaulting a police officer (\$500 bond); the charges were dismissed. In October 1971, a Wilmington judge declared him not guilty of driving an unregistered vehicle (\$500 bond). In December 1971 in Wilmington, he was acquitted of a charge of accessory after the fact in a murder case (\$100,000 bond). In April 1972, he was declared not guilty of aiding federal fugitives, not guilty of conspiracy against the U.S. government, and had charges dismissed for possession and manufacture of illegal firearms (\$20,000 bond). In January 1972, he was charged with running a stop sign, failing to show a registration card and disruption of public schools; he was eventually cleared of all charges. When he wasn't in jail awaiting one trial or another, Chavis was often hauled to courts in leg irons and waist chains; in addition, in one free period, his car was destroyed by a firebomb and he narrowly escaped death.

Because Chavis had a solid academic record and a commitment to nonviolent social reform, his ordeal was noticed within the state. A Charlotte Observer editorial called his treatment "harassment" and "persecution," and said that Chavis "is beginning to look more and more like the target of political rather than criminal prosecutions." The Observer noted what it called "a strange twist." When the federal government came after Chavis for aiding two fugitives to flee to Canada, it dropped charges against the fugitives. The newspaper likened this to "permitting the big fish to go free in hopes of catching the little fish." Although Chavis was acquitted in this case, his friend James Grant, a Penn State Ph.D. in chemistry and a former VISTA worker in Charlotte, was convicted. He now does time in the Atlanta federal prison. The same government witnesses whose word led to Grant's being put away for 10 years were also the government's star witnesses in its case against Grant and two others, known as the Charlotte Three. Amazingly, as recently revealed by The Observer, the government's witnesses were secretly paid at least \$4,000 each by the Justice Department and were granted immunity from prosecution on several charges.

The upcoming appeal of Ben Chavis and

the Wilmington 10 follows their October 1972 conviction on firebombing and conspiracy charges. Each in the group (eight were teen-aged students) received astonishingly severe sentences; for most, it will be 1994 before their minimum imprisonment has been reached. Chavis could be imprisoned until the year 2009. In the period of the alleged crime—early 1971—Wilmington was turbulent with racial unrest following desegregation of two high schools. Chavis came to Wilmington at the request of a white United Church minister, to help avoid potential violence by counseling the youth of the black community.

Even aside from the string of arrests and dismissals, friends of Chavis became suspicious of the state when a mistrial was declared. A jury of ten blacks and two whites had been accepted by the defense, with the prosecutor not yet agreeing. But when the latter suddenly announced that he was ill, and with no backup prosecutor available, the judge called a mistrial. A second trial—this time the jury make-up was reversed: ten whites and two blacks—convicted the group. An appeal was made, with bail at \$50,000. Chavis remained imprisoned for three months until the church raised bail; it was nine months in prison for the teen-agers until the church could raise money for them. Bail totaled \$350,000. In standing behind the group, the church followed its policy of providing money for its workers or local churches caught up in litigation. More, the church states that none of the Wilmington 10 has a criminal record. All maintain they are innocent. Competent attorneys are convinced there were serious errors in the procedures of their trial, errors in rulings by the judge and possible admission of tainted evidence.

Ben Chavis lives nervously these days. Currently working in Washington for the church that avidly believes in him, and taking theology courses at Howard University, he has seen his friends swept off to prison by the same techniques now used against him: the state's use of questionable witnesses, high bail and severe sentences. One of those interested in Chavis' case is Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.), a congressional Black Caucus member. Last year, a Conyers' aide, Stuart House, went to Wilmington to investigate. "Ben Chavis is an emerging black leader in North Carolina," House says. "But it's clear he's being railroaded. Some authorities see him a prime political whipping post. So they have charged him with all kinds of things, and they appear determined to get him one way or the other."

Will they? Chavis and his young friends should know shortly. Unlike the trials of the peace movement which were given much public attention—and thus exposing the government's weak cases, if not its raw political intentions—few beyond North Carolina know much about the Wilmington 10. But are these blacks defendants reduced to that: depending not on justice for their freedom but on publicity, and hoping it will shame North Carolina's white officials into backing off?

CARL LIND—A FINALIST IN INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FAIR

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor today of informing the Members of the House of a science award recently won by a young

man from my home community of Santa Ana, Calif.

Mr. Carl Lind, a high school sophomore was, for the second time, selected as a finalist in the International Science and Engineering Fair. His project, honored at the fair in Oklahoma City last month, is "A Practical Method for 3D TV and Home Movies."

To be so honored out of thousands of science fair participants in the Nation is a credit to Carl's creative intelligence and dedication as well as a credit to his family and teachers.

I am sure all the Members of the House join me and all of Carl's friends in Orange County, Calif., in offering our heartiest congratulations.

HON. LUCIEN NEDZI

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the debate on Monday, June 16 regarding the matter of the acceptance of the resignation of the gentleman from Michigan, LUCIEN NEDZI, was somewhat curtailed and I did not have an opportunity to express my opinion on the matter.

I was still a student in college when LUCIEN NEDZI was first elected to the U.S. Congress. Ever since that time, I have had tremendous admiration for the man and for his work as a representative of his district and of the city of Detroit in which we both reside. I have also consistently admired and respected his outstanding accomplishments as a member of the Armed Services Committee.

When I became a Member of Congress this year, I welcomed the opportunity to get to know Mr. NEDZI personally. We in Michigan have a very close-knit congressional delegation, but there is none with whom I feel a closer personal friendship than with LUCIEN NEDZI.

I have found him to be intelligent, forthright, articulate and, above all, a man of the greatest integrity. He has extended many personal kindnesses to me and my feelings toward him are not only respect and gratitude, but real affection. If a new Member such as myself seeks a model of honor and rectitude, he could do no better than to emulate LUCIEN NEDZI.

I know that he would never allow considerations of personal friendship to deter him from doing what he thinks is best for the country. Thus, when we came to different conclusions about what is best for the country in the matter of the CIA investigation, I felt honor-bound to follow the dictates of my conscience. It would be a poor sign of my respect for Mr. NEDZI if I had allowed my feelings of personal friendship to persuade me to do otherwise.

It was, therefore, with the greatest reluctance that I voted to accept the resignation of Mr. NEDZI as chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

LEGISLATION TO BAN FIRST
CLASS TRAVEL FOR HOUSE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to cut back on a luxury which is clearly not necessary for the efficient conduct of our business—first class air travel.

The legislation I am introducing would limit reimbursement for first class air accommodations for Members and House employees on official business. This limitation would apply in all but a few exceptional occasions—such as when no other space is available, or when first class accommodations are necessary because of the health of the individual. The policy I am proposing for the House is identical to the GSA regulations which govern air travel for other Government officials.

Last month, a number of my colleagues joined me in opposing increases in various House allowances. Although the reasons for voting against increases were not identical, most of us believe that in this time of economic hardship, it simply is not appropriate for us to vote ourselves additional allowances. However, that attempt to hold the line was not successful.

One of the major increases voted last month was the number of round trips from Washington to the Member's district which are reimbursable. Many Members said that they needed more trips home to properly serve their constituents and that they could not afford to pay for them out of their own pockets.

But whether a Member travels first class or coach, he is going to arrive at the same time and at the same place. The additional cost of first class air travel is a luxury item and the extra expense is a premium incurred by the Government for essentially personal consumption considerations—rather than a necessary expenditure for the conduct of official business. My bill would not stop Members or staff from flying first class if they so choose—it would just force them to pay the difference between coach and first class air fare.

It is estimated that my bill would provide a cost savings of about \$1 million and equally important tell the people that we realize times are tough and we, too, are doing our part to "economize."

As most of us fly home over the July 4th recess, I think we should ask ourselves one simple question: "If I were paying for this trip myself, rather than the taxpayer, would I fly first class or coach?" If the answer is "coach," then I hope that you will cosponsor and support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the legislation follows:

H. Res. 560

Resolved, That it is the purpose of this resolution to prohibit Members of the House of Representatives, their employees, and employees of standing committees and select committees of the House from being paid or reimbursed for the difference between the

cost of first-class accommodations with respect to air travel and the cost of other air travel accommodations, except for reasons described in section 2, and to make possible a reduction in the amount of funds necessary to defray travel expenses of such Members and employees as a result of such prohibition.

Sec. 2. Until otherwise provided by law, a Member of the House of Representatives, an employee of any such Member, or an employee of any standing committee or select committee of the House, may not be paid or reimbursed for the difference between the cost of any first-class accommodation with respect to air travel, and the cost of any other accommodation with respect to air travel, unless—

(1) no other accommodations are available;

(2) first-class accommodation is necessary because of the health of the Member or employee involved;

(3) in the case of foreign travel, only first-class accommodation meets satisfactory standards of sanitation, health, or comfort; or

(4) the cost of first-class accommodation provided by the air carrier involved does not exceed the cost of other accommodations provided by other air carriers.

Sec. 3. The Committee on House Administration shall prescribe rules to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Sec. 4. For purposes of this resolution, the term "Member" or "Member of the House of Representatives" means each Representative in the Congress, the Delegates from the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

ADMITTED VIOLATION OF RULES

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as I feel that this is a matter which affects all Members of Congress, I should like to share the contents of a letter which I have addressed to Chairman FLYNT of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, concerning recent activities by the Representative from the Sixth District of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that this action on my part is in no way a personal one. The record is clear that the rules of the House and of the Committee on Armed Services have been broken, and I feel that this admitted violation must be dealt with in proportion to its seriousness.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1975.

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Monday, June 16, 1975, the Committee on Armed Services, in open session, a quorum being present, reaffirmed action it had previously taken directing an inquiry to your Committee requesting guidance on the accessibility of Committee documents to Members of the House of Representatives.

I understand that the Committee on Armed Services has officially transmitted to you, by letter dated June 11, 1975, a copy of

the motion approved by the Committee on Tuesday, June 10, 1975.

As you will notice, the second paragraph of that motion identified Congressman Michael Harrington, of the State of Massachusetts, as having been "denied access to any Committee files or classified information maintained therein because of his previous refusal to honor House and Committee Rules regarding material received by the Committee in executive session."

I further understand that your Committee has been given access to a copy of a hearing conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Armed Services on September 25, 1974, in which Congressman Michael Harrington appeared before the Committee and, while under oath, acknowledged his violation of certain House and Committee Rules. Specifically, among other things, Congressman Harrington acknowledged that he was aware of House Rule XI, Clause 27(o) (93d Congress), which provides as follows:

"No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee."

Further, Congressman Harrington acknowledged that he was aware of Armed Services Committee Rule No. 10, for the 93d Congress, which provides for the adequate safekeeping of national security information and which authorizes the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to promulgate such additional rules as may be necessary to adequately provide for the protection of classified information in the Committee files. A copy of these rules has also been provided your Committee.

The Committee Rules state that only Members of Congress may have access to classified information obtained by the Committee in executive session and bearing a classification of secret or higher, and further that such information will not be divulged to any unauthorized person in any fashion. Congressman Michael Harrington (D-Mass.) obtained access to such classified Committee information, which had been obtained in executive session, on June 4 and June 12, 1974, under the provisions of Rule XI, Clause 27(c) (93d Congress) which provides that Committee hearings, records, files, etc., shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access to such records.

At the time Mr. Harrington was given access to these documents on June 4 and June 12, 1974, he acknowledged in writing, with his personal signature, his awareness of the House and Committee Rules regarding the restrictions on the use of this information.

Subsequent to Mr. Harrington's access to this information which consisted of a Committee transcript, dated April 22, 1974, in which the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency discussed the Agency's previous activities in Chile, important portions of the information contained in the transcript appeared in the news media. As a consequence, the Special Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Armed Services Committee convened a hearing on September 25, 1974, to ascertain the manner in which Congressman Harrington utilized the information made available to him in the Committee files.

As I have previously indicated, Congressman Harrington did, during that hearing, and while under oath agree that he had been aware of the Committee and House Rules regarding this matter and notwithstanding that fact had made the information provided him in the Committee files available to unauthorized persons, to wit: various individuals not involved in the Congressional process. The details concerning his admissions are reflected in the Committee transcript of September 25, 1974.

Finally, I call your attention to the "Code of Official Conduct" of the House of Repre-

sentatives, which in Clause 2 provides as follows:

"2. A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Rules of the House of Representatives and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof."

In view of these circumstances, and because of the blatant disregard of the House and Committee Rules by Congressman Harrington and because of the grave implications to both the Congress and the national security that will result if action of this kind is not deterred in the future, I am requesting that your Committee proceed to investigate the official conduct of this Member of Congress in this matter, and after notice and hearing, to recommend to the House, by resolution or otherwise, such action as the Committee may deem appropriate in the circumstances.

I will assume that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will give this complaint a full and complete review with appropriate recommendations to the House or, in the alternative, I will be forced to utilize other avenues to insure that the Members of the House of Representatives will be given an opportunity to act in the premises.

I solemnly swear that the information contained in this letter is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, accurate and reflective of the facts in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBIN L. BEARD,
Member of Congress.

MAURICE LEON—THE LAST
OF THE BEST

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the RECORD an excellent article by Mike Leon of Story, Wyo., one of my State's foremost outdoors writers, underscoring the need for a strip mine bill in this Nation.

I am running it in the hope that it will give some understanding to RECORD readers of how those who live in Wyoming and who love it feel about its future.

The article follows:

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press,
May 28, 1975]

THE LAST OF THE BEST
(By Mike Leon)

Somebody is conning the President. Somebody is feeding him the worst sort of counsel. Somebody has led him to the mistaken conclusion that a strong strip mine bill will be inflationary and contribute to unemployment.

These were the two main justifications the President made for his veto of the strip mine bill: inflation and unemployment.

Both arguments are nonsense.

Unemployment? To the contrary, a strong reclamation program is a bona fide job creator. Who produce the seed that goes into the process of surface restoration? Elves? Who make the machinery that restores the surface and plants the seed? The Seven Dwarfs? Who operate the machinery? Gnomes? Who are responsible for drawing up reclamation plans, expediting them, overseeing their implementation and checking the results? Leperchauns? In every instance human beings by the thousands will be necessary, representing a range of skills from laboratory researcher to seedsman to range specialist to what-have-you.

Inflationary? Bunk! There is a tendency to blame inflation on anything handy. If we want a scapegoat, blame the Arabs. But inflation was growing monstrous before our Middle Eastern friends shut off the spigot and then turned it back on at outrageously increased prices. If we could manage to get it through our simple-minded heads that inflation is a function of too many people competing for a diminishing supply of the world's resources we would stop the foolishness of imagining that strong strip mining controls are inflationary. Paying as you go is not inflationary. It is anti-inflationary. Reclaiming strip mined-land properly as it becomes necessary means getting the job done now, so the land can be useful later on. No matter how high the cost of reclaiming an acre of strip-mined land that cost is not inflationary.

What is inflationary, dangerously so, is the attempt to keep energy artificially cheap. Does this seem contradictory to you? Consider, then, the long range effects of control of natural gas prices. I'm in complete accord with those wiser heads in the petroleum industry who have been pleading for deregulation of natural gas prices for years. What has an artificial price ceiling on natural gas done? It has been responsible for the most profligate sort of waste imaginable. If natural gas had been allowed to sell at its value as a precious resource we long ago would have been insulating our homes better, looking for energy alternatives, thinking and practicing conservation and eliminating waste. But this "cheap" energy, this artificially-priced natural gas which was so abundant for so brief a time, has led us into inflationary habits which, apparently, have become an addiction.

Let's not make the mistake with coal we made with oil and natural gas. Let's treat it as something precious and finite. Let's make an art as well as a science out of reclamation. Let's have enough sense to make a distinction between wise and necessary investment in caretaking and preparation for the future, on the one hand, and our dangerously inflationary habits on the other. Let us ask Congress to override that veto.

INCLUSION OF USRA LINE No. 1262
IN THE CONRAIL SYSTEM

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to urge that USRA line No. 1262 extending from Huntington—Milepost 125.2—to Hammond, Ind.—Milepost 249.6—be included in the ConRail system.

It is my privilege to represent Indiana's Second Congressional District which includes Pulaski, Starke, Porter, and portions of Wabash and Lake counties. All five of these counties would be seriously effected if the Erie Lackawanna were forced to discontinue operations. I would like to address myself today to the general impact the abandonment of this line would have on the citizens and future economic development of these communities.

As you may know the second district, in general and the communities I refer to today, in particular, are in a predominantly agricultural area. The loss of this line would have a serious adverse impact on the already depressed agricultural industry. Farmers throughout this area would be faced with a variety of

higher costs if rail service were discontinued. Building materials now shipped by rail would increase in price. Various types of farm implements that are presently assembled prior to shipment would increase in price to the farmers if shipped by truck and assembled upon reaching destination. Perhaps of most importance to the farmers would be the increased price of bulk fertilizer that is presently shipped predominately by rail.

A large portion of the grain in this area is produced for sale. Therefore farmers would be faced with lower grain prices due to a forced transfer to higher priced trunk transportation.

In addition to the agricultural industry, several businesses and industries in the second district which are partially and in some cases almost entirely dependent on rail service have indicated to me that their freight charges would increase as much as 100 percent if forced to transfer to truck transportation. Many businesses have made large investments during the past few years after being assured by Erie Lackawanna that rail service would be available. They now face the dilemma of being cut off completely.

Finally, the abandonment of this line would have a serious impact on the future growth of these communities. The railroads play an integral part in the economy of small towns. Several towns are developing industrial parks and many businesses have plans for future expansion which will be brought out in forthcoming testimony today. However the railroad is vitally necessary if these plans are to continue.

It was recently brought to my attention that this line is perhaps one of the better segments of rail in the country. The Erie Lackawanna, a class 1, double track, is considered to have one of the best roadbeds in Indiana, capable of an average speed of approximately 50 miles-per-hour. At a time when the overwhelming majority of the roadbeds in this area are in need of extensive repair it makes little sense to single out a good section of rail for abandonment.

Further, alternative methods of shipping would be a major problem. Several communities would be left with no rail service at all, while others would receive only limited truck service due to poor conditions of the highways. In some cases the only access to the town is by very narrow county roads.

Mr. Speaker, since the announcement by USRA that this section of the Erie Lackawanna would not be recommended for inclusion in the Conrail system I have held two public meetings in communities which would be effected by the abandonment. Over 100 people who would be directly and indirectly effected attended these sessions and voiced unanimous opposition to the proposal. Further, my office has received numerous phone calls and letters all of which voiced extreme concern regarding the adverse impact the discontinuation of the Erie Lackawanna would have on their community.

In conclusion, I would like to say that these are small communities but the effects of rail discontinuation in rural areas are far reaching. Rather than

abandoning this line, service should be improved to handle future growth.

Therefore I strongly urge USRA to reconsider its recommendation and that this section of rail be included in the final ConRail system plan.

GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been impressed by the dedicated efforts of the Farmers Union to represent the interests of family farmers throughout the Nation. As a Congressman from a largely rural district of Minnesota I share Farmers Union's concerns for the welfare of the family farmer, whether he lives in the Midwest, or in any other portion of the Nation.

In Minnesota's sister State of North Dakota, the controversial Garrison diversion project of the Bureau of Reclamation has the potential of benefiting some family farmers through irrigation development, at the expense of other farmers whose land is being taken for project canals, reservoirs, and mitigation. The North Dakota Farmers Union has been in the forefront of efforts to resolve the serious controversy that surrounds the Garrison project. While the NDFU supports the concept of irrigation development and would someday like to see the completion of the project, they have been very concerned over the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation to deal with problems construction of the project has caused for hundreds of farmers. The North Dakota Farmers Union now believes that these problems are so serious that they have requested that Congress not allow appropriations to be used for new construction or land acquisition for this project until a congressional investigation of the situation has been made, and serious problems apparent with the project have been resolved.

I believe that the recent testimony of the North Dakota Farmers Union to the Public Works Subcommittee of Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding this issue gives very important insight as to why the largest farm organization in North Dakota is now asking that new construction and land acquisition on this project be delayed. In that the House will soon address this controversial issue, I urge my colleagues to read and carefully consider this testimony:

STATEMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

The North Dakota Farmers Union is a private farm organization with a membership of over 32,000 farm families in North Dakota. Within our membership are farm families that will be potentially benefited through the Garrison Diversion project and those who have already experienced significant impacts from construction activities of the principle supply-works of the project.

Those of us within Farmers Union who witnessed the parched earth and the emaciated livestock that accompanied the lack of forage during the drought of the 1930's have a commitment to diversion of water that simply cannot be understood by those who

did not experience the farm tragedies of this period.

Because of this we have a difficult time understanding those who have recently involved themselves in the Garrison Diversion controversy and their willingness to permit the project to die on the vine because federal agencies have not accepted the responsibilities for the accompanying community and individual impacts of the project.

We also deeply resent those responsible entities and individuals who have demonstrated their willingness to sweep the existing problems connected with this project under the rug without realization that such problems would eventually erupt and significantly affect the future of the project.

Since the inception of this organization in 1927 as a chartered division of the National Farmers Union, the North Dakota Farmers Union has been deeply involved in water resource policy questions. Historically, the North Dakota Farmers Union has supported the concept of diverting Missouri River water for irrigation purposes and we continue in our support of such diversion.

The North Dakota Farmers Union opposed the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin because it did not provide for the overall and comprehensive planning and development that we felt was essential for the success of water and resource management in the Basin and instead we favored the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. However, as the structures of the Pick-Sloan plan became a reality, the North Dakota Farmers Union gave its support to the greatly reduced irrigation development under the Garrison Diversion Unit.

On numerous occasions in the 1950's and early 1960's, North Dakota Farmers Union officials and their representatives appeared before Congressional committees favoring the re-authorization and funding of the Garrison Diversion project.

We cite this history because we feel it is essential that Congress understands that the North Dakota Farmers Union is deeply committed to assisting its membership through public policies in developing the irrigation potential within our state and our region.

Since the initial funding of the Garrison Diversion project, the North Dakota Farmers Union has continued in its support of further appropriations for the project. However, we have also increasingly become deeply concerned about the failures of the responsible governmental agencies in implementing the project.

In early 1972, because of the concerns expressed by farmers in the initial construction areas of the project, the county presidents of the North Dakota Farmers Union, which constitute our Board of Governors, directed the state organization to conduct an investigation into the problems faced by farmers and their communities.

These and subsequent investigations by the North Dakota Farmers Union were undertaken in order to correct the inequities of the project and help resolve the problems of land owners and farmers affected by the project.

Our initial investigation identified twelve problem areas including adequate compensation for farmers adversely affected by the project, the high cost of replacement acreage to farmers, the payment schedule for acquired lands to farmers, the inadequacy of relocation services to landowners and tenants, the effect of the project upon underground water resources utilized by farmers, the need for alternate instruments in acquiring wildlife acreage and the Bureau's reluctance to permit the farm operators on the brinks of the canal to utilize even small amounts of canal water for their farm operations.

In June of 1972 we requested Senator Burdick, as a member of the Senate Interior Committee, to conduct a Congressional investigation of the land acquisition practices

of the Bureau of Reclamation and other concerns we had identified. This request resulted in an unofficial hearing by the Senator and an agreement by the Bureau to make a number of administrative changes in handling of land acquisition for the project.

While the Bureau of Reclamation announced these changes, continued contact from affected landowners provided an indication to us that the Bureau was still not adequately implementing the procedures and was still limiting its interpretation of land acquisitions and relocation laws and regulations to the disadvantage of affected farmers.

We therefore continued our investigation and collected numerous affidavits from affected landowners. After review of this material, it became apparent that the problems raised questions of such a nature that it was essential that the management practices of the Bureau of Reclamation and laws regulating their practices as it pertained to the Garrison Diversion project be thoroughly reviewed by a Congressional Committee.

In October 1972, the North Dakota Farmers Union initiated a request to U.S. Representative Henry Reuss, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources of the Government Operations Committee to conduct such an investigation. We transmitted the collected affidavits and associated material to the subcommittee.

Again we identified a number of problem areas requiring review, including: failure of the Bureau officials to follow the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970; failure of Bureau officials to enter into meaningful negotiations with landowners prior to initiating condemnation proceedings; failure of the Bureau to respect the rights of tenants; failure to respect the landowners property rights prior to initiating condemnation; and a general lack of concern by the Bureau for those landowners who agreed to settlements after the landowners had signed the settlement documents.

These same concerns were transmitted to Bureau of Reclamation Commissioner Ellis Armstrong. We did not receive a reply from Commissioner Armstrong until three months later and only after we had communicated this failure to the President.

The responses of the Bureau of Reclamation and its local irrigation contracting agency, the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District continued to be directed toward a "public relations" program rather than dealing with the substantive concerns expressed by our members. Therefore in March 1973, we renewed our request to the House Government Operations subcommittee to conduct a Congressional investigation into the matter and again urged field hearings by the subcommittee in the affected areas of North Dakota.

When the Bureau of Reclamation finally released its Environmental Impact Statement on the Garrison Diversion Project, the North Dakota Farmers Union submitted a 47 page response to the EIS at hearings in May in Minot, North Dakota. Again, we outlined the failures of the Bureau of Reclamation to deal with significant economic, social and environmental impacts as they related to the family farmer.

We were deeply concerned with inadequacies of the EIS in terms of agriculture and were fearful that these inadequacies reflected the operational and administrative practices of the Bureau of Reclamation which were increasingly placing the Garrison Diversion Project in jeopardy.

In our EIS response we indicated our concern of the lack of completed studies and the failure of the Bureau to make definitive plans available to farmers and landowners who would be potentially affected by construction and other activities in order that they might adjust their farming operations

and plans to avoid undue economic hardships.

We expressed concern over the lack of sufficient personnel who could authoritatively help resolve landowner and community problems resulting from the project; over the Bureau's inadequate review of the impact of the project on groundwater supplies and quality and their subsequent effects upon farm operations; the lack of alternatives to the location and acquisition of wildlife mitigation areas; the inadequacy of the review of adverse economic effects upon farmers and their communities resulting from the project; the failure to find a mutually acceptable agreement with Canada and therefore placing potential irrigators in a planning limbo by jeopardizing the development of certain irrigation districts.

In their final EIE, the Bureau failed to directly respond to these and other concerns which the North Dakota Farmers Union submitted in testimony at the EIS hearings.

When the General Accounting Office initiated a preliminary investigation of the Garrison Diversion project, we provided as much assistance and cooperation as possible in hopes that the investigation would result in solutions of the problems created by insufficient planning and the lack of coordinated, consistent policies by the Bureau.

In addition to seeking to resolve these problems and concerns at the federal level and with federal agencies, including the Bureau's Garrison Diversion Project office in Bismarck, the North Dakota Farmers Union has sought resolution of these concerns of our members through the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District which is responsible for the project as the state's contracting agency.

After considerable prodding the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District established a land acquisition committee to investigate landowner problems and to make recommendations to the Bureau. We fully concur with the recommendations that the committee submitted this past October to the Bureau after consultations with affected farmers and a number of interventions on behalf of these farmers with the Bureau. These include: (1) That appraisals should be upgraded to include the increase in demand for land and replacement costs; (2) Appraisals should be kept current at all times and (3) Changes in regulations or federal laws to permit: an increase over the appraisal value of the land to compensate the farmer for not being a willing seller; that relocation laws should apply to all farm buildings; necessary land takings should be purchased two years before construction starts; and that the Bureau should advance relocation money where it is needed for the farmer to complete new buildings.

The North Dakota Farmers Union also supported legislation approved by the recently concluded North Dakota legislative assembly which gave the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District more definitive responsibility to assist landowners affected by the project.

We cite this history of the involvement of the North Dakota Farmers Union in attempting to correct and resolve problems associated with the project in order to emphasize that as a long-time supporter of the Garrison Diversion we feel we have a responsibility to assist farmers adversely affected by the project.

The North Dakota Farmers Union has not taken these steps because it wishes to jeopardize the Garrison Diversion project. Instead, we have taken these steps because we are convinced that each unresolved problem created by mismanagement and unresponsive bureaucracy by the responsible federal agencies is creating an atmosphere which has seriously jeopardized the project. This, therefore, may significantly diminish the future irrigation opportunities for many of our members.

Considerable concern has been expressed over the cost over-runs being incurred by the Garrison Diversion project. Besides the general inflationary trends in our economy, we are convinced that the cost over-runs are direct results of the lack of comprehensive and coordinated planning by the Bureau of Reclamation in its rush to implement the construction of the project.

We do not believe that the cost over-runs are justification to terminate the project. We do believe that the cost over-runs indicate a need for the Congress to review the management practices of the Bureau of Reclamation in order that the costs might be better controlled.

The North Dakota Farmers Union believes that laws and regulations governing the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps of Engineers must be strengthened and fully enforced to protect the rights of landowners, tenants and farm operators and to insure that such projects will bring about the envisioned benefits.

The burden of proof in the need for eminent domain proceedings in acquisition of land for such projects must be more firmly placed on the agency requiring land. Severance damages should include not only payment for the diminution of remaining land value, but also the payment for the loss of income, increased expenses, and inconvenience suffered by affected landowners and operators.

The increased cost incurred by local and state governmental units as a result of such projects should be provided through impact funds, and considered a cost of the project itself. In addition, the federal government should provide in-lieu-of-tax payments to governmental subdivisions for all acreages removed from local tax rolls by such projects.

Governmental agencies responsible for water projects must fully comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Uniform Land Acquisition Act, and the Federal Relocation Act.

We oppose the acquisition or condemnation of land for any purpose by any federal agency until they revise their land acquisition policies to fully reflect the actual financial loss to each individual affected.

An independent ombudsman should be appointed for each project to insure that the rights of affected citizens are fully protected. The ombudsman should initiate legal action on behalf of affected citizens, when necessary.

The North Dakota Farmers Union reaffirms our support of federal irrigation development and the objectives of projects such as Garrison Diversion. However, such project must be implemented in a manner which will benefit the long-term future and stability of family-farm agriculture.

Continuing developments have provided a strong indication that insufficient planning and expediency in implementing the Garrison Diversion Project by the agencies responsible for its development may now jeopardize important facets of the project and perhaps the project itself.

We therefore urge that this subcommittee and Congress approve the budgeted \$13.6 million appropriations for the Garrison Diversion project with the stipulation that no funds can be utilized for the acquisition of any land or implementation of any new construction activities until a Congressional committee has had an opportunity to fully investigate the inequitable treatment of landowners and other problems associated with the project as previously outlined in this testimony.

Only after a Congressional Committee has made appropriate recommendations in policy and administrative changes, and has documented evidence that demonstrates that the Bureau of Reclamation is, in fact, implementing the necessary changes, should the committee release the funds to continue fur-

ther land acquisitions and construction activities on the project.

We further urge that after funds are released for further land acquisition and construction activities that a Congressional Committee continue its review of the land acquisition practices and the steps taken to resolve other serious problems of the Garrison Diversion project by the Bureau of Reclamation.

After these conditions have been realized, the North Dakota Farmers Union will be prepared to urge this subcommittee and Congress to appropriate supplemental funds as requested by the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District in their testimony before this subcommittee on May 6th.

The North Dakota Farmers Union believes that these steps are essential if the Garrison Diversion project is to be properly implemented and completed.

The North Dakota Farmers Union further believes that unless a thorough review is conducted to correct the present problems of the project that the Garrison Diversion project will produce significantly fewer benefits for the people of this region than originally anticipated when it was authorized.

We are convinced that unless such action is taken the project will continue to be in serious jeopardy and North Dakota may be left with a partially completed project that has no value to anyone.

This would be grossly unfair to those who have already suffered adverse impacts in order to benefit other areas of North Dakota. They would not even have the satisfaction that their suffering had any purpose.

It would be also grossly unfair to those farm families that have literally worked for generations to divert Missouri River water for irrigation and other purposes.

The North Dakota Farmers Union pledges its cooperation to this subcommittee and to Congress in taking the necessary steps to correct and resolve the problems presently hampering and jeopardizing the completion of the Garrison Diversion Project.

CHILD CARE SCANDAL IN NEW YORK CITY—PART II

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD, the first part of a seven part investigative series into New York City's private child care agencies conducted by the New York Daily News. Part II discusses several case studies of children who have been forced to live in the child care system homes and foster homes. This article relates some shocking tales of abuse and neglect of these children by foster parents who were more interested in getting their money than caring for their children.

Mr. Speaker at this point in the RECORD I wish to insert part II of this series entitled, "Unwanted Cathy: Seven Homes in 7 years":

UNWANTED CATHY: 7 HOMES IN 7 YEARS

(By William Heffernan and Stewart Aih)

(Second of a Series)

(Three months ago, a team of News reporters working under Assistant City Editor William Federici set out to investigate this city's multimillion-dollar child care system. The findings are presented in this series. In some instances, to protect the privacy of

children and employees in that system, names are withheld.)

Cathy is a 9-year-old multiracial child—unwanted, born out of wedlock and then discarded into the city's private child care system.

Every night now, Cathy goes to bed and beats her pretty head against her pillow until she collapses from exhaustion. It is the only way her small, wracked body can force itself to sleep.

Cathy is not an uncommon product of this city's child care system. At the age of 7 she had already lived in seven foster homes, bouncing from one to another, more like a rubber ball than a human being.

Her caseworker claims that each change in homes becomes a rejection, a betrayal by someone she had hoped would give her love.

"And out of each betrayal came a sense of guilt," her caseworker says. "It became easy for Cathy to believe that there was something terribly bad about her—something ugly, something evil, something no one could ever love."

To this day Cathy can still remember being locked in closets for long periods. Reluctantly, she recalls beatings administered by foster parents. And she remembers being told she wasn't wanted any more and then being moved to another foster home—where the problems began all over again.

Recently, Cathy was riding in the rear of a car with another child her own age. The other child asked where she had lived before. At first, Cathy stared silently, her large brown eyes blank, then she suddenly began rattling off all the last names she had in her foster homes. She recited the names awkwardly.

"But those people didn't like me," Cathy told the other child. "This time I won't have to change my name again. My mother (her adoptive mother) says I belong to her, just like my brothers and sisters. She says nobody can make me live elsewhere any more."

Cathy, in fact, is one of the luckier children. After seven years in foster care she fell into the hands of a caseworker who fought to place her in an adoptive home.

Her adoptive parents together with that caseworker battled to overcome obstacles set up by the child care agency, to change that agency's "plan" for Cathy—a "plan" of long term foster care.

Now Cathy has a home and parents who love her. But she also has the scars from seven lonely years in the city's child care system—scars her parents believe she will carry all her life.

Today, throughout the city and state, there are thousands of children whose lives are being scarred each day.

During a three-month investigation. The News found that children are being kept in long-term foster care and denied the chance of finding permanent homes, while the private agencies assigned to care for them collect millions of tax dollars each year for their continued maintenance.

Throughout its probe of the child care system, The News spoke with many of those children—some who are still in the system and some who have left it.

REPORT ABUSE AND NEGLECT

These children told of abuse and neglect in some foster homes. Others spoke of being happy with certain foster parents, only to find themselves suddenly taken from those homes and placed in others where abuse and neglect were everyday occurrences.

Many of the children spoke with bitterness. Many others spoke with confusion, asking why they could not be adopted.

Some children spoke through tears—tears that one caseworker said "would fill a river if they were all gathered together in one place."

Many of these same children were already badly damaged when they entered care. Many had been severely abused by their real parents.

Mrs. Flora Cunha is the president of the Organization of Foster Families for Equality and Reform. She described some of the abuses that foster children suffered at the hands of their own parents.

FORCED TO WATCH X FILMS

Mrs. Cunha spoke of a 6-year-old who told her of being forced to watch movies that he described as "naked people doing things," and how he closed his eyes so he wouldn't have to see.

One boy, Mrs. Cunha said, could recall being forced to urinate in a cup and then watching while his younger brother was forced to drink it.

Some children, she added, recalled watching their mother in sexual intercourse, "sometimes with the father, or stepfather, or the man presently living in the house, or the man passing through that evening."

Many can describe orgies, she added, and some children have even told of sharing their mother's bed to provide devious thrills—"thrills" they later relived in nightmares.

Yet many children who enter foster care find that their lives in care are little different from the lives they left behind.

Odessa Carrion, who spent five years as an agency supervisor in the child care system, discussed the open brutality she found in many foster homes and the unwillingness of some agencies to do anything to correct it.

IN IT FOR THE MONEY

"Some of these foster parents are in it purely for the money they can get," she said. "And it is not uncommon for them to skimp on food and clothing for the children in their care."

"There are also sadistic foster parents who regularly beat these children," she added. "Children have even been murdered in foster homes and it is not uncommon for foster fathers and adolescent boys in the family to rape young girls placed in their homes."

Ms. Carrion told of one of the foster homes she eventually closed after a caseworker investigated the family's food buying habits.

"I had a caseworker go to the family's butcher and ask about the meat they bought, she said. "It didn't take the caseworker long to find out that the foster mother regularly asked the butcher for scrap meat for her dogs and then used that meat to prepare steaks for the children."

"When the family ate steak, she added, "the children would be lucky to get hot dogs. And this experience was not isolated, it was a common occurrence."

Ms. Carrion told of one of the first foster homes she visited as a caseworker for one agency. The mother brought Paul, the foster child, out to meet her.

WANTS HER TO STAY

"After a period of time, she said, "Paul had crawled behind the sofa and began pulling my arm to indicate he wanted me to stay. Paul was about 6½ years old and when I revisited the home a week later, the same thing happened."

Ms. Carrion said she went to the director of her agency and told her she felt there was something wrong in Paul's foster home.

"The director told me the woman was a good foster mother who had worked for the agency for years and that she was not going to move the child or close the foster home."

"Three months later," Ms. Carrion added, "I saw Paul with a bloody face. I took him away from his foster mother and brought him to a doctor who said the child had bruises all over his back and that he appeared to have been badly beaten with a hairbrush."

Ms. Carrion said she asked the director of the agency to have the foster mother arrested.

"The director refused, claiming it would

make the agency look bad if one of its foster mothers was arrested for child abuse." Ms. Carrion said. "When I insisted that she either close the home or that I would have the woman arrested myself, she finally agreed to close it."

"I later learned that Paul had been exposed to beatings ever since he was placed in that home," she said. "He had been there for 2½ years."

One young woman, interviewed by The News, supported Ms. Carrion's stories of abuse. She explained what it was like to grow up in foster care.

Ellen is now 20 years old and her memory of her childhood is far from pleasant. By the time she was 9 she had lived in nine foster homes.

Each time she settled into a new home her mother demanded her back and she was uprooted from her new surroundings. But this didn't last long.

"The few foster parents I got to like I had to leave," she recalled. "I learned the only way I could survive without going crazy was to remain aloof and cold with my foster parents."

"How can you attach yourself to someone and then have that attachment broken?" she asked. "It's what happens after you get burned by a candle—you learn to stay away from it."

Asked how she was treated by her foster parents, Ellen said that in almost every home "the foster fathers would put me on their laps and put their hands in my pants."

DAUGHTER INTO SEX

When she was 8 and slept in the same room with her foster parents' daughter, the daughter "was into sex—trying to get me to walk around nude."

And when she was 9 her foster parents' 18-year-old son regularly slipped into her room at night to "make me fondle him."

"I should have been adopted two years after my mother starting putting me into foster care," Ellen said. "My mother never should have been allowed to take me back and then give me up again."

Asked about the food she received in foster homes, Ellen said that in every home but one she often had "little or nothing to eat and my foster parent hardly ever bought me clothes—I was never treated like the rest of the family. (Every foster family gets a clothing allowance for the children.)"

"One family I was with always had their big meal in the middle of the day. As I recall, they would usually eat something like roast beef while I would get a peanut butter and jelly sandwich."

Ellen, a tall, painfully thin blonde, who is now a Long Island college student, said she has had the good fortune of "finding" herself and being able to put her past in its proper perspective.

"I was in my last foster home from the age of 9 until I was 18," she said. Unlike the previous foster parents, these people were decent and good. "But it wasn't until I was 17 that I realized that these foster parents were the only real parents I would ever have and that I'd better stop fighting the love inside of me."

THEY NEVER GAVE UP

"They (the last foster parents) had never given up loving me," she said. "I visit them often even now."

There are times that Ellen would like to find out "where I was, who I was with, when certain things happened to me; but the agency won't let me see my records because they say they are all secret."

Ellen said she considers herself especially fortunate because she was able to make more of her life than her five brothers—four of whom lived in more than a dozen foster homes by the time they were 16.

Looking back on her years "in care," as the official lingo puts it, Ellen said she believes that the agencies "should be accountable for

what they do. If they are not doing the job right, they should get out of the business.

"My brothers didn't have the luck I did. . . . I made it, they didn't. They all have problems and I don't think they will ever recover. My mother did a lot to destroy her children but the agencies took up where she left off."

THE PLIGHT OF THE BLACK AGED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the black aged in America face the current economic crisis in a far more vulnerable position than most of our citizens. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the Urban League, has accurately described their plight in a recent column which appeared in the May 31, 1975, edition of the Chicago Crusader.

As Mr. Jordan perceptively noted:

Our society has a reputation for being a "throwaway" society; everything is disposable and we'd rather replace something than fix it. Unfortunately, that applies to people too, and our seniors are victims of the throw-away mentality that shuffles them into invisibility.

The tragedy of the black aged is magnified by the fact they are the victims of a lifetime of neglect. For decades Government ignored their voices, and many in despair have stopped voicing their concerns and their situation. Government must be responsive to those whose plight is hidden, as much as to those who are vocal.

I include Mr. Jordan's column in the RECORD at this point:

BLACK AGED HIT HARD

Everyone's hurting in this Depression, but hit hardest are elderly blacks. They don't have the securities, bank savings and bonds affluent people sock away for a rainy day, and few have ever worked in the kinds of jobs that allowed them to plan a comfortable retirement.

In fact, they were explicitly barred from jobs that carry decent pensions and other retirement benefits.

All most of them have are social security checks, other government payments including Supplementary Security Income (SSI), or earnings.

That's not enough in these days of skyrocketing prices. Stories of old folks buying pet food because it's cheaper indicate the extent of their hardship.

SSI payments are less than half of what the federal government estimates as a moderate standard of living for a retired couple. They're even below the poverty level in most places.

Most older blacks are poor or close enough to being very poor to feel the pinch badly. And with growing unemployment, financial help from children is drying up too.

The thing to remember about the black elderly is that they are survivors. Most of them survived the Jim Crow system and low-paying, low-status jobs, and now they've got to try to survive further indignities instead of enjoying well-earned retirement years.

Compared with older whites, elderly blacks have less education, fewer financial resources, more have chronic health problems, live in substandard housing and have less access to private and public resources available to the aged.

They are survivors in a literal sense, too. Most of their contemporaries have passed on. The life expectancy for black males actually declined in the 1960s, from 61.1 years to 60.1 years. This means the typical black man will never live to collect social security benefits, deductions for which were taken out of his measly paycheck all through his working years.

Black women live fewer years than do whites—the typical black woman lives to an age of 69.3 years, while white women can expect to live to 75.6 years.

These life expectancy figures have given rise to suggestions that instead of limiting social security payments to those 65 and over (with many getting payments starting at age 62), a system of differential age eligibility should be instituted.

Under such a system the population would be broken down by subgroups and those subgroups, such as black men, whose life expectancy is below the national standard for social security eligibility, could begin to collect at earlier ages.

Such life expectancy tables could be computed regularly, with eligibility limits moved up or down depending on the actuarial figures. Other groups in our society, including Native Americans and many Spanish-speaking peoples, have low life expectancy and it seems only fair that such persons should get back money they've been paying for retirement.

It's an interesting idea that certainly deserves further exploration. It might even spur better health care efforts by the government, and that should be a major item on the agenda for helping old folks.

They pay premiums for medical care, but much of their costs, like over-the-counter drugs and remedies, are never covered. They would be among the prime beneficiaries of a national health system that delivered quality health services for all.

Our society has a reputation for being a "throwaway" society; everything is disposable and we'd rather replace something than fix it. Unfortunately, that applies to people too, and our seniors are victims of the throw-away mentality that shuffles them into invisibility.

Until ours came along, every society honored its old folks and measured its humanity by the way it cared for those who past sacrifices entitled them to the comforts of dignified old age. It's a sad commentary that contemporary America so brutally violates the commandment to honor its older citizens.

RES PUBLICAE

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1975

Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a mother of two teenagers, I am very concerned about what our young people are thinking today. I would hope that my colleagues also share in this concern, and will find the following essay written by Elizabeth Schweitzer, 1975 winner of the Palm Springs Rotary Club Americanism essay contest, of interest:

RES PUBLICAE

(By Elizabeth Schweitzer)

Not so long ago one third of the population of thirteen colonies rebelled and destroyed the tie to their government. They felt that government no longer deserved their loyalty. They did what they did for their personal gain and saw no shame in it. They were proud, stubborn, and selfish. The world did not love them, and they did not care. Al-

though considered country bumpkins by the more "genteel" set, they were called "demigods" by their own kind.

They tried a not-so-popular form of government. Their first attempt failed, so they tried again. This time it went well. They lived through scandal, economic crisis, and an unpopular war. The mistakes were theirs, and they took the blame. The victories were theirs, too and they flaunted them.

Now, two hundred years later, the citizens of the country they founded are celebrating a bicentennial. Perhaps it is time to clear away all the cobwebs in the closets of those demigods and rediscover the basics of the nation the Founding Fathers set up.

At a time when there should be rejoicing that the United States has made it this far, the cry of the citizenry is, "America is going down the drain! Life is not worth living anymore; there are just too many problems."

In a way it makes sense, considering the apparently glorious history the United States has had. Movies, songs, and even textbooks proclaim that back in the "good ol' days" everyone was patriotic, goods were inexpensive, and this was the land of opportunity. It is no wonder the future appears gloomy; nothing short of paradise could compare with that Elysian heritage.

Life was not really that beautiful, but Americans like to think so. The Founding Fathers were called demigods by some of their contemporaries, but they turned the compliment down. They were good because they had something to believe in and to reassure them. If they were great, it was because the times permitted, and their souls demanded them to be.

In this modern day and age, will people be able to respond to the call? Everything seems to indicate the opposite. Pollution, corruption, and poverty are rampant. People are being labelled, licensed, and numbered. A different system of political thought is opposing the traditional "American Way". There is nothing solid to believe in. The entire idea of a United States of America appears bound for eternal damnation.

This concept is nothing new; critics of the United States have been hoping for it for years. Karl Marx claims that any and every free enterprise system will fail. His doctrine states that either socialism or total collapse shall eventually occur. His followers believe this, naturally. The question is: why do so many Americans believe it?

Do they follow Marx? Are the recent Washington scandals and the Vietnamese War so disillusioning? Are they so affected by the present economic imbalance? Do they really have a choice in what they believe?

The only way they could be convinced of the stability of this society would be to hear good news from the government. However, since the War Between the States, the U.S. Government has been considered generally corrupt and the credibility level is down (recent events have not been discouraging this sentiment.)

The Government has all of the characteristics of "Big Business," plus it is the only one licensed by itself. The people are having a hard time keeping track of it. There is a lot of room for "deals" to be made.

There are some honest people in office, but it is so tempting not to stay that way. The Founding Fathers were honest, but then there was no choice. Now, however, all that stands between a politician and temptation is a conscience and a good business sense.

Even if the entire government became honest, the public would still have problems with it. The few direct connections between the U.S. citizen and the U.S. Government have (for all intents and purposes) been severed. Speeches nowadays are polished by professional speech writers and delivered by a man with a bad make-up job. Governmental forms and letters are often verbose, impersonal, and indecipherable. Civil servants and office seekers are coming in all colors, shapes,

and sizes, but they generally are considered cold, calculating, and inaccessible. The nation turns its eyes to the indirect method, the mass media.

The media possesses an awesome power. It is the only access to the government's inner workings, so it believed. The pen has always been greater than the sword, and now when ink flows from the pen of a journalist, the opinion of the public is being molded. The words in a common newspaper are oftentimes considered gospel.

This would go well enough, but a few factors are working against it. First, reporters are human; they can make mistakes. Second, the media is a vast free enterprise system. Free enterprises are successful only when they show a profit. The best type stories to sell are bits that are sensational, unusual, and bad news. The consumer that depends solely upon screaming headlines for information can be misled to believe his world is falling apart.

Loss of confidence is not the only drawback to an all-powerful media. Possibilities of use in propaganda are tremendous. If any one man or political group could get in control of the editors and anchormen, he or they could direct the history of the world. There have been examples of this in recent times. In the 1950's Senator Joseph McCarthy used the media to destroy individuals who did not believe as he did. Later, when a training camp for troops of various nations was held for anti-Communist guerrilla warfare, the John Birch Society spread rumors that the "Reds" were coming. In both cases, panic was widespread and people were victimized.

With all its drawbacks, the American media is one of the great accomplishments of humankind. Although it may be biased, as when information is proved incorrect, it has the wonderful asset of being able to admit error without admitting shame. Of course, humility is not stressed and the point it not overemphasized. If an apology is needed, it is made, and business goes on as usual, very efficiently.

It takes one editor to admit he is wrong in order to make others say the same. It is the same with the rest of society. It takes one body and soul to raise doubts, and then the system can start rejuvenating itself. This country cannot afford to be an army of corporate yes men working for the State and the almighty dollar. Without a non-conformist saying, "No! It should not work this way!" there would be no progress in human rights.

In this century, Americans have been stereotyped as men bowing and scraping to his employer in order to feed the wife and kids. In the meantime, his employer is bowing and scraping to politicians who are bowing and scraping to the people (at election time). Vicious circle? It is, when there are no individuals around.

Individuals are people who follow their own conscience instead of their greed. True, feeding loved ones is an honorable profession, but it is not necessary to bow and scrape.

A society (especially this one) is only as strong as its weakest member. Before, there has always been an ample supply of strong individuals. The Founding Fathers were individualistic rebels, and America has produced Lincoln, Thoreau, Theodore Roosevelt and even Eldridge Cleaver. The best way to produce strong individuals for the future is to provide a broad spectrum of concepts; this is true education. It is an old idea: the truth shall set you free. Brainwashing will only hinder this country's system.

This might be a nation of bureaucracies, corporations, and political parties, but without rebels and dissenters, there would be no progress in the field America is most noted for: Americanism.

Americanism is not following all those proud individuals who set up this country

out of a sense of obligation. It means, rather, doing something because it is right. The reason it sounds so decent and humane is because it is not based on a politician's dream, but on respect for humanity. It must remain so, or the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall perish from the earth.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH COVERAGE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, proposals to create a comprehensive national health insurance program of one sort or another have been introduced in this and past Congresses.

Despite the variety of health insurance plans which have been considered, it is apparent that there is no consensus as to the direction Congress should take on this subject.

Although it may be a long time before any large-scale health legislation is passed, Congress should not remain inactive.

People with special medical problems requiring expensive treatments need immediate relief. They need what legislatively is termed "catastrophic coverage."

Some advocates of national health insurance believe that catastrophic coverage should not be separated from the comprehensive health care question for fear that the press for comprehensive coverage would be lessened.

I, for one, do not believe the physical and the economic health of millions of Americans suffering from diseases requiring long and costly treatment should be held hostage to secure the adoption of an overall health insurance measure.

I am glad that the Washington Post, in this editorial of June 17, 1975, sees the issue in the same light:

INSURING THE NATION'S HEALTH

This country seemed, as recently as a year ago, to be on the verge of enacting a national health insurance plan covering most medical costs for everyone. Last January congressional leaders were talking optimistically of early enactment of a health insurance bill. But by now it is clear that the whole proposal is going nowhere at all this year. Whether there is any chance of enactment even in the years beyond depends on finding persuasive answers to a series of large questions. Some of those questions concern financing, but by no means all of them. There is a spreading opinion, in Congress and in the country, that simply providing more money, training more doctors and building more hospitals will not necessarily improve health care for Americans.

To use an analogy that practically everyone will find offensive, the health insurance issue is a bit like the rescue of the Penn Central. In both cases, all right-thinking people can agree that the service is essential and something has to be done. But in both cases any comprehensive solution involves a sufficiently large number of billions of dollars to induce extreme caution. Even if the money can be found, Congress does not want merely to continue obsolete service to places where no one wants to go. In health care as in railroading, there is the matter of feather-

bedding. Some studies have suggested that, for example, as much as one-third of the surgery done in this country is avoidable. It is evident that any insurance plan is going to have to include mechanisms to protect the patient from too much of the wrong sort of care, provided simply because it was available.

The fading of the current health bills illustrates the broad change that has recently overtaken national attitudes toward large social programs. Part of this change is obviously owed to the recession. But another part of it is a reaction to the great wave of social legislation of the 1960s. Many of these innovative laws turned out to carry costs and consequences far beyond anything predicted for them. The experience of the past decade is making the country cautious now about fundamental changes in the health care system. Medicare and Medicaid have been enormously valuable to the country, but they have also been enormously more expensive than their authors originally estimated. They have raised the questions of review and control that are going to have to be answered before the larger insurance plan goes into law.

Americans are currently spending a little over \$100 billion a year for health and medical care. That figure has doubled in the past eight years, with a rising demand for these services compounded by an inflation rate much higher than the average for the economy. Out of that total, some \$40 billion is public money, mostly Medicare for the elderly and disabled, and Medicaid for the poor. The rest is private money, and enactment of a comprehensive health insurance program means shifting some or even all of that \$60 billion a year to federal administration.

Although President Nixon had supported a health insurance bill, President Ford decided last winter not to revive it. With the economy in a recession and the budget already running an extremely large deficit, he ruled against any bill this year. Health outlays, under a federal insurance program, would be the kind of expenditure that the Ford administration has denounced as uncontrollable. The budget deficit has become one of the most sensitive numbers in Washington politics. The painful surge of inflation over the past two years has made voters highly attentive to it, and the new budget procedures now require Congress to vote explicitly on a deficit. Most of Congress appears to have joined the President in his reluctance to add another large new unknown factor into the federal budget at this moment.

Beyond all of the large questions of public policy, the path of any health insurance legislation is further impeded in Congress by a sharp dispute over committee jurisdiction. Earlier this year, when the House Ways and Means Committees wrote a bill to provide health insurance benefits to the unemployed, the Commerce Committee protested that its territory was being invaded. The affair has now settled into a stalemate. If the House leadership ever chooses to resolve this tangle, it will be confronted with a much more serious controversy over financing these benefits. All of the present tax and premium proposals are dubious, to one degree or another. The technical difficulties in funding this limited protection for the unemployed is serving to dampen enthusiasm for proceeding with the much larger bill for general coverage of the whole population.

It may turn out that the only possible course is to abandon the idea of a comprehensive bill and, instead, continue to improve the present patchwork. Since the scale of the future system is extremely difficult to forecast accurately, perhaps the patch-by-patch strategy will turn out to be the wisest in the end. It permits Congress to address itself to one issue at a time.

The greatest immediate needs are catastrophic coverage for everybody, and basic

care for rural areas. Even families with very good health insurance policies know that there is always a limit to the coverage. Even the most prudent family can be threatened with disaster by one terrible illness. But huge though the costs can be in individual cases, the price for catastrophic coverage is not large for the country as a whole. As for rural areas, experience with Medicare and Medicaid shows that merely making insurance money available is not enough to guarantee reasonable access to modern medical care. Meeting specific needs like these, one at a time, may well take the country toward adequate health insurance faster than a stalled argument over a comprehensive bill that now seems farther than ever in the distance.

STANDING UP FOR SOUTH KOREA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the fall of South Vietnam, and following the rescue of the *Mayaguez*, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared that:

There are limits beyond which the United States cannot be pushed.

With American credibility open to serious question, it is essential that the leaders of North Korea, Communist China, and the Soviet Union understand that we will not permit aggression to succeed a second time in Asia. It is necessary, at the present time, to restate our commitment to South Korea in terms so certain that no potential aggressor will miscalculate our response.

Korea clearly is the next test which the Communists intend to provide us with in that part of the world. As Saigon was collapsing, Kim Il Sung, the North Korean leader, was in Peking. A joint Communist Chinese-North Korean communique called for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Korea and reaffirmed China's "resolute support to the Korean People in their just struggle for an independent and peaceful reunification." Both phrases are strikingly similar to those used in the past concerning Vietnam.

Kim Il Sung's statement in Peking that, "North Korea would not stand by with folded arms in the event of a revolt in South Korea," is regarded as particularly ominous. The Park Government in Seoul—a government which admittedly has internal difficulties of its own—is facing increased opposition from students, clergymen and the press. South Korean sources fear that any demonstration might be used as a pretext for a full-scale Communist attack.

We must understand the North Korean strategy in this connection and leave no doubts that aggression will be countered, whether it is in its traditional form or is of a more deceptive, covert kind.

Writing in *The New York Times*, Zygmunt Nagorski, Jr., a staff member of the Council on Foreign Relations and previously a Foreign Service officer who served in South Korea, noted that:

Korea's future is vital to the United States. It is vital not only as a strategic landmass essential to maintain stability in the Japan

Sea and the entire Korea-Japanese area, but also for American self-respect and for our image in the world as a nation capable of living up to its commitments.

Mr. Nagorski concludes that:

Should we declare our unwillingness to be with the Koreans tomorrow should their hour of stress arrive? Surely, we would be betraying our own beliefs. . . . Their abandonment to Northern aggression and eventual Communist take-over would be the end of their political and intellectual rebellions. How is it possible—young Koreans born since the Korean War would ask themselves—for Americans first to whet our appetites for freedom, only to abandon us when freedom is truly in danger?

I wish to share with my colleagues the important article, "Standing Up For South Korea," by Zygmunt Nagorski, Jr., which appeared in *The New York Times* of June 14, 1975, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

[From the *New York Times*, June 14, 1975]

STANDING UP FOR SOUTH KOREA

(By Zygmunt Nagorski Jr.)

Korea's future is vital to the United States. It is vital not only as a strategic landmass essential to maintain stability in the Japan Sea and the entire Korea-Japanese area, but also for American self-respect and for our image in the world as a nation capable of living up to its commitments.

I am not arguing for the old-time notion of national honor. But I am appalled by the voices implying basic dishonesty to American motives. No one wishes to see another war in Asia. The concept of a sinister military plot concocted at the Pentagon welcoming another conflict reflects a part of today's national paranoia. There seems to be nothing beyond reproach, nothing free of suspicion.

The case of South Korea—in spite of President Park Chung Hee and his senseless authoritarian measures—has been a success story in Asia. It is a country which has gone through a trauma of a Communist war and a Communist occupation that left deep scars. Present opposition to the Korean Government stems partly from people's fears that another totalitarian system would weaken resistance to a possible attack from the North.

It may sound almost illogical but in Korea both sides—the Government and the opposition—have one common denominator: they both act to offset a possible outside attack. The Government feels that repression and law and order are the best methods to unify the country and make it strong; the opposition feels differently. No regimented people, the opposition feels, can have the necessary will to fight back against a totalitarian aggression. Therefore, a government permitting consensus and free debate is much stronger than one which superimposes its will. This is where the present Korean weakness lies. This is where a tendency exists on the part of some Americans to confuse the inner political struggle with President Park's repressive methods.

The mere fact of the existence of a democratic opposition in Korea is a success story. Add to it the Korean economic growth which made that little peninsula one of the most rewarding experiences for the American economic assistance program. Add to it Korea's basic determination to resist outside aggression. There is no trace in Seoul of the cancer which ate the military machine of South Vietnam. An average young Korean desperately clings to the notion of his own freedom of choice. He will fight for it if necessary. He is fighting for it now on the domestic front. He will do it elsewhere if needed.

And this is where the United States comes into the picture. For the last 25 years this country has been viewed as Korea's most

reliable friend. It is from America that the concepts of people's participation in the Government came. It is from us that the notion of free press, of *habeas corpus*, of the legislative and executive roles and their divisions have been imported. It is from this part of the world that most South Koreans today are getting their political inspiration.

Should we declare our unwillingness to be with the Koreans tomorrow should their hour of stress arrive? Surely, we would be betraying our own beliefs. After all, they are in a rebellious mood because we helped them to be. Their abandonment to Northern aggression and eventual Communist take-over would be the end of their political and intellectual rebellions. How is it possible—young Koreans born since the Korean war would ask themselves—for Americans first to whet our appetites for freedom, only to abandon us when freedom is truly in danger?

This is not a call for another Asian war for Americans to enter. It is simply a call to preserve our own sanity. No man can live alone in the world of today. No nation can live alone, not even a nation like ours. The moral fiber of our international existence must be built around a system of values.

If these are rejected in a clever maze of rhetoric attributing sinister motives to anyone who hesitates to abandon these values, only a void would remain. Insuring for South Koreans today a feeling of confidence that they are not alone and that their acquired concept of a consensus Government cannot be lost without a struggle would be one way to prevent such a struggle.

It would also be a way to reassure ourselves that we are capable of standing up and being counted, for our own sake, not for anybody else's.

FEDERAL AUTHORITIES AND RECOMMENDED FEDERAL ACTIONS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, last week the first portions of a study done by the Interagency Task Force on Inadvertent Modification of the Stratosphere—IMOS—were released to the public. This was the product of a 5-month investigation on the effects of fluorocarbons on the Earth's ozone layer. The task force, under the coordination of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Federal Council for Science and Technology, was composed of 13 separate Federal agencies having a direct concern over ozone depletion.

I am particularly interested in the work of the task force because of my concern over the possible damage being done to the ozone layer by fluorocarbons. Congressman PAUL ROGERS and I have introduced legislation which would fund further Federal research on fluorocarbons and ban their use in aerosol cans in 2 years unless proof can be found that they are not harmful to health and the environment. Hearings on this legislation have been held in both the Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Science and Technology Committees and both committees are currently marking up our bill.

Though I am not in full agreement with everything in the task force report, I would like to commend Chairman Peterson of the Council on Environmental Quality and Chairman Stever of the

Federal Council for Science and Technology for their efforts. They have recognized a need for cooperation among the Federal agencies which I believe is essential in any further research on this problem.

Since the question of fluorocarbon damage to the ozone is gaining considerable public attention and legislation may be coming to the floor on this subject, the task force report should be of interest to all Members. I am including in the RECORD the section of this report on recommended Federal actions:

FEDERAL AUTHORITIES AND RECOMMENDED
FEDERAL ACTIONS

Products that release fluorocarbons ultimately reaching the stratosphere can be divided into four categories according to how they may be regulated.

Fluorocarbons that are used as propellants in foods, drugs, and cosmetic products can be regulated by the Food and Drug Administration. These same compounds used to propel pesticide products can be regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency. Any other product (except automobiles) produced for distribution to, or use by, consumers can be regulated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

There is, however, no Federal authority governing any of the other fluorocarbon uses such as automobile air conditioning, industrial and commercial applications for air conditioning and refrigeration, and uses as a foaming agent of fire retardant. The proposed Toxic Substances Control Act now pending before Congress would provide for effective control of all uses of fluorocarbons if required and, in addition, would provide a regulatory base for control of a wide variety of potentially harmful substances with broad environmental consequences. This is the preferred approach in lieu of narrower specific legislation for fluorocarbons. The task force urges rapid passage of this legislation to fill these important gaps in the applicable Federal Authorities.

The task force has concluded that fluorocarbon releases to the environment are a legitimate cause for concern. Moreover, unless new scientific evidence is found to remove the cause for concern, it would seem necessary to restrict uses of fluorocarbons-11 and -12 to replacement of fluids in existing refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment and to closed recycled systems or other uses not involving release to the atmosphere.

The National Academy of Sciences is currently conducting an in-depth scientific study of man-made impacts on the stratosphere and will report in less than a year. If the National Academy of Sciences confirms the current task force assessment, it is recommended that the Federal regulatory agencies initiate rulemaking procedures for implementing regulations to restrict fluorocarbon uses. Such restrictions could reasonably be effective by January 1978—a date that, given the concern expressed now, should allow time for consideration of further research results and for the affected industries and consumers to initiate adjustments.

In order to reduce the chance of unduly penalizing producers and marketers of aerosol products that do not use FX-11 and F-12, the task force recommends that the regulatory agencies proceed immediately with consideration of a requirement that all aerosol products using fluorocarbons be labeled to indicate their fluorocarbon content.

International cooperation is strongly urged, inasmuch as the U.S. produces and uses only about one-half of the world-wide fluorocarbons, and effects on stratospheric ozone from ground release transcend national boundaries. The State Department will initiate and coordinate a program of inter-

national exchange of information, cooperative research, and proposals for international action to help implement uniform policy actions on a world-wide basis. U.S. concern will be expressed and coordination will be initiated in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), other international organizations, and through bilateral channels.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to the Johnson Wax Co. of Racine, Wis., for its action in removing fluorocarbon propellants from its spray can products.

I am pleased to see this company responding responsibly without the threat of Government action. Johnson Wax has proved that American industry can act with speed and responsibility to environmental problems and that they can do so on their own initiative. I believe they deserve the thanks of the American public.

The action of this major producer of consumer goods proves another point as well—it illustrates conclusively that other propellants are available and that a company can use them without damaging its competitive position in the market.

IOWA SUN ENERGY PLANT WOULD
BE WORLD'S LARGEST

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, many individuals, private industries, and local governmental units are showing once again that not all leadership is in Washington, by taking the lead in developing solar energy. Surely, if we are to meet our energy demands of the future, we must begin to rely more heavily on the inexhaustible source of energy of the Sun. I am proud that my home State of Iowa is taking the lead in this area. A recent article appearing in the Ames Daily Tribune, June 5, 1975, describes a solar heating and cooling project contemplated for a new statehouse complex. I insert this article in the RECORD as information for my colleagues:

TALK SOLAR HEATING-COOLING FOR STATEHOUSE: IOWA SUN ENERGY PLANT WOULD BE WORLD'S LARGEST

(By Randy Minkoff)

DES MOINES.—If the legislature acts on a small appropriation soon, the state can begin work July 1 on what state officials are convinced could lead to the largest public solar heating project in the world.

Gov. Robert D. Ray has asked and is likely to receive approval for a \$200,000 experimental solar heating project to both heat and cool the Statehouse complex, and leaders have indicated they would go along with the allocation.

If that is the case, state General Services Director Stanley McCausland said the solar heating project would begin on or about July 1 as the first step in a move designed to cut fossil fuel use by statehouse office buildings by 20 per cent.

"We've no doubt that they will pass the appropriation," McCausland said. "It's a small allocation but it's for a project that would lead to a tremendous breakthrough for solar heating in the state."

The implementation of solar heating could not come overnight nor could it totally replace existing use of coal, gas or fuel. Long-range expectations by designers indicate the state's goal is to have 20 per cent of the heating and cooling of existing state buildings and the two new facilities to be built this summer to rely on the sun.

Simultaneously, the state is planning to build a new power plant for Statehouse complex buildings which will eventually be connected with the use of solar "panels" that would be located on a bluffs area south of the capitol.

"If we approve the money for the experimental station, which will involve installation of four to eight 'dishes' that we can monitor, we could be talking about 400,000 square feet of solar panels that draw energy from the light of the sun," McCausland said. "This would be the largest type in the world and would draw researchers from all over the world if it works."

The experimental project would last about two years—about the length of construction for the state's two new office buildings—to see if the solar panels are feasible for the larger scale heating.

"We would be able to tell in two years from next month if we can go ahead with this thing," McCausland said. "We're fortunate because of the land area and the bluffs around the capitol to install these reflectors if we find the project feasible."

The bluffs area around the Statehouse is an "ideal location" according to McCausland because the tilt of the land is within a few degrees of the angle at which the reflectors should be set to get the maximum sunlight. In addition, the consulting firm which studied the Statehouse land for the project said Iowa receives enough sunlight to provide sufficient energy.

IT IS TIME TO ADJUST DAIRY PRICE
SUPPORTS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday Representatives STEIGER of Wisconsin and I sent a letter to Secretary Butz urging his immediate consideration of adjustments in the dairy support levels in order to return to 80 percent of parity.

Rising production costs and falling dairy prices since January, when the price support levels were last adjusted, have forced many dairy farmers to convert to grains and other crops or leave farming entirely. Although Representative STEIGER and I would have preferred quarterly adjustments in the price support levels, as provided for in the vetoed emergency farm bill, we believe that it is imperative that Secretary Butz exercise his authority to make periodic adjustments at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that the letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., June 18, 1975.

HON. EARL L. BUTZ,

Secretary of the Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: After the President vetoed the Emergency Farm Bill of 1975, you wrote to Congressman Wampler, Ranking Minority Member of the House Agriculture Committee, saying "it is our intention to

make a semi-annual review of the dairy price support situation in the year ahead." Since the dairy price supports were last adjusted in January, the time for the review is at hand.

Although we personally believe that no less than quarterly adjustments in the price support are essential, the semi-annual reviews are a step in the right direction.

Since the January adjustment, production costs for the dairy farmer have continued to escalate while dairy prices have fallen. On January 3, when the new \$7.24 support level was announced, it represented 80 percent of parity. By April, dairy farmers were receiving only \$7.02 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk—\$.22 below the support price and only 75.4 per cent of parity.

The continuing deterioration of dairy prices is having a devastating effect upon the dairy industry in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture recently reported that more Wisconsin dairy farmers quit dairying in the first four months of 1975 than in all of 1974. The January-April loss was 939 herds compared to 895 for all of last year. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the end of 1974, Wisconsin had the lowest number of farms since the 1870's.

We believe that a timely and equitable adjustment of the price support levels is in order for the first week in July. We urge you to act immediately to adjust the dairy price supports rather than waiting until the hearings by the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry tentatively scheduled for July.

Best regards,

ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

OF KENNEDYS AND KINGS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, columnist William Safire has a most telling commentary on the wiretaps of Martin Luther King during the midsixties. While a good portion of his essay discusses the failure of Kennedy supporters to criticize the questionable actions of their much admired leader, I am more interested in his comments about the justifications for the wiretaps.

Throughout history, philosophers as well as politicians have struggled with the morality of whether the end justifies the means. In most cases, when viewed with hindsight, we tend to excuse the means used by well-meaning people in light of the great good they have accomplished. This, despite the fact that if the circumstances of the means were known at the time of the activity, its occurrence would have been soundly condemned.

The lesson we as Americans must learn from the sixties and seventies is that no individual with the immense powers of this Government at his hands is immune from misusing those powers—albeit to a greater or lesser degree. It is now essential to install the necessary checks on the abuse of power to prevent this personal corruption.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including Mr. Safire's column at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1975]

OF KENNEDYS AND KINGS

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—The diehard loyalty of the old Kennedy mythmakers is glorious to behold.

Those who have been assuring us for years that the Kennedys secretly battled J. Edgar Hoover gulped silently when Ben Bradlee recently broke ranks to reveal how President Kennedy invited the F.B.I. director to the White House to pore over dossiers and chorle over the peccadilloes of public men.

Those same Kennedy mythmakers helped fashion an article of impeachment when it was revealed that President Nixon ordered the F.B.I. wiretapping of newsmen. They now stand mute as the Rockefeller Commission report states that a newsman had been wiretapped by the C.I.A. in 1962—with no authority in law—"apparently with the knowledge and consent of Attorney General Kennedy." (We'll soon see if Frank Church follows that up.)

However, several old Kennedy hands have taken vociferous umbrage, in public and private, to a point made in this space about the double standard used in judging past Presidents: "Nixon never ordered the extended wiretapping of a civil rights leader for the purpose of leaking derogatory information about him to the press."

This referred to the wiretap that Attorney General Kennedy directed the F.B.I. to place on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on Oct. 10, 1963, and which remained in place for more than eighteen months until removed on April 30, 1965, by Robert Kennedy's successor, Nicholas Katzenbach.

During this time, in an attempt to besmear and discredit Dr. King, F.B.I. agents—in violation of the law—played recordings of bugged conversations and sounds from Dr. King's hotel rooms to newsmen, and even mailed one such salacious recording to Dr. King's wife. The Department of Justice has never sunk lower, before or since.

Nobody disputes those facts. The question is: Did the Kennedys have good reason to suspect that the purpose of the tap was not national security, and that the F.B.I. would leak whatever it found to smear its most outspoken critic?

Mr. Katzenbach tells me no. He writes: "A telephone tap on a phone used by Dr. King was authorized by Attorney General Kennedy in 1961 or 1962 [sic]. That tap was requested by Mr. Hoover on national security grounds by a written memorandum, which stated in the strongest terms that Dr. King was closely associated with a person known by the Bureau to be a high official of the Communist party in close contact with the U.S.S.R."

"The purpose of the tap was stated to be to assist the F.B.I. in determining whether Dr. King and his movement were being manipulated by this person in the interests of the Soviet Union."

I am informed by Mr. Katzenbach that in December 1964, (while the F.B.I. wiretap on Dr. King was still in operation) he was told by reporters that the F.B.I. possessed recordings of "buggings" of Dr. King which they were playing to newsmen. "I immediately inquired of the Bureau if this improper activity was in fact taking place and it was flatly denied. . . . I believe the activity did, however, cease immediately."

Mr. Katzenbach carefully differentiates between the warrantless wiretap approved by Mr. Kennedy and the "buggings" that he then thought were made by state law-enforcement officials. He believes there is a difference; I believe one reinforced the other.

He is correct, however, in denouncing as "utterly false" my assertion that the Justice Department had recently admitted that the purpose of the King wiretap was "investigating the love life of a group leader for dis-

seminating to the press." The department did use those words to describe the F.B.I.'s counterintelligence program and the leader referred to was Dr. King, but Mr. Katzenbach had left the Justice Department by that time and I regret the error.

I cannot accept, however, the mythmakers' line that Robert Kennedy was the innocent dupe of J. Edgar Hoover in this tawdry episode. He knew Mr. Hoover was out to "get" Dr. King's reputation; he knew how the director used raw material gathered in dossiers to titillate confidants, even Presidents. I believe Mr. Kennedy's purpose in authorizing the wiretaps was primarily to appease the powerful F.B.I. director, even if it meant letting him destroy the reputation of Martin Luther King.

Mr. Katzenbach insists that his own motive was purely national security, and I am satisfied that he believes that this is true. Yet, as he points out, he learned of the F.B.I.'s smear campaign in December 1964; with very good reason to know the real purpose of the F.B.I. tap, and with the power to terminate it with a single command, Mr. Katzenbach permitted the King wiretaps to continue for an additional five months. He had reason to suspect the commission of crimes by lawmen and—aside from asking the newsmen who alerted him to reveal their sources—the nation's chief law officer did nothing.

Privately, Kennedy mythmakers have been saying that the appeasement of Hoover on the King wiretap made it possible to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act. How's that for irony? Shades of Daniel Ellsberg and Gordon Liddy, men who thought it was right to break a few rules because they saw a higher cause. The Kennedys were willing to subvert the personal civil rights of the nation's leading fighter for civil rights—and do it in the name of civil rights.

ENDANGERMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD, I inserted Dr. William Walker's remarks on the endangerment of human rights and national security within South Korea.

At this time, I would like to include further comments by Dr. Walker who testified before the International Relations Subcommittee on International Organizations on this subject.

I believe that his remarks deserve an indepth review:

ENDANGERMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Despite its many imperfections we need to remember that the Republic of Korea is a far cry from its rival in the North. A recent article in the Far Eastern Economic Review—May 16, 1975—by Roy Whang, which is essentially negative toward and critical of the Park government in the South, nevertheless observes:

For it is important to keep a sense of proportion and recognize that no matter how authoritarian Park's Administration may be, it is the personification of perfect democracy compared with the Byzantine power-play in hermetically-sealed Pyongyang.

Basic human associations such as the family and religious groupings and many aspects of art, literature, and historical research enjoy full freedom in the Republic of Korea,

except where they impinge on immediate political activism. Prof. Jerome A. Cohen in his testimony of May 20 before this subcommittee commented on "the Park regime's descent toward totalitarianism." I suspect that Professor Cohen himself knows that the relatively pluralistic society and economy in the Republic of Korea and the absence of an all-embracing and pervasive ideology hardly justifies this term.

Second, it is important to remember that we are basically constrained against interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. Here in the case of the Republic of Korea, Americans have sometimes carried their political concerns and activism beyond bounds. This has been true in the case of some of our missionaries whose activities have sometimes resulted in the regime's interference in church matters and whose insistence on their own special rights has on occasion smacked of a former age of imperialism.

I note, for example, that in his testimony before this subcommittee the Reverend James P. Sinnot talked of his efforts to "make churchmen aware of the uses Park was making of them." He testified about seven months of political activity in the Republic of Korea, when he said, "We got much educating done at the almost bi-weekly prayer meetings." Such activities by foreigners could serve as a catalyst for turning the government against the Christian churches (symbols of foreign influence which modern nationalism needs to eliminate) and to turn Christians into activists against their government.

Third, the political traditions in lands such as Korea are all too frequently different from our own. Traditionally and today, government in Korea is not popular and its legitimacy is not usually judged by ratings in a Gallup poll. An American medical missionary who has served as a presidential interpreter, Dr. Paul S. Crane, has noted in his book, *Korean Patterns*:

By its very nature, the average Korean traditionally has looked upon government as a nuisance. Government is thought to exist largely for the benefit of the rulers. People seem to have little love for the government or those connected with it. Whereas there is great emotional loyalty to Korea, there often seems to be little sense of loyalty to support the administration in power.

Too frequently Americans with little experience in Korea are likely to forget this fundamental attitude in making assessments of current politics and policies.

Fourth, there has been a long accumulation of trends, events and incidents which have affected security perceptions in the South and particularly those of President Park. These have tended to reinforce each other and led to the enactment of Draconian measures and to acts of repression which all of us can only lament and deplore—repression of the student movement, political kidnappings, or actions against the great Korean daily *Donga Ilbo*—but it is legitimate to wonder how immune we would be to an exaggerated we-they attitude if we endured a similar catalog of problems. We can only remember the siege mentality revealed for our own White House through the Watergate hearings to realize how much more intense it might be for the Blue House in Seoul. Let me just briefly list a few items:

Literally thousands of violations on an almost daily basis of the Truce Accord to include sending commando units into the Republic of Korea.

The almost successful attempt on the life of President Park by a large commando unit sent from the North and getting within a few hundred feet of the Blue House in January 1968.

The seizure of the U.S. ship *Pueblo* a few days later resulting in American negotiations with the North on a bilateral basis and a relative ignoring of the seriousness of the Blue House raid.

The shock of the opening to Peking without informing our Korean ally.

The signature in January 1973 of the Paris Agreement which allowed North Vietnamese forces to remain in South Vietnam and signalled a defeat for American power at the hands of Communist forces.

The impact of detente diplomacy on a government which still has to cope with a Kim Il Sung whose every action defies detente.

The successes of North Korea in the Third World denied to the government of President Park because of its close ties to the United States.

The assassination attempt against the Korean President in August of last year which resulted in the tragic killing of his wife, and finally

The uncovering in the last seven months of the formidable tunnels which the North Koreans have dug underneath the demilitarized zone and which could be used by men of Kim Il Sung disguised as South Korean troops to give the impression of the military revolt against the Park government. This could make the situation sufficiently ambiguous to interfere with an effective American response to a Northern drive South.

Such is only a partial listing of important items. In Korea, an oft-forgotten country, a little country, and an area viewed not in terms of its own intrinsic value but as subordinate to policies toward Great Powers, the sum total can occasion serious insecurity indeed. In addition, we must remember the Koreans do follow closely developments in the United States because of their intimate dependence upon us. Numerous Korean leaders, including those in the opposition parties, have expressed to me their concern about an isolationist sentiment they sense here.

Fifth, there has been some tendency on the part of Americans who are prone to project our own institutions upon foreign lands, to assess the human rights issue in terms of political rights. Sometimes issues in Korea are judged in terms of elections, representative democracy, or unrestrained political activism. All too frequently the very activities for which South Koreans find themselves arrested or oppressed are expressions of political division and opposition. The society is one which seeks consensus rather than opposing positions, and organizational activities which our Anglo-American tradition regards as essential human freedoms are in Korea subversive political opposition.

Finally, and by all odds, most significant, Korea must be fitted into the general security picture of the Northwest Pacific. This is the area where the three great atomic powers meet, where the three greatest industrial powers meet, and where three of the six most populous nations of the world meet. It is the area of the most rapid expansion of American trade and of most significant economic development. And Korea is right at the heart of it—in the cockpit, so to speak.

In the last 2 years I have spent quite a bit of time on several visits to Japan, and I cannot stress enough how vital the Japanese regard the security of South Korea to their own. In the wake of Vietnam any indication of an abrogation of the American security commitment to Korea would have repercussions which could threaten the stability, development, and potential viability of the whole of Northeast Asia.

I find myself in wholehearted disagreement with the statement made to this subcommittee by Prof. Jerome A. Cohen that "a non-Communist South Korea is not vital to American security interests." Since he informed you that he based his recommendations on that assumption, I find it difficult to take his recommendations seriously. South Korea has become one of our own great trading partners (last year total import and export trade with the United States amounted to more than three billion dollars). Its trade with Japan is even more important for Tokyo.

The Republic of Korea is locked into a growing web of Free World trade in the Pacific. Thus its continued security is related in these sensitive days of international economic interdependence to the financial stability of many countries, including the United States.

The Republic of Korea, as this Subcommittee has been told, has registered some remarkable achievements in growth and development over the past decade and a half. In some cases this has brought with it expansion of important human rights (such as the right to decent food, clothing and shelter), but it has also occasioned social tensions, especially in the burgeoning urban areas, particularly Seoul. It is necessary to remind ourselves that much of what is happening in Korea takes place outside of Seoul and that the capital city is beset with problems and tensions, political activism and ambitions which are not necessarily reflective of all of Korea. Human rights have expanded at least to some extent in the rural countryside, as anyone who visited Korea and saw the impoverished condition in the years immediately after the war can attest. Improvement of the lot of the peasant through rural electrification, increased supplies of fertilizer and energy, and through the construction of transport facilities have reflected a cooperation between our two countries in which the assistance of the United States has helped the average Korean.

Nevertheless, there is a problem in Korea as testimony before this Subcommittee has made only too clear. While putting the Korean problems within the larger framework, we are not necessarily offering rationalization for practices which can possibly serve to undercut the very security of the Korean peninsula about which we worry. Corruption in human values, arbitrary and inhumane treatment, or repression of free expression of ideas serve neither the long range future of the United States nor the Republic of Korea.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is with this background in mind that my own recommendations to this Subcommittee are made in the hope that perhaps its work can serve to initiate a spiral of self-confident expansion of human rights on the Korean Peninsula. I hope that the tone can be positive and constructive rather than negative and disruptive.

1. Make the first order of business to reassure the people in south Korea that you regard their security and freedom as a major concern for the United States and that we will honor our mutual defense commitments with the Korean people.

2. In reporting findings and making your own recommendations to the Congress, do not fail to observe the nature of the Communist rule in North Korea. It is important, especially in the era of detente policies, that we not adopt a one-sided policy of criticizing and pressuring only our allies.

3. Give indication that we Americans understand some of the difficulties as well as the threats to security which beset our Korean ally and that we are anxious to assure that type of security which will enable the expansion of personal and civil rights for the Korean people.

4. Seek as a *quid pro quo* for continuing Congressional support for military and economic support, undertakings, commitments, and long-range plans from the Korean government for the guarantee of human rights as security increases in the peninsula.

5. Initiate a series of regular consultations with regard to the subjects which this Subcommittee legitimately feels it can pursue without being charged with interference in the domestic affairs of another nation or with being indifferent to different cultural values.

6. Finally do our many Korean friends in the Korean Government as well as those in

opposition the courtesy of letting them know that American concern for human rights there is not derivative of a prior concern for other powers. It is important that your deliberations in this Subcommittee not be the occasion which could lead Kim II Sung to make a miscalculation of American resolve in the Western Pacific.

**THE DEFENSE BUDGET:
MORE, MORE, MORE**

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Leslie Gelb which appeared in the New York Times, offers what I feel is a provocative analysis of a major area of debate in Congress on the issue of defense spending. Gelb points out with insight, that this year's Department of Defense budget request is a significant indication of a trend of increased budgets in future years. This request occurs at the very time many Members of Congress have been critically scrutinizing appropriations for defense.

The new programs we authorize, Mr. Speaker, will be adding billions of dollars to future authorizations. Each time we approve a new program, the defense budget inflates proportionately. Cost overruns have further exacerbated attempts to limit wasteful spending.

Despite our propensity for spending heavily on defense, we are, perhaps, no more secure than we were before the days of Minuteman and MIRV. Perhaps political cooperation offers more of a road to security than doomsday technology.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert for the RECORD Mr. Gelb's article which appeared in the June 15 issue of the New York Times:

THE DEFENSE BUDGET: MORE, MORE, MORE
(By Leslie H. Gelb)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is now well on its way to passing what Defense Secretary James Schlesinger calls his "turnaround defense budget" and what defense critics call "the camel's nose." It is both and more.

When the policies embedded in this \$100 billion-plus budget are analyzed and when the politics of its passage are examined, the effects over the next five years are of great importance.

It will lead to military spending on the order of \$150 billion, counting inflation, by 1980, by the Pentagon's own estimates.

It will thus mark the death-knell of the domestic priorities campaign launched by liberals with so much fanfare years ago.

The Navy increasingly will become the dominant service as the budget pie is sliced each year, with the Army descending into last place.

New strategic nuclear programs will get under way, intended as "bargaining chips" with the Soviet Union. The programs could, just as easily, lead to a new round of deadly nuclear competition.

Perhaps most important, the Pentagon acknowledges that the budget is designed to enable the United States to meet all of its existing commitments; the budget has not been framed with a view toward re-examining those commitments.

When Mr. Schlesinger spoke of a turnaround budget, he meant that this would be the first defense budget since about 1969

where the increase in military spending actually exceeded inflation. But more significant than the real increase in spending this year over last (estimated at about 8 per cent), is the new direction this budget will give to future military spending.

In actual figures between fiscal years 1972 and 1976 outlays went from \$75.8 to \$92.8 billion. However, until the fiscal year now being reviewed, the average spread between appropriations requests and outlays was about \$6 billion. For fiscal year 1976, however, the gap leaps to \$12 billion. The greater the spread between these two figures, the larger spending will be in succeeding years. This is because the funds are being committed to start programs that will inevitably expand and lead to even larger expenditures in future years. In other words, Congress is not only being asked to pass this year's defense budget, but to make commitments on spending over the next five years. As Mr. Schlesinger himself acknowledged in his budget presentation, there will be a real annual increase in spending of about \$2.4 billion for actual arms modernization and force readiness (that is, over and above pay increases and retirement costs), over the next five years.

When the House and the Senate debated and voted on the key part of this budget over the last several weeks, the \$28 billion Arms Procurement Bill, neither the indignation nor the votes were there among liberals and moderates to turn around the turnaround budget.

With the influx of liberals in the Congress from the last election, it seemed almost certain that this was the year for turning guns into butter. But the bill passed the House by better than a 3-to-1 margin. In the Senate, amendments to make modest cuts were beaten back by votes on the order of 56 to 39.

As in previous years, it was expected that the votes in the Senate would hinge on 10 to 12 "swing" senators. The other votes for and against were pretty much set. But this year, Democrats such as Edmund Muskie of Maine and John Pastore of Rhode Island, and Republicans such as Charles Percy of Illinois and James Pearson of Kansas, went the other way. Having held their ground over further aid to Indochina, they were in no mood to challenge the Administration on other foreign policy issues and run the risk of being labeled isolationists.

As this defense pie grows in succeeding years, more and more of it will go to the Navy, principally for ship-building. Navy ships are projected to increase from about 500 at present to about 600 in the mid-1980's. The division of the pie by services this year shows about \$34-billion for the Navy, about \$30.5-billion for the Air Force, and about \$25-billion for the Army. The Brookings Institution estimates that Navy expenditures will rise at about 6.3 per cent each year over the next five years as compared with 5.4 per cent for strategic nuclear forces, 4.4 per cent for tactical Navy and Air Force aircraft, and 3.3 per cent for the Army.

Most of the increase for the Navy is due to two factors. Congress mandated that new combat ships be nuclear-powered. This drives costs way up. And the Navy is the only service that says it cannot make reductions in the costs of support forces. Moreover, the increase comes at a time when a number of nongovernmental critics are questioning the role of a large surface naval fleet. Is a large Navy needed to fight an extended war in Europe? What does it mean in today's world to protect shipping and trade lanes?

The cost of new strategic nuclear weapons is not great in the new budget, but the kinds of weapons research and development that Congress has now approved are considered to be of great importance. The new programs—to enhance the explosive power and accuracy of missiles—will, if fully exploited, give the

United States the capability to destroy Soviet missiles in their hardened silos. Since the present mutual balance of terror is based on the ability of each side to destroy the other even after being attacked first, these new programs could undermine that balance.

Mr. Schlesinger speaks of the new programs as levers to bring about Soviet concessions in the Nuclear Arms Limitations Talks. But if the United States were to test these new weapons, it is almost a certainty that Moscow would want to do the same. Thus, threats with good intentions in the past have led to new arms races.

What drives this defense budget for President Ford, Defense Secretary Schlesinger and Secretary of State Kissinger is two factors. One is the continuing and somewhat inexplicable improvements in Soviet military power. The Administration is determined that the United States keep pace. Second is their attendant belief, as Mr. Schlesinger put it, that "We have vital interests in Western Europe, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and Asia." His watchword is "steadfastness." There is no sign, especially in the post-Vietnam environment, of a new adjustment in American overseas commitments.

The defense budget debate is not yet over this year. Other parts of the budget must be authorized and then the Congress must go through the appropriations process. But unless something drastic happens to alter the Congressional mood, it seems safe to say this: The liberals and moderates won their battle of principle over Vietnam only to decide that now was not the right time to extend these principles to other parts of the world; that for a while, things should stay about the same.

NEW HOUSING BILL

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by my colleagues, THOMAS M. REES, Democrat of California, and ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Democrat of Georgia, today in introducing a new housing bill incorporating the main features of the Emergency Homeowners Relief Act and the Emergency Middle Income Assistance Act approved by the House earlier this year. I am pleased to say that more than 50 Democrats have joined in sponsoring this measure since it was drafted late yesterday.

I am also pleased to say that this bill meets the major administration objections to the conference report and I have good reason to be satisfied that the President would sign it into law.

The question is whether the Congress is going to insist upon confrontation with the White House even when the President is willing to cooperate—indeed, to come 95 percent of the way. I think people want us to produce, not posture for the sake of politics.

The legislation introduced today is fully responsive to the two emergency housing measures which our Democratic Caucus gave top priority to earlier this year: An emergency housing measure to stimulate home building and mortgage foreclosure relief for home owners whose income has been substantially reduced as a result of the current recession.

Title I of the new bill is designed to stimulate the construction of 400,000 new

homes during the coming year. It authorizes a 7½ percent mortgage program in place of a program in the conference report which offered home buyers the choice of a 7-percent mortgage for the life of the mortgage, a 6-percent mortgage for 3 years, or a \$1,000 grant to cover the downpayment on a new home. At least 80 percent of the \$10 billion authorized for this new program is earmarked for purchase of mortgages up to a maximum of \$36,000. The purchase of multi-family and condominium units is included in its provisions.

Title II incorporates the major features of Ashley's original Emergency Homeowners Relief Act. It authorizes loans of up to \$250 a month for homeowners at least 3 months delinquent in their mortgage payments and threatened with foreclosure because of unemployment or substantial loss of income. Such distressed homeowners will be limited to twelve months participation in the program which will expire on June 30, 1976. An additional 12 months eligibility is available for homeowners deemed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to be in need of such assistance. The new bill authorizes HUD to enter into coinsurance agreements with lending institutions providing mortgage relief where this is determined to be more expedient than direct advances from HUD.

As we pointed out yesterday in a letter to Democratic House members, the extraneous, nonemergency, nongermane Senate amendments contained in the conference report are dropped but will be the subject of a separate bill.

In short, the new bill carries out the will of our Democratic Caucus, it meets the strictures of the Budget Resolution we recently adopted, and it is a measure that can become law and help people—an objective we are sure you share.

Let us be candid and realistic: The dual objectives of this bill represent Democratic initiatives. The administration has offered no alternatives. Nonetheless, the President is willing to cooperate if we are willing to meet some of the reasons for his upcoming veto of the conference report. Inasmuch as our basic Democratic aims will be met, and since we don't hold all the trump cards, we think cooperation makes better sense than confrontation—especially a losing confrontation.

LAFAYETTE LAKE AND THE NEED FOR FLOOD CONTROL

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Wabash River crested at 6 feet about flood stage, flooding two to three thousands acres of Indiana farmland. This recent flood is part of a continuous problem that has plagued the Lafayette area for decades.

For 6 days in early June of 1958 pounding rain, high winds, and hall-

storms struck Tippecanoe County. Swelled by the storm the Wabash River overran its banks, reaching more than 15 feet above flood stage. At the height of the flood nearly 20,000 acres of Tippecanoe County, including the low-lying sections of Lafayette and West Lafayette, were under water.

It was not the first time that devastating floods hit the Lafayette area, nor will it be the last. Since 1943 eleven persons have lost their lives as a result of Wabash flooding below the Wildcat. Engineers estimate that we can expect a flood like the 1958 flood once in every 15 years; floods like the 1943 disaster which cost four lives and swelled the Wabash to more than 17 feet above flood stage can be expected every 50 years; and the record-breaking devastation of the worst flood in county history, the 1913 disaster, is likely to be repeated once in every hundred years. Those who witnessed these disasters should remember that the conditions which caused them will definitely return.

Although scientists and engineers can predict how many floods will occur over the years, they can not predict exactly when flood waters will hit our area again. That is why we need to plan in advance to reduce the threat to lives and property in our county.

Some people say that the best way to protect an area from floods is to put money in the bank to pay victims for damages after floods. But that is not the same as preventing people in our area from becoming the victims of flooding. No amount of money can fully repay loss of human life.

There is one proven way to reduce the threat of flooding on the Wabash. The flood-control reservoirs at Salamonie, Mississinewa, and Huntington are already protecting lives and property in the upper Wabash and are taking some of the edge off floods that reach Tippecanoe County. The reservoir planned for the Lafayette area will take nearly two additional feet off flood crests at Lafayette, providing the protection against floodwaters we need. I insert the following:

WABASH RIVER FLOODING—THE GOOD OLD DAYS OR LAFAYETTE'S FUTURE?

Creeping Wabash Closes Five Roads (Lafayette Journal and Courier, December 28, 1973)

Wabash Hits 21.6 Feet; Still No Crest In Sight (Lafayette Journal and Courier; January 29, 1969)

Wabash River Begins A Reluctant Retreat (Lafayette Journal and Courier, January 31, 1969)

Water Tops 21-Foot Level; Several Highways Closed by Flood; Amphibious Duck Rescues 4 Persons Stranded in Car Near West Lafayette (Lafayette Journal and Courier, January 29, 1969)

Rain Raises Wabash; New Crest of Up To 26 Feet Seen (Lafayette Journal and Courier, June 13, 1958)

Brown Street Levee Flooded (Lafayette Journal and Courier, June 16, 1958)

FLOOD CRESTS AT LAFAYETTE

Flood waters reach Main and 3rd Streets, Southwest side of Lafayette under water, March, 1913, at 32 feet.

Serious damage near Wabash Avenue, threat to life, May, 1943, level of water at 28 feet.

Williamsburg Apartments flooded, June, 1958, water at 26 feet.

Extensive damages to county roads and bridges, February, 1936, January, 1950, February, 1959, water at level near 26 feet.

Evacuation of low lying homes in Southwest Lafayette, January, 1969, March, 1963, April, 1959, water at 24 feet.

North and South River Roads flooded, Wabash Valley Hospital isolated by flood waters, December, 1966, January, 1962, April, 1964, April, 1961, water at 22 feet.

Shamrock Park flooded, minor damage and road closing downstream, crop damage near Lafayette, January, 1959, July, 1958, December, 1973, water around 18 feet.

REPRESENTATIVE KARTH PROVES PROPHET ON PUSSYCAT ENERGY BILL

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Bible tells us that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country, and in his own house, and in recent weeks that seemed to hold true for a small band of courageous and far-sighted Members of the House.

They were the prophets and the men of wisdom, these Members of the small band who fought hard and long—and against heavy odds—for a strong and effective energy tax and conservation law.

One of the front-line leaders of this courageous group, both on and off the floor of the House, was Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota's Fourth District.

His was a highly principled position that withstood lobbying assaults from all sides and insidious pressures for compromise. Congressman KARTH battled continuously in this session for legislation that would perform two all-important services for the country and the American people: first, protect them against exorbitant price hikes on gasoline, motor oils and fuel oils; and second, even more important, protect Americans against another disastrous boycott by the Arab oil-producing nations.

Congressman KARTH and his colleagues, time and again, offered amendments to the energy tax bill that would achieve these two protections. But also their proposals would have provided other invaluable benefits, such as confronting Detroit with the most urgent incentives to begin production of fuel-efficient passenger cars and other vehicles.

Day by day, however, despite their prophetic warnings, KARTH and his colleagues saw the energy tax legislation softened, weakened, emasculated. In the end, as we know, it became nationally known as a "marshallow" bill and as "pussycat legislation."

But within a few hours of this body's approval of the "pussycat legislation," Mr. Speaker, Congressman KARTH and his colleagues were proved to be prophets who deserve to be honored in their own country.

This morning's newspapers carry side by side on page one the news story on

our 291 to 130 vote for the "marsh-mallow measure"—headlined "House Votes 'Battered' Energy Bill," and next to it another news story headlined "Estimates of U.S. Oil Cut in Half."

That second story is a shocker, informing us that:

Government experts have suddenly slashed their estimates of America's offshore oil riches by a dramatic 80 percent and said the entire nation may have only half the undiscovered oil and gas resources thought to exist a year ago.

So there we are, Mr. Speaker. The future caught up with us less than 1 day after we voted approval of this feeble energy tax charade. Just as Congressman KARTH and his fellow-fighters feared, we are now, as a Nation, vulnerable again. And again we are susceptible to enormous price hikes as we become desperate for gasoline, and susceptible again to an Arab boycott which could ruin our economy.

For his brave but losing fight, Representative KARTH deserves everlasting credit and our thanks.

The St. Paul Pioneer Press, in a recent searching editorial on this issue and our sadly inadequate congressional action, pays tribute to Mr. KARTH's leadership and courage in this legislative battle which will shape the American destiny for many years to come.

The editorial follows:

Go, Go, Gas Hog!

The remains of the House energy bill, a pussy-cat in the tank, will be voted on this week and (probably) passed and shipped over to the Senate. There's just a chance some muscle can be restored there. You'd think the boys would do it to stop President Ford from laughing at them, if no other good reason comes to mind.

Every bit of fuel conserving strength was drained from the House bill and all attempts to toughen it were defeated. Among the features that were lost were a tax to discourage gasoline use and to finance studies of alternative energy sources and a special tax on gas-guzzling cars aimed at encouraging Detroit to produce more efficient machines.

Heavy lobbying by the auto industry and organized labor—especially the United Auto Workers—was successful in defeating the gas-guzzler tax. There were forecasts made that thousands of jobs would be lost if the measure passed. St. Paul, it was said, would lose its Ford assembly plant, which is a big car operation.

In the end, the vote was overwhelming. Slide-rule types are still trying to figure it out, but the net effect of the House bill appears to be an actual reduction in gasoline prices, thus encouraging rather than discouraging fuel consumption.

Rep. Joe Karth, D-Minn., was among the sponsors of the gas-guzzler tax proposal. He took his share of the heat and stood by his beliefs. Basic to Karth's position is the thought that Detroit can build and sell efficient cars, that if it offers good, economical machines it will pull ahead of foreign competition and the result will be a turnaround in auto industry employment. It's even possible Ford could be putting together something other than LTD's in its St. Paul plant.

It strikes us that the Karth approach makes sense. He said it would save some 500,000 barrels of fuel a day by 1980 and this is what the whole energy law business is about—conservation aimed at reducing American dependence on imported oil. Taxing inefficient cars to achieve that end is far more desirable than making it "uneconomical" to heat one's house in the winter. That is

what comes of straight by-the-barrel taxes and tariffs on crude oil.

The Karth proposal (you see it identified in news stories with one of the other authors, Rep. Joseph Fisher, D-Va.) calls first for a sliding scale of taxes based on the miles per gallon a given car delivers; The more mpg the less the tax. It would go into effect with 1977 model cars and peak in the 1980 model year. For examples: The tax on a 17 mpg car in 1977 would be zero, but by 1980 such a car would be taxed \$300; a car delivering under 13 mpg would be taxed \$300 in 1977 and \$1,400 in 1980. Tax specifics would appear on the car sticker price sheet.

A second part of the proposal involves a special manufacturer's excise tax to be imposed on any manufacturer or importer whose total production—or total imports—fail to meet specified average mileage requirements, reaching 20 mpg in the 1980 model year. Environmental Protection Agency testing and administrative procedures would be followed.

The matter seems to be dead in the House, although a token effort may be made to amend a Commerce Committee energy bill with some sort of gas-guzzler penalty clause. Attention has shifted to the Senate, and Karth and his people are now working closely with Sen. Walter Mondale, D-Minn. There's a Senate Commerce Committee bill on auto standards that should reach the floor soon and is subject to amendment. Then there's that House energy bill that will be going over as a conversation piece, if nothing else . . .

THE TEXAS EXPERIENCE WITH NO-FAULT INSURANCE

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Texas State Board of Insurance, Joe Christie, recently gave one of the most enlightened speeches which I have ever heard on no-fault insurance. His remarks and the Texas experience would be well worth reading by my colleagues in Congress:

REMARKS ON NO-FAULT AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

(By Joe Christie)

In June of 1972, President Richard Nixon wired the National Governors' Conference that no-fault automobile insurance was an "idea whose time had come".

To me, this was a certain sign that an election year was upon us and that word of widespread dissatisfaction with the current system of liability insurance had somehow reached the oval office.

The pronouncement also implied that no-fault insurance is new or revolutionary. In basic terms, no-fault insurance is simply a system of first-party insurance which provides some combination of medical, disability—and occasionally—property coverage.

In many areas, policyholders can look to their own insurance companies for payment of claims.

This kind of insurance is neither new or revolutionary.

I might also mention at the outset, that I have no vested interest in either eliminating, modifying or continuing the third party liability system in automobile insurance. As a State insurance regulator, I feel we have enough experience to regulate both no-fault and fault type coverages. In fact, we do now.

My one overriding interest is an automobile insurance system that will best serve

Texans. I think this is a concern that you share with me.

On the other hand, the social impact and importance of automobile insurance raises serious concern with me regarding the advisability of a nation-wide experiment to test no-fault.

A spokesman for the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—commonly referred to as the NAIC—recently voiced to members of the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee a similar concern.

The NAIC membership consists of the principal insurance regulatory officials of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Nation's trust territories, and in effect represents the best brains and talent in the insurance regulatory field.

Their concern deals primarily with the establishment of national standards for automobile insurance.

Applying the no-fault concept nationwide disregards a wide range of legislative choices at the State level that the Federal Government is not equipped to handle.

Proponents of no-fault are urging that virtually all injuries will be compensated regardless of fault. The conflicting objectives are apparent—lower costs versus increased benefits—you can't have both.

Local considerations and conditions in each State, however, effect the basic questions such as what benefits the public wants, what privileges the public is willing to forego and what cost level is acceptable.

According to the testimony of my colleagues in the NAIC:

"At present, 24 States with over 53 percent of the national population have enacted some form of no-fault legislation. The approaches vary, and it is only by the process of trial and error that the public will ascertain the true costs and benefits of the various no-fault plans. The experimental efforts at the State level are uniquely suited to sifting through the multitude of factors, concepts, attitudes and values, which vary from area to area. Not all States are alike and public policy changes can be best made on a State-by-State basis."

I think the last sentence of that statement is the most realistic reason that we shouldn't enact a Federal no-fault system.

Citizens of different States are not equally benefited or hurt by or receptive to a mandated Federal, nationwide program. Medical costs in Texas are not the same as those in New York. Liability claims in California are generally not the same as those in Iowa.

Ultimately, the best solution for one State may be inappropriate in another.

There is no reason justifying a mandated nationwide program that would encumber or inhibit State-by-State development of better forms of automobile insurance.

In effect, a Federal no-fault bill would "freeze" no-fault into a single approach at the very time when experimentation is most needed.

It would also put every Member of Congress into the middle of subsequent premium rate and benefit level controversies. And, I'd venture to say you'd be receiving calls from your constituents when they were involved in fender-benders. When there were premium increases or claim problems, you would probably get a large share of the blame if the system failed to deliver what was promised.

The law would permit Federal regulatory involvement to the point of allowing the Secretary of Transportation wide discretion in applying the national standards. The bill would allow Federal investigation of virtually everything an insurer does and the operation and effectiveness of the State insurance departments.

I think that's an open invitation to take a multi-billion dollar casualty and liability industry and make it the biggest political game in town since the signing of the declaration of independence.

For years, the insurance industry and the states have enjoyed a unique freedom from federal interference because the supreme court has consistently held that insurance was not in interstate commerce.

When the court reversed that position in 1944, congress passed legislation to keep the states predominant in regulating insurance.

The federal role, traditionally, has been confined to a few special situations—crop insurance, bank deposits, and lately, the federal government has moved into inner-city riot insurance and flood insurance.

National no-fault, on the other hand, is a sweeping change in the federal government's role. It is a change which you should question very seriously. As a general proposition, I don't think it's the kind of federalism that makes good sense.

From the customer's point of view, the known local points for applying citizen pressure would be removed, disbursed, or obscured.

And, there would be no assurance that the resulting quality of federal regulation would justify the dislocations caused by this change of regulatory authority.

The history of several federal agencies do not give rise to over-confidence—but I'm not going to say anything about the post office department today.

You might be skeptical by what I have been saying and I'd question my own credibility were it not for the fact that I am convinced that Texas has demonstrated a better grasp of this issue than most of the other States.

Nearly two years ago, I requested that the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs evaluate the State's automobile accident compensation system.

I had noticed that all the advertisements favoring no-fault had been paid by the insurance companies. That made me suspicious.

I had noticed that all the testimony opposing no-fault had been given by my fellow lawyers. That made me suspicious.

What I had not seen was an objective, no-axe-to-grind investigation of the subject and its effects on Texas drivers—not the drivers in Iowa or California or Florida.

What they produced in the course of 18 months is the first and most far-reaching research activity ever undertaken in our State. It is a comprehensive and current assessment of our automobile insurance picture and I have provided you and your legislative assistant with a copy of this report.

The school's first conclusion was that no-fault in Texas was not a cure-all for the present system. It did recommend some reforms and these recommendations were sent to the legislature.

Most startling, however, was the finding that the Milliman and Robertson study on national no-fault that the Department of Transportation paid \$3 million for was woefully inadequate and immensely unreliable.

Within the last few months, others have come forward to criticize the DOT study. Notably, an early supporter of no-fault insurance, the Allstate Insurance Company, testified in the Senate that promises of reduced premiums under S. 354 and its predecessor S. 945 were unreal.

An Allstate spokesman said:

"The Milliman & Robertson report predicted that in most instances the average price of automobile insurance in most States would decrease as the result of enactment of S. 354. We devoted a great deal of time and attention to a thorough review of M. & R. costing. After completion of this review, we concluded that it was seriously deficient in numerous respects. M. & R. does not in fact adequately reflect what would happen to the average private passenger car owner in the real world of operation of S. 354."

"Allstate's costing reflects that private passenger cars will have to pay more."

The company also criticized the M. & R.

study for pricing survivors benefits too low or at least unreasonably low. The Federal study pegged death benefits at \$5,000, when a \$15,000 figure more accurately reflects the benefits in most States.

The company's reversal of its position on national no-fault was not one of whim. Their statistics were based on their actual experience in Florida.

The model bill in the M. & R. study suggested the Florida rate would be \$85.00, but real world experience showed that an adequate rate was \$92.00.

When Florida passed no-fault, the legislation mandated a 15 per cent reduction in premiums. Since that time there have been two successive rate increases and now policyholders are paying \$23.00 a year more than under the previous system.

The same story will hold true for Texas, according to the LBJ report. The study group concluded they could not justify recommending a switch to no-fault on the basis of premium reduction alone.

The study does discuss a modified no-fault plan and a modified tort liability plan for Texas and ultimately recommends that the modified tort liability plan be adopted.

The proposed modified tort liability plan leans heavily on being paid by one's own insurance company for his losses and restricts damage suits so long as the mandatory first-party coverage is the initial source of recovery.

There are uncertainties about the Federal plan that I hope you will study and review. Like you, I want to support a system that will serve the best interests of Texas motorists. I cannot endorse something that will dramatically hike the cost of driving an automobile in Texas.

FICTION AND FACT

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Newberry News, of Newberry, Mich. ran an interesting editorial comment regarding our involvement in South Vietnam. I would commend this article to my colleagues for its thoughtful viewpoint, and thank Mr. A. Glen Hunter of Newberry for bringing it to my attention:

FICTION AND FACT

Finally, our involvement in Viet Nam is over. Like most Americans, we are greatly relieved, but we also view it with a certain introspection.

Our first thoughts went out to the relatives of those from the Luce County area who lost loved ones in the conflict. We wondered how they must feel upon hearing of the fall of South Viet Nam, that their loss had very little meaning. But aren't all wars that way? What good has any war accomplished except that heretofore, we were always on the winning side?

If any good is to come out of the Viet Nam War it will be that now we will have time to sit and reflect upon our role in the world of nations. And if we have learned anything at all we will insist upon considerably more candor from our political and military leaders. If we have learned anything at all, we will accept our military leaders for what they are, people educated and trained in the art of conducting war. We should have learned that 20 years ago when MacArthur tried to march his troops beyond the Yalu River and into Red China. That alone would have given us enough military "games" to last us 30 years.

If we have learned anything from the Viet Nam War, we will know that wars are not fought to protect the world for freedom and democracy. That's a cop out. We fight to protect our "have" status. Other poorer nations and peoples, the "have nots", fight to feed their starving masses or kill them off so they won't have to feed them, whichever is most expedient. Our foreign aid programs are well-intentioned, but invariably we expect the recipients of our "conscience money" to support us against communism. They probably don't know what the word means and could care less. Invariably we end up supporting a military dictatorship that is just as bad if not worse than communism, and the starving are still starving. Do not weep too many tears over the Vietnamese people. The majority of them may fare better under Ho Chi Minh than they did under us. But that's not the ultimate answer either.

Our role as a leader of nations should be to address ourselves to the real causes of unrest in the world; overpopulation and underproduction of food. If we have to attach strings to our foreign aid, let them be strings that would encourage a greater production of food and less children.

If we have learned anything from the Viet Nam War, it should be that we cannot impose our form of government, our religious beliefs or anything else that is ours on people of other nations. Somehow we have come to believe that the answer to the world's starving masses is to convert them to accepting our democratic form of government, our religion, our western culture. It does not work. Democracy works here, but in an undeveloped country it doesn't stand much of a chance. We have been trying to "Christianize" the far east since before Teddy Roosevelt's time, but we must remember that we are trying to change a civilization that is much older than our own, and that may prove to be a monumental task. It is not easy to change attitudes and beliefs that have been handed down for more than 2,000 years. And who is to say Christianity, as we practice it, has all the answers?

We have strongly suspected that American governments in the past have been subject to some bad advice from their ambassadors and foreign emissaries. This is one fault of our political system. "To the victor belong the spoils." Why is it we always have to appoint political hacks to these important positions? An ambassador ought to be the highest on the civil service totem pole. If we can require high qualifications for our mental hospitals, we ought, perhaps, to require a Ph.D. in foreign relations and five years experience living with a family in the country in which the appointee is to serve for ambassadorships. Can you imagine Scopy Williams, the poor little rich boy, as any kind of any ambassador, much less ambassador to an African country?

I love my country. She has been subjected to traumas in the past several years that would topple a lesser nation. The lessons of Watergate and the Viet Nam War will only make her stronger. If that happens, then the sacrifice of those who paid the ultimate price will have some meaning.

PAUL SIMON PROPOSES MEANINGFUL FOREIGN AID FORMULA

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years this Nation's foreign assistance program has been subjected

to ever-increasing scrutiny and reexamination. Considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed both over the manner in which our foreign aid is dispensed and the program's overall objectives. For far too many years there has been a longstanding preoccupation with achieving short-term political goals and in mollifying opposition from overseas rather than attempting to aid in the establishment of a sound economic and social infrastructure upon which third world countries can base meaningful development. Many believe that the premises upon which our economic aid program in other lands are based are often unsound and that they have frequently helped to exacerbate international tensions rather than provide the security and economic-political-social stability which they theoretically seek.

Certainly a reassessment or reappraisal of the foreign aid program is needed and it should be healthy. We should consider how we are dispensing assistance, to whom and why. Past and present policies should be closely studied and new determinations as to future directions should be made.

Recently our very able and distinguished colleague from Illinois, PAUL SIMON, has prepared a very thoughtful and thought-provoking article on the foreign assistance effort. Appearing in last Saturday's Washington Post, Mr. SIMON's article quite properly observes that the present structure of the foreign aid efforts has resulted in "gross inequities in disbursement and less than effective use of our funds." In order to overcome the numerous serious shortcomings which now exist, Congressman SIMON has recommended the creation of a formula on which the dispensation of our foreign aid can be based. As he notes:

The criteria of the formula deal with basic development goals, while leaving methods open to choice.

A former Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and a former member of that State's house of representatives and senate, PAUL SIMON has had considerable experience in the field of foreign assistance and world nutrition and food. He is the author of "A Hungry World" and coauthor, with his brother, of "The Politics of World Hunger," which he has very graciously shared with many of us. I believe his timely and well-written article on a foreign aid formula warrants close and careful consideration, particularly as the House International Relations Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, will begin working on the foreign aid authorization in the not-too-distant future. I commend Representative SIMON's article to the attention of our colleagues and am pleased to insert it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

"WE NEED A FOREIGN AID FORMULA"

(By Paul Simon)

"Reappraisal" is the popular word after our painful exit from Vietnam, and one of the areas in which a genuine reappraisal should take place is foreign economic assistance. We need a foreign aid formula.

We have taken this step with Public Law 480 (Food for Peace), and there is discussion about even further reform there. Public Law 480 has been changed to require that 70 per cent of the benefits go to nations classified as

the most needy by the United Nations. It still leaves flexibility, but it gives a much greater sense of direction than we formerly had.

That same sense of direction is needed for general economic assistance abroad. Flexibility should be there, but also some guidelines. The present process—foreign aid on the basis of whim or the casual conversation of a Secretary of State with a foreign official—should be reduced. No other government program provides as unrestrained an opportunity for executive expenditure as does our foreign economic aid.

The result has been gross inequities in disbursement and less than effective use of our funds.

Gradually more of our aid can be channeled through international agencies, but aside from the international banking institutions there is yet to develop among the international agencies the effectiveness we might hope for in the assistance field. That means that the United States and other donor nations must have their own programs and try to make them effective.

And while there may be some criticism that a foreign aid formula would interfere with the domestic affairs of another country, in reality there has always been a limited amount of interference, and often of the worst kind: deceptive, secret, too often supporting the status quo, too rarely supporting reform.

We could, instead, be open about our intentions, and perhaps even invite some of the developing nations to help draft the formula.

How should we shape such guidelines?

Thirty per cent of aid could be continued as at present, with complete flexibility. The choice of nations to be selected for the application of the formula would, in fact, give an administration additional flexibility. A formula might be:

	Percent
Need	35
Capacity for growth.....	15
Equalization factors.....	15
Respect for Civil Liberties.....	10
Restraint on military spending.....	10
Population control.....	10
Environmental concern.....	5

Need. Those with the greatest need should receive the most assistance. Obvious and fundamental, this has not been our practice.

Capacity for Growth. A realistic assessment of the development potential of a recipient country should be part of any aid package. Assistance should be determined in part by where it can produce effective results.

Equalization Measures. This would test a country's willingness to further development in such a way that it produces gains for the bottom-rung poor. Land reform, loans to small farmers, a labor-intensive approach to production, education that includes the rural poor—these are some of the methods for further equalization.

Respect for Civil Liberties. There is no need to underestimate the difficulty of reaching even limited goals. Africa provides an example. Over a third of Africa is under military rule and most of the remaining countries have only one political party; they face special difficulties. After allowances are made for local circumstances, it is important to distinguish between repressive regimes and those growing in commitment to civil liberties.

Military Spending. Too frequently countries devote far too much of their budgets for military equipment they do not need and the purchase of which actually retards their development. This sometimes stimulates a regional arms race, suppressing whole areas of the world. And as the No. 1 seller of military weapon systems, we have often encouraged a retardation of economic development. Given a formula, would a country such as India develop nuclear capability if it were

known that it might result in a significant reduction in foreign assistance?

Population Control. This is a sensitive area and cannot be forced, but demonstration of effective efforts ought to be part of the formula.

Environmental Concern. This is a difficult one for developing nations who look with envy upon the sources of our industrial air pollution. They would like to have some of our environmental problems. But there should be a growing awareness that even in a poor country garbage should not be dumped into the ocean, that steps should be taken to safeguard water supplies and that there are environmental hazards to be reckoned with in the most underdeveloped parts of the world.

How would the formula work practically?

County "A" theoretically could receive a maximum of \$100 million:

	Possible	Actual
Need (the country falls into a second of 10 possible ranks on need).....	\$35	\$31.5
Capacity for growth (high).....	15	15
Equalization (fairly high).....	15	13
Respect for civil liberties (high).....	10	10
Restraint on military spending (ranks poorly).....	10	--
Population control (fair).....	10	4
Environmental concern (good).....	5	5
Total	100	78.5

A formula of this type can give developing nations support to do what they should do on their own but perhaps hesitate to do for domestic political reasons. The carrot of assistance can help countries adopt better development practices. This "carrot approach" has worked with such marked success within the United States, bringing major reforms in everything from schools to nursing homes—yet it has not been applied in the international sector because we hesitate to be openly involved in the internal affairs of other countries. But we have fooled no one.

The criteria of the formula deal with basic development goals, while leaving methods open to choice. They do not prescribe capitalism or socialism. They allow, by intention, considerable latitude in how a country reaches its objectives.

The measurements harmonize with the stated ideals of the United Nations, and they derive no less clearly from the ideals of the United States. Their use might dramatically shift the flow of our present assistance and be equally dramatic in the increased effectiveness of that aid.

A FOLLOWUP ON THE VIETNAM REFUGEES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I call my colleagues' attention to a report in Wednesday's Washington Post which indicates that more than 2,650 Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees now wish to return home. The article also notes that the new government in South Vietnam has reacted positively to overtures by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, who has sought to determine whether those who return would be welcome.

I raise this point, because I seem to re-

call a lot of criticism, bordering at times on ridicule, directed both at me and at Senator McGovern when we suggested last month that many refugees might want to go back when the bloodbath scare subsides and ought to be offered the opportunity to do so.

The hundreds who have already expressed a wish to return are apparently far more trusting than our friends in the executive branch who have responded to the new governments in South Vietnam and Cambodia only by imposing a total trade embargo on those countries and pulling off a trigger-happy police action in the Gulf of Siam.

The text of the article follows:

INDOCHINA REFUGEES ASK RETURN

UNITED NATIONS, June 17.—More than 2,650 Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees have expressed a desire to return home, U.N. officials said today.

They include 1,982 Vietnamese, most of them still on Guam, and 670 Cambodians, the office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees said. In addition, 67 Vietnamese are known to have returned already on their own, officials said.

The first batch of several hundred repatriation applications was turned over to representatives of the new Saigon government last week, a U.N. commission staffer said.

"Their attitude so far has been completely positive and we foresee no difficulties," said the staff member. He added that the first group of voluntary repatriates could be flown back to Vietnam by the United Nations "in a matter of weeks."

The reasons the Vietnamese give for returning vary, he said. Many insist they had no intention of leaving in the first place, but were swept along in the confusion. Others say they want to return because their families are there or that with the war over, they want to help reconstruct Vietnam.

U.N. officials have been in touch with Cambodian authorities in Hanoi, Paris and Peking on behalf of Cambodians who asked U.N. assistance in returning, but there has been no official response, they said.

"This is not the final figure," the U.N. commission's report said. "People will be coming forward for months; it is not something to settle overnight. The important thing is to keep the option of returning open."

To do this, U.N. officials have located themselves in the camps, placed announcements in camp newspapers, and talked informally to groups of refugees.

"They know we are there if they want to use us," the U.N. official said.

ALTERNATIVES NEEDED FOR SOLUTION TO NORTHEAST RAIL CRISIS

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to direct the U.S. Railway Association in its final system plan to provide for the establishment of a Federal administration to acquire, rehabilitate, and maintain the track, roadbed, and associated fixed facilities of the railroad corporations being reorganized under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973.

In the weeks since the release of the preliminary system plan by the USRA, a great deal of concern has surfaced.

The formidable abandonment proposals, with their potentially dire economic consequences to many businesses and communities, coupled with the magnitude of projected Government-guaranteed borrowing, are only two of the troubling issues.

In my own State of New Jersey there is great concern about both abandonment and the maintenance-solvency problem. The USRA plan would eliminate a total of approximately 6,000 miles, including as many as 295 miles in New Jersey. The State's Commissioner of Transportation has called for a reconsideration of the proposals, which would eliminate a number of valuable branch and secondary lines in the State, arguing that the requirement that lines must be within 10 percent of profitability is unrealistic and could be disastrous.

What we are clearly facing is an escalating, interconnected crisis for our country's rail system—with a clear impact on the whole of the effectiveness of our national transportation system. The present problems facing ConRail, combined with its formidable abandonment plans, indicate that the situation can only be expected to become worse.

On April 9, I introduced the Railroad Right-of-Way Protection Act which provides for a Federal administration which would optionally acquire and maintain essential rail lines. This is the product of extended study of various proposals put forward to maintain a rail transportation system as a vital national interest. A key component of this effort must be to maintain a viable, competitive railroad industry in a constructive partnership with the Federal and State governments.

The provisions of H.R. 5777 are designed to build on the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 and to complement the efforts already made by the USRA in the Northeast and Midwest. Other important provisions are directed toward a larger State role with respect to the design and operation of an essential railway system and for protection against sudden railroad spur abandonments. It also assists private sector competition, with built-in incentives to railroad companies to increase services and promote efficient operations while being relieved of the major portion of overhead costs for track maintenance and State and local taxes on track routes.

My bill calls for a limited, but clearly defined Federal role; establishes a responsible advisory committee of directly involved parties, including management and labor, to monitor the rail system; provides for maximum recognition of the rights, wage rates, and labor contracts of railroad employees; spells out reporting requirements to enable effective congressional oversight; and facilitates the consolidation or merger of properties of rail carriers.

Although H.R. 5777 addresses itself to a national solution to the railroad problem, I believe that its provisions should be applied now to the Northeast and Midwest systems.

The U.S. Railway Association itself acknowledged at the time the preliminary system plan was released that an alternative means of providing funds and

security for Government obligations would be separate ownership and financing of the railroad right-of-way and structures, as well as their rehabilitation.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. ADAMS, one of the two principal sponsors of the Northeast rail legislation, has recently stated that Government acquisition of all the lines of the bankrupt railroads could correct the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I introduce today would direct USRA to make this correction itself—a more desirable course of action than having Congress reject the preliminary system plan, leaving the fate of the Northeast and Midwest bankrupt railroads still undetermined.

The net result would be that, for the Northeast and Midwest at least, rail carriers would be placed on the same institutional basis as air, water, and highway carriers. That should make the railroads more viable and should lead us to recognize that the profit figures for particular lines should not be the sole criterion for determining whether or not such lines should continue to serve the needs of the region, indeed of America, now and in the future. This approach would also enable us to obtain the benefits of having public control over a vital aspect of national transportation policy, while retaining the benefits of private competition between companies for the most efficient conveyance of persons and goods.

July 26 is a very short time away. If congressional action is to have any effect on the planning decisions of USRA, we must make our objections to the initial USRA plan clear now. We can ill afford to continue pumping hundreds of millions of dollars into bankrupt railroads with few or no assurances that the result will be a more viable, competitive rail transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration of this resolution.

HOW THE MEDIA HELPED DEFEAT US IN VIETNAM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, certain news commentators and others have suggested there ought not be any recriminations relative to the fall of South Vietnam, but I hold an opposing view. We ought to find out why our policy was wrong, who was responsible, and why we were defeated. Many persons and things contributed to that defeat. Among the more interesting reasons mentioned was the one described by AIM—accuracy in media—in its April 1975 report. The article follows:

HOW THE MEDIA HELPED DEFEAT US

The use of psychology and propaganda as a weapon of war is not a communist invention. The British, and indeed we ourselves, developed the art to a high degree in World War I. We recognized its great importance and made full use of it in World War II.

But for some strange reason, we downgraded these tools in the two wars we have fought against the communists in Korea and Vietnam.

Just as the French abandoned the fight in Indochina because they had been psychologically defeated at home, so the United States abandoned Vietnam because it lost the will to do what it had the power to do.

The technique our enemy used to achieve this was outlined 40 years ago in a book by Edward Banse, *Germany Prepares for War*. Banse wrote:

It is essential to attack the enemy nation's weak spots—and what nation has not its weak spots? You must undermine, crush, break down its resistance and convince it that it is being deceived, misled and brought to destruction by its own government. This is done to cause it to lose confidence in the justice of its cause so that the opposition at home . . . may raise its head and make trouble more successfully than before.

The original well-knit, solid, powerful fabric of the enemy nation must be gradually disintegrated, broken down, rotted, so that it falls to pieces like a fungus when one treads on it in the woods.

Our communist enemy was greatly aided in accomplishing this by the fact that we were fighting an undeclared war. We refused to apply the restraints on journalists and the press that were taken for granted in earlier wars.

One result was that in the midst of the war, journalists and others were able to visit the enemy country. Those permitted to do so were carefully screened by the enemy, and care was taken to insure that only those who would help the enemy's psychological warfare were admitted. There were, of course, journalists who saw that this was folly and who said so. For example, Crosby Noyes, foreign editor of the *Washington Star*, said this in a column published January 3, 1967:

This is the first U.S. government in history to have committed American lives to the outcome of a war and at the same time permitted—one could almost say invited—the systematic subversion of this commitment by the press . . . It is simply incredible that a government can ship 400,000 men to fight in a war and at the same time cheerfully accede to visits by reporters, hand-picked by the enemy, to tour his territory and write straight-faced dispatches on what they are told and shown.

The folly of the government is compounded by the divisions of public opinion that exist in this country over the war. No matter how conscientious the visiting reporters may try to be, it is inevitable that what they see and hear will serve the cause of the enemy and further confuse opinion at home. Their dispatches are already being seized on by domestic critics who for years have done everything in their power to subvert the effort in Vietnam.

Among those who made the pilgrimage to Hanoi and assisted in disseminating Hanoi's propaganda were Harrison Salisbury and Anthony Lewis of *The New York Times*. Salisbury was criticized for having sent back Hanoi propaganda handouts without indicating the source. Lewis filed a story carried on page one that was designed to discredit the effectiveness of the mining of Haiphong harbor. It was soon shown that his facts were totally wrong.

Charles Collingwood of CBS was another visitor to Hanoi who proved helpful in their propaganda offensive. On April 8, 1968 Radio Hanoi broadcast Collingwood's interview with the communist regime's foreign minister. The Vietnamese used the interview to denounce President Johnson, to appeal to the opposition, and to convince the American people that they were being deceived and misled. According to Radio Hanoi, Collingwood asked: "Is there any specific message that you would like to convey to the American people through the medium of CBS?"

The reply was an appeal to the Americans to halt their "war of aggression," to question why their sons had to fight and die in

Vietnam, to appreciate that Vietnam was simply fighting for independence as America once did, etc. The formula followed Ewald Banse's prescription perfectly.

A captured Vietcong document, "Report on Propaganda and Foreign Affairs," in 1967 spelled out the goals of the communist propaganda offensive. Among the themes they were ordered to stress were "the fascist and dictatorial" character of the South Vietnamese government, American "crimes" and the "barbarous character" of the U.S. military activities, U.S. "neo-colonialism" and the inevitability of a U.S. defeat. These became familiar themes in the American news media in the ensuing years.

It was not only the journalists who journeyed to Hanoi that helped disseminate the propaganda. The veteran Scripps-Howard correspondent, Jim Lucas, who covered Vietnam from 1964 to 1968, pointed out in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that there were serious problems with the reporters stationed in South Vietnam. He recommended that a hard look be taken at the accreditation procedures, and he favored the imposition of censorship in the war zone. He pointed out that some of the correspondents "don't give a damn how many lives they cost if they can launch a successful career." He added: "Some simply do not like us. They make no bones about it. They are not on our side." In another forum, Lucas went so far as to say that he did not think *The New York Times* had had a reporter in Saigon who was on our side in all the years he was in Vietnam.

TET: A VICTORY THE MEDIA LOST

The turning point in the Vietnam propaganda war came in February 1968. The communists launched their Tet Truce offensive, and they suffered a stunning military defeat. They expected the South Vietnamese in the cities to rise up and support them. It did not happen, and the Vietcong elite were wiped out.

But the American news media told the story differently. TV was especially effective in convincing the public that they had been deceived when their leaders told them that great progress had been made in bringing the situation in Vietnam under control. Edward Jay Epstein described how the networks covered the story and the impact their distorted portrayal had on the country in an article in *TV Guide* on October 6, 1973. One result was that support for the war, according to the polls, sank from 74 per cent at the beginning of February to less than 50 per cent two months later.

Epstein relates that later in the year an NBC producer suggested that they correct the record and air a program "showing that Tet had indeed been a decisive victory for America." He said this was rejected by Robert J. Northshield, a senior executive, who later explained that Tet was already "established in the public's mind as a defeat and therefore it was an American defeat."

This is the first battle Americans won in the field and lost in the news media.

THE TALE OF TWO MASSACRES

One of the war propaganda goals emphasized by Ewald Banse was "to fill the nation with hatred and bitterness towards the enemy." In the past this was accomplished by emphasizing the brutality of the enemy, making him both hated and feared. For example, in World War I, we had a Committee on Public Information which organized 75,000 speakers throughout the country who were trained to talk about German war crimes and atrocities, among other things.

In the Vietnam War, our own media downplayed the atrocities and crimes of the communist enemy and perversely focused massive attention on crime committed by Americans and our South Vietnamese allies.

The result was that we filled the nation with self-doubt, if not self-hate.

The American news media reported relatively little about the organized terror campaign of the communists in Vietnam. This was noted by Senator James O. Eastland in *The Human Cost of Communism in Vietnam*, published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1972. Senator Eastland asked: "If the Free World knew little or nothing of this day-to-day terror despite the presence of hundreds of correspondents in South Vietnam, what chance is there that the Free World would know anything at all about the bloodletting that would inevitably take place in South Vietnam if the Communists came to power, expelled the western press corps and then proceeded to deal with their enemies?"

We know of the appalling bloodbath the communists inflicted on the population of Hue when they occupied that city for 26 days in 1968. After the area was retaken, mass graves containing the bodies of their victims were discovered. The confirmed total came to 2,750 bodies, and the bodies of another 3,000 missing civilians have never been found. Some of the victims had been shot, with their hands tied behind their backs. Others had been clubbed and some had even been buried alive.

It was established that the killings were not carried out in the heat of battle, but on the basis of explicit orders. The bloodlists were prepared, and the communists moved through the streets methodically, pulling the victims from their homes. Hanoi did not deny the atrocity after the hidden graves were found. Hanoi Radio on April 27, 1969, made this comment on the discovery of the graves: ". . . in order to cover up their cruel acts, the puppet administration in Hue recently played the farce of setting up a so-called committee for the search for burial of the hooligan lackeys who had owed blood debts to the Tri-Thien Hue compatriots and who were annihilated by the Southern armed forces and people . . ."

Straightforward reporting of this atrocity would have done much to strengthen the resolve of the American people to never permit the perpetrators of such deeds to take over South Vietnam. It would have required no embellishment, no exaggeration.

In a letter to the Norwegian newspaper, *Aftenposten*, in September 1973, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the brave Russian writer, charged that the brutal butchery by the Communists at Hue in 1968 "had been lightly noticed and almost immediately forgiven in the West." He charged that this was because "the sympathy of society was on the other side." He added: "It was just too bad that the information did seep into the free press and for a time (very briefly) cause embarrassment (just a tiny bit) to the passionate defenders of that other social system."

Solzhenitsyn was absolutely right about at Hue. The *Times* gave 5 inches to the first report of the massacre on February 12, 1968. It followed up with another story three months later, reporting that the embassy had charged that 1,000 civilians had been murdered at Hue. The *Washington Post* put that story on page 22, giving it 11 column inches. They did add a brief editorial condemning the slaughter, which is more than *The Times* did.

The *Post* again alluded to the story in December 1969, when it revealed that 2,750 bodies had been discovered to that date.

By way of contrast, it took 3½ pages of the *New York Times* index to list all the stories published by *The Times* on the My Lai Massacre which was committed by Americans, in the months of November and December 1969 alone.

It is said that 347 civilians were killed at My Lai, 6 per cent of the number killed by the communists at Hue. Those killed at My Lai were the victims of combat troops mak-

ing an attack on the village. They were not plucked from their homes, from lists prepared in advance, and taken out to hidden places, forced to dig their own graves and then shot in cold blood. But the American news media's fascination with My Lai was almost pathological. It did not begin to compare with the Hue massacre in scope or in bestiality. Given the response to the two massacres by the American press, one would have thought the reverse was true.

Syndicated columnist Max Lerner said that the My Lai massacre would take its place in history along with other war outrages—"Malmedy, Lidice, Katyn Forest." He added: "It may well prove the stickiest moral crisis in the history of the Vietnamese war." Lerner significantly did not mention Hue in his list of war outrages. Perhaps he was unaware of what had transpired there, since it was so lightly reported.

Lerner, perhaps like many other Americans, concluded that "the best atonement" that we could make for My Lai was "to get out of the war—systematically, unequivocally, with every possible dispatch." He did not pause to consider that such an action would mean turning all the South over to the butchers of Hue, but again, perhaps he did not know about Hue.

One can only speculate what the course of the war would have been had the American media reported these two massacres in proportion to their enormity.

HOW CBS SLANTED THE NEWS

Edward Jay Epstein asserts that the three television networks all began treating the war negatively after the Tet offensive. There is evidence that television became a potent influence in turning public opinion against the war effort.

The best documentation of the loading of the television news against the war is provided in the Institute for American Strategy study, *TV and National Defense* by Dr. Ernest W. Lefever, (Available from AIM for \$3.95, postpaid).

Dr. Lefever analyzed all the CBS Evening News programs in the year 1972 to see how they dealt with the war. TV news stories are usually built around a theme. Dr. Lefever counted the identifiable themes in the Vietnam stories, and he found that those that tended to be critical of U.S. policy and our South Vietnamese ally were aired 651 times in 1972. Themes supportive of our policies were aired only 153 times. Criticism outnumbered support by 81 per cent to 19 per cent. The most frequent theme was that "U.S. involvement is wrong because the war is cruel, expensive or senseless." This was aired 254 times, or about 5 times a week.

Dr. Lefever concluded: "The preponderant weight of critical CBS reporting and interpretation on Vietnam was directed against the U.S. military presence there, and particularly against U.S. mining and bombing initiatives in the North." He found that CBS had a strong propensity to quote statements made by those who were critical of our policies and wanted us to cut back or get out. These types were quoted 842 times in 1972. On the other hand, the hawks who wanted to see the war pursued more vigorously were quoted a mere 23 times in the year. That is a ratio of 36 to 1.

It is particularly interesting to note that CBS tended to report favorably on North Vietnam more often than it criticized our communist enemy. Dr. Lefever found that 57 per cent of the themes on North Vietnam were favorable and only 43 per cent were unfavorable.

Dr. Lefever comments: "This lopsided reporting is difficult to understand or explain. Obviously, there were developments that warranted criticism in South Vietnam. But what would compel a TV network repeatedly to point to the shortcomings of a wartime ally while almost inevitably overlooking the graver faults of a wartime enemy? Perhaps

the norms of objectivity and fair play were subverted by a conviction held by CBS newsmen that the United States was engaged in an illegitimate and unjust war? How else can one explain what appears to be a persistent and thoroughly unprofessional split-level ethic?"

The presentation of the North Vietnamese in a favorable light, overlooking the dictatorial nature of that government as well as the atrocities it had perpetrated upon its own people, was characteristic of CBS coverage of the Vietnam War. Dr. Lefever states: "It portrayed the North Vietnam people as long-suffering and courageous, seeking independence from external oppressors, the last being the mighty United States which was acting like a bully by bombing the North. Hanoi was portrayed as caring properly for American POWs, although they were officially regarded as 'war criminals.' There was not a single story indicating the contrary. During the entire year, CBS Evening News rarely, if ever, broadcast similar favorable comments about South Vietnam. . . . CBS failed to present a full or fair picture of opposing viewpoints on the issues of peace negotiations, the problem of American POWs, the nature of the U.S. military presence, or—on a larger canvas—the significance to the United States of the struggle between communist and non-communist forces in Southeast Asia."

While Dr. Lefever's groundbreaking study is concerned only with CBS, there is no reason to think that CBS was unique in its slanting of the news in a way that undermined support for the war and for continued aid to South Vietnam.

Our two great picture magazines, *Life* and *Look*, both now defunct contributed their bit. To help undermine morale on the home front, *Life* on June 23, 1969, devoted 11 pages to printing the photos of American servicemen killed during a week of fighting in South Vietnam.

James Reston of The New York Times boasted of the role played by the media in his column on April 30, 1975, saying: "Maybe the historians will agree that the reporters and the cameras were decisive in the end. They brought the issue of the war to the people, before the Congress or the courts, and forced the withdrawal of American power from Vietnam."

With the incessant pounding delivered by these and other important elements of the American news media, it is little wonder that the originally well-knit, solid, powerful fabric of this nation gradually disintegrated. When the test finally came, and we were asked to indicate whether we would continue to supply South Vietnam with material and moral support we showed all the strength of a fungus.

CENSORSHIP ON TV

HON. ALLAN T. HOWE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Speaker, television is probably one of the greatest and most significant achievements of the 20th century and has become, in a very short period of time, one of the most influential forces in our lives.

When you consider that 96 percent of all the homes in America own at least one television set and most people, of all ages, watch an average of 2 to 2½ hours of television a day, the degree of influence television has on our society is readily apparent.

Although still in a comparatively

young stage, the television industry has revolutionized communications to the point where a message is transmitted instantly across long distances to a wide variety of people.

Television has increased our learning capacity, created greater understanding, and in general has raised the quality of life here in this country. It is probably television's ability to increase learning that is its greatest asset. However, this asset has, in recent years, come under attack because of the amount of sex and violence that daily enters homes across the country. Instead of being beneficial, many people consider television content to be harmful to both children and adults.

Solutions have been proposed to remove or at least reduce the amount of television sex and violence—one of which is governmental control. Because television falls under the protection of the first amendment, Congress must determine whether findings justify increased Federal intervention.

A sampling of public opinion, according to a recent Gallup poll, estimates that only 6 percent of the population favors no censorship in the area of sex on television and in the area of violence, approximately 25,000 persons, in 1974 alone, wrote to the Federal Communications Commission—FCC—objecting to the amount displayed. Studies, too, support the premise that this type of programming can have harmful effects.

Hearings conducted for the last 10 years by the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency indicate there is at least a causal relationship between TV violence and more aggressive behavior of some youth, and there are presently some 20 published experiments which document that children are capable of imitating filmed aggression shown on a movie or television screen.

Dr. Victor Cline, professor of psychology at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, has conducted a series of studies and concluded that "constant exposure to violence 'desensitizes' our conscience, blunting our empathy, and concern for other human beings." Dr. Cline and others, have also sighted dozens of instances where acts of violence have been patterned after those shown on television.

Also, let us consider what experts in the field of human behavior have said on the subjects of sex and violence. Former Oxford Professor J. D. Unwin in his book, "Sex and Culture," studied 80 primitive and civilized societies and concluded that there was a distinct correlation between increasing sexual freedom and social decline. Professor Unwin says:

The more sexually permissive a society becomes the less creative energy it exhibits and the slower its movement toward rational, philosophical speculation and advanced civilization.

In the area of violence and television, the U.S. Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld, in testifying before a Senate subcommittee, stated:

The overwhelming consensus and the unanimous Scientific Advisory Committee's report indicated that television violence, indeed, does have an adverse effect on certain members of our society. . . . It is clear to

me that the causal relationship between television violence and antisocial behavior is sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action. . . . There comes a time when the data are sufficient to justify action.

I think, however, it is noteworthy to consider the network effort to move in the right direction by scheduling "family-type entertainment" in the first hour of prime time television—the time when children are most likely to be watching television. They also have instigated a policy to broadcast "viewer advisories" to warn parents that material contained in a particular show might be unsuitable for younger viewers.

Local station owners, too, have been asserting their right to reject programs that they feel are not in the best interest of their viewers. The networks cannot be adequately acquainted with individual locations across the country, but local station owners do have a better understanding of their own areas.

They no longer feel that they must automatically accept every program sent out by the parent network. This indicates to me, a greater sense of responsibility on their part and I commend them for their efforts.

But the networks and local stations alone cannot be held totally responsible because some of that responsibility should lie with the individual. Parents should also make every effort to supervise their children's television viewing and to assert their basic responsibility for their moral development.

The public as a whole should continue to write to networks and local stations and express their disapproval of programs which they find objectionable and their support for programs they like.

The Federal Communication Commission commends the idea of self-regulation and hopefully this type of reform coupled with guidance in the home will alleviate any idea of regulation of the airwaves by the Federal Government. But, if networks ignore public opinion, then perhaps Congress should take another look at where their responsibility lies as to the rights of the first amendment and the television industry.

SLOVAK PATRIOTISM

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of addressing the delegates to the 44th Congress of the Slovak League of America. During their congress, the members adopted a proclamation, setting forth their views. I am especially pleased with their patriotism and expression of loyalty to this country. America is a better nation for the presence of its Slovak citizens, and I commend this proclamation to my colleagues as a splendid example of American-Slovak patriotism:

PROCLAMATION OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA ADOPTED AT ITS 44TH CONGRESS, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 24, 1975

The officers, delegates and members, assembled at the 44th Congress of the Slovak

League of America in Detroit, Michigan, with thanksgiving to Almighty God, declare that the absolute majority of Slovak Americans represented by their organizations, publications and parishes wholeheartedly approve and support the program, fundamentally pro-American and pro-Slovak, of the Slovak League of America.

We look upon America as the happy homeland of one-third of the Slovak nation. We are loyal American citizens and patriots and we stand solidly behind the United States of America in good times and bad.

On the threshold of the bicentennial of American Independence, we proudly state that it was at the initiative of the Slovak League that a Slovak-American bicentennial commission was created to prepare a great national celebration of Slovaks in the city of Detroit during the month of June in 1976. In addition, the Slovak League plans to pay tribute to the Founding Fathers of the United States of America in the city of Philadelphia, Pa. during our March 1976 Conference there.

We call the attention of our fellow Slovak Americans in the United States to the bicentennial programs and invite all of them to help make these events a grand success. Our nationwide observance in Detroit will also manifest our patriotism and unwavering loyalty to the ideals of American democracy.

At the same time, we turn to Slovaks living everywhere in the free world to join us and help us, according to their means, to celebrate this great historical American anniversary in 1976. We invite them to cooperate with us in all our other cultural and civic endeavors for the mutual interest and welfare of all our Slovak brethren in America, throughout the free world and in Slovakia, the historic homeland of our ancestors.

We cordially extend sincere greetings to the forthcoming General Assembly of the Slovak World Congress in Rome, and reaffirm our pledge that the Slovak League of America will continue to support the programs of the Slovak World Congress completely, for without its leadership we cannot hope to win the united cooperation of Slovak organizations in America and the free world.

While fully cognizant that our primary loyalties are to our own United States of America and all things American, we cannot help but note the present tragic situation in Slovakia.

We would be remiss if we did not speak out against the communistic and atheistic despotism which presently prevails there, depriving the Slovak nation of all freedoms and plunging it into the darkest forms of slavery in all history. While Slovakia is occupied by foreign military forces and so heavily oppressed, her very stones would cry out in anguish were we, Americans of Slovak birth or ancestry, to remain silent.

So, we repeat our often stated denunciation of the uncontrolled cruelty of the communistic red regime that ruthlessly, though temporarily, rules the Slovaks, the other central and eastern states of Europe and vast areas of Asia.

Therefore, as Slovak Americans most solemnly and patriotically,

(1) We pledge continued allegiance to the United States of America and its ideals;

(2) We congratulate our fellow Americans for their individual and collective ethnic contributions to the mosaic which is the greatness of our native or adopted country;

(3) We appeal to the conscience of the entire world, to our own American government, to the United Nations and to all freedom loving peoples not to be indifferent to the sufferings of the Slovak nation and other oppressed peoples, but to assist in reestablishing freedom everywhere including the land of our forefathers;

(4) We affirm our confidence that in God's good time, Slovakia with its eleven centuries old Christian heritage will regain its lawful

place in the family of nations, either as a free and sovereign state or in European confederation of independent states;

(5) We pray that our heavenly Father will bless our great country as we continue to live under its wonderful motto of hope—"In God we trust", and that with His Guidance and Help, Slovakia may someday soon enjoy the liberty and justice which is so abundant here in this gem of the oceans.

In the above sentiments, the entire Congress, in solemn conclave convened, unanimously concurred and they were officially adopted.

EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK,
President.
JOSEPH PAUCO,
Secretary.

INTEREST AND KNOWLEDGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive from students of Mrs. Brazelton's civics class at Bolsa Grande High School in Garden Grove, Calif. copies of several bills they would like to see enacted. The students' presentation of these proposals and their discussion of them with me is indicative of their interest in and knowledge of the legislative process and their awareness of national issues. I am proud to know these fine young people and I take the opportunity now to commend the entire class on its efforts. Following are excerpts from some of the bills that were presented to me:

I. OFF-SHORE OIL DRILLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

(Submitted by Mark Taft): Drilling for oil off the coast of California will be permitted if and only if:

a. the drilling occurs outside a 15-mile boundary around the California Coast.

b. the group that wishes to drill gets the approval of a special committee assigned to the subject (along with the approval of the voters).

c. the group wishing to drill assumes all responsibility if an "oil spill" occurs. The company must pay to clean up a spill if it occurs, no matter what the cost.

Permitting off-shore oil drilling will make available new sources of oil which will affect the high prices paid for gasoline, motor oil and other petroleum products.

Permitting drilling will also help us gain independence from the nations in the Middle East who know that they have control in the "struggle for oil".

Drilling would create many new jobs for unemployed people. This in turn, would put more money in circulation, and stimulate the economy.

II. ABALONE LIMIT

(Submitted by John Solido): The government should set a very low number on the Abalone limit that commercial fishermen can take per day. The commercial fishing industry is stripping the coast of Abalone, decreasing the species. Abalone can be raised in underwater pens for commercial purposes like oysters.

III. CONSERVATION OF RE-CYCLABLE ITEMS (Submitted by John Solido): It should be the producers obligation to install a system for collecting all non-returnable and returnable re-cyclable items, not the consumers'.

This could be done very easily by the newspaper companies, for example: a box in which the old newspapers are left to be picked up by the delivery boy when he deposits the new paper. The old one can be returned for recycling. To insure total participation, a federal conservation program would be more effective and bring more results. This would bring any violators against conservation under Federal laws.

IV. HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS

(Submitted by James B. Wagner): The purpose of this bill is to give underprivileged people the right to good medical care . . . To accomplish this we will bring into being, sufficient HMO's (Health Maintenance Organizations) to serve large numbers of people adequately and efficiently . . . The benefits of an HMO are the ability to provide comprehensive care, including emergencies 24 hours a day, nursing home care and rehabilitation facilities. Its major benefits would be service to the poor, pre- and post-natal care for unwed mothers, x-ray and laboratory services and immunizations and programs for periodic check-ups.

The managerial decisions would be made between two groups: one for prepayment of materials, the other for delivery of care, each allotted 50% of the budget.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues join me in congratulating these fine young leaders of America's tomorrow.

GUERRILLA SUPPORTERS ATTEND SOUTHERN CO. ANNUAL MEETING

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, the U.S. supporters of African Marxist revolutionary guerrilla groups have masqueraded as "liberals" who were conscientiously opposed to the former governments of Angola, Portuguese Guinea, Mozambique, Rhodesia, and South Africa. With Portuguese revolutionary government's turning over of its African provinces to the Marxist guerrilla groups of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Angola, the support groups have focused on Rhodesia and South Africa.

Small groups from several radical groups including the admittedly socialist Georgia Power Project, the Church Project on U.S. Investments in Southern Africa and the Maoist coalition, the Southwide Coalition To Stop South African Coal, as well as the United Mine Workers of America, attended the Southern Co.'s annual shareholders meeting this year in Baxley, Ga., on May 28.

The Church Project on United States Investments in Southern Africa—CPSIA—operates from room 566, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027. Acting within the National Council of Churches' Center for Social Action, CPISA emerged from a 1971 NCC coalition to, in their words—

. . . promote corporate responsibility in Southern Africa and to work for majority rule in the countries of Southern Africa.

In 1972, CPISA initiated several stockholder resolutions designed to create economic pressure against the targeted countries. The following year, 12 stockholder resolutions were introduced; and in 1974, 22 American corporations were selected for pressure by the Church Project, because of business dealings in this area.

Among the religious groups that compose CIPSA are the National Council of Churches, which has consistently provided propaganda forums of guerrilla representatives; Independent Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa; United Church of Christ; American Baptist Church; Protestant Episcopal Church; United Methodist Church; Unitarian-Universalist Association; Christian Church—Disciples of Christ; United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; Reformed Church in America; and the Atonement Friars of the Roman Catholic Church.

One wonders what deceptions have been practiced by the CIPSA organizers and directors in gaining support for atheist Marxist "liberation forces" from such religious organizations.

CIPSA's financial support is provided by the supporting organizations. Full-time employees include Rev. Donald Morton, a South African who is also a member of the collective of Southern Africa magazine, a stridently proterrorist propaganda publication; Paul D. Irish and Timothy Smith.

Tim Smith is a Canadian educated at the University of Toronto from which he received a BA degree in 1966. His public career of interest in African affairs began in 1966 when he was sent to Kenya by Operation Crossroads Africa, on whose board of directors he served in 1970. While attending Union Theological Seminary, Smith served on the Southern Africa Committee of the University Christian Movement, described by the mass media as the "Christian new left." Smith remains a member of the collective of the militantly proguerrilla Southern Africa magazine published monthly by the Southern Africa Committee. Smith has held executive positions with the Committee for a Free Mozambique, a support group for the Marxist-Leninist FRELIMO guerrillas now ruling Mozambique; with the Interfaith Committee on Social Responsibility in Investments; the United Church of Christ Council for Christian Social Action; and the Church Project on U.S. Investments in Southern Africa, which he serves as executive director. Smith has been a consultant for the Council on Economic Priorities and a member of the board of the American Committee on Africa—ACOA—the NCC's rival in devotion and service to advancing the causes of African revolutionaries.

The Southwide Coalition To Stop South African Coal was formed at a secret conference of Maoist Communist and militant groups in Atlanta in February of this year. The conference was called by the Southern Conference Educational Fund, a former Communist Party, U.S.A. front captured by a Maoist coalition in 1973.

The Southwide Coalition To Stop

South African Coal includes members of such groups as the Congress of Afrikan People—CAP, the African Liberation Support Committee—ALSC, October League—OL, National Lawyers Guild—NLG, Revolutionary Union—RU, Revolutionary Student Brigade—RSB, Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization—VVAW/WSO, and the Southern Conference Educational Fund. At this time, the Revolutionary Union appears to be the leading influence in the coalition.

Leaflets distributed by the Southwide Coalition at a demonstration in Birmingham, Ala., on May 27, the day before the Southern Co. shareholders meeting, called for militant support of the anti-coal import forces at the company meeting. In part the leaflet read:

The purchase of South African coal by the power companies not only supports the racist regime there; it also threatens U.S. miners with the loss of their jobs if they struggle for higher wages and better working conditions. The giant companies in this way try to pit the U.S. workers against workers of other countries. But in reality we are not enemies but allies with the same enemy—giant corporations, such as the power company. Unite to fight attacks on working people in South Africa and America.

The leaflet continued the attempt by the Maoists of the October League and Revolutionary Union to involve members of the United Mine Workers Union in the coal boycott as a prelude for more extensive indoctrination work later on Marxist-Leninist lines.

My colleagues may recall the African Liberation Support Committee's proposal adopted as the working program of the Southwide Coalition which I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 21—pages 8279-90. The Maoists stated their goals included indoctrinating the American people about the nature of imperialism, and developing the class consciousness and fighting ability of the workers, oppressed peoples, and the American people in general.

The discussion papers at the founding conference stated that "rank-and-file miners groups, union officials, consumer groups, and other progressive forces—such as liberal churches, students, community organizations, et cetera" were to be approached for inclusion in the united front coalition.

Using proxies made available by the Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth, N.J., and the Sisters of St. Joseph, two orders in sympathy with the church project, a handful of demonstrators were able to gain entrance to the Southern Co. shareholders meeting.

In the meeting, the "stop the coal" group wisely behaved in an orderly manner and were able to make lengthy presentations in support of their resolutions. Coalition speakers included Rev. Dr. Howard Schomer of the United Church of Christ's United Church Board for World Ministries and a long-time supporter of Communist Party, U.S.A., fronts and causes, the most recent being the June 19 22d annual memorial for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, sponsored by the National Committee To Reopen the Rosenberg Case; Timothy Smith; Malcolm Suber of the Southwide Coali-

tion; Mike Dobson or Dobbins, Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization; Ed Martin and June Rosten from the Georgia Power Project; Lloyd Baker and Richard Seymour of the United Mine Workers; and Lewis Gilbert of New York.

Rev. Schomer, whose speeches at the Southern Co. meeting were extensively reported in a "Special to the Daily World" article on June 6 in the CPUSA press, likened the import of coal from South Africa to dealings with the Mafia to purchase heroin.

Tim Smith, in his presentation, cited without any obvious attempt at humor, the many instances of leftist agitation against the coal imports by "U.S. churches, numerous organizations in the black community—CAP and ALSC, and consumer groups—the socialist GPP—as reasons to end the import contracts.

A vote taken on the resolution offered by the board for World Ministries attracted 2,279,205 shareholder votes out of a total of some 98 million votes cast.

The concerned citizens and constituents who attended the meeting of their company and spoke out to expose the long-range ploys of the revolutionary support groups should be commended for their actions.

VOTER REGISTRATION BY MAIL

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, a voter registration by mail bill will be enacted in this session of the 94th Congress. The two most well-known bills on this subject are H.R. 1686, sponsored by Mr. HAYS, and S. 1177, sponsored by Mr. McGEE. Both provide for voter registration forms to be mailed at least every 2 years to all postal addresses and residences in the United States, whether or not the addressees are already permanently registered in a State and are, therefore, eligible to vote in all Federal elections.

I believe that post card registration is an excellent idea and that it is long overdue. For this reason I introduced my own bill, H.R. 6079, in April based on my experience as an elections official in Washington State. Under my proposal, all eligible citizens could register to vote in elections by completing and mailing a post card to the proper authorities. Postage would be paid for by the Federal Government.

The main difference between my bill, H.R. 6079 on the one hand, and H.R. 1686 and S. 1177 on the other, is that my bill would not provide over 85 million already registered voters with a useless form. In place of this unnecessarily expensive mass mailing feature, I propose that post cards for registration be made widely available in such places as post offices, social security offices, and other public locations and for distribution by private individuals and organizations. Of course,

anyone who wishes to register may call a registration official and the form will be mailed.

In addition, H.R. 6079 would not limit the voter registration program to a mass mailing effort. States and units of general local government would be offered financial incentives for implementing expanded registration programs including, for example, expanded registration hours and locations, mobile registration facilities, and public information activities.

Two Washington State papers, the Spokesman-Review in Spokane, and the Columbian in Vancouver, have recently run articles on post card registration. I would like to commend these two informative articles to my colleagues' attention.

[From the Spokesman-Review, June 18, 1975]

WEATHER'S FINE, THINK I'LL VOTE

Convenience is a favorite American pastime. As a result, it has brought a confusion between healthy growth and artificial necessity.

There is an especially troublesome problem therefore when convenience is added to voting, one of an American's most cherished rights. The biggest question is how far do we go in making it easier to register to vote before it begins to become artificial convenience.

There is a renewed effort in Congress to create a nationwide system of voter registration by mail. A provision of the bill would authorize the mass mailing of a post card-size registration form to every household in the nation prior to every federal election.

The steam behind this drive comes because of low voter turnout. In the 1974 congressional election, for example, the turnout was below 40 per cent. The support for post card registration grew because though few register, most of those who do end up voting.

But there is something about registering to vote by post card that demeans the process as though it were not really significant what sort of mental process and, initiative you went through to vote just as long as you voted. Boost the statistics but don't contribute to meaningful participation.

When someone takes the initiative to register to vote, he is making a commitment to vote responsibly. Post card voting registration sounds more like a raffle entry or lottery ticket purchase.

There has been a problem with voter registration among low income groups and racial minorities not only in the past in the South but in many rural poverty areas and urban low income pockets. But that problem is not solved by postcards but by increasing registration efforts and locations.

An alternative bill introduced in the House by Washington's Rep. Don Bonker is a more reasonable approach. Bonker's bill would make grants to states and localities to beef up their own registration programs with mobile registration units and efforts to encourage registration on a state and local level.

The mechanical and structural problems of a national post card registration drive are obvious. Citizens will become confused and may register more than once or there may be confusion about numbers of eligible voters registering in a single household. A bureaucracy is likely to develop to handle the many unforeseen problems.

In addition, state and local registration officials would have to compile separate voter lists for local and federal elections. Vote fraud could easily go undetected posing a need for penalties and enforcement. Mailing dates will be bothersome particularly if the mails are slow.

Many Americans may not be registering because they do not like the alternatives before them. Change that and we might see increased participation.

Summary: There are just some times when convenience goes too far and post card voting registration nationally is one.

EASIER VOTING REGISTRATION

Confusion over proposals requiring states to adopt postcard voter registration procedures may scuttle the badly needed legislation.

As outlined in a Congressional Quarterly "Pro-Con" feature on today's Op-Ed page, many Americans eligible to vote don't. Inconvenient registration procedures are one deterrent.

Proponents of postcard registration are after the same result—expanded registration and increased participation by eligible voters at the polls. But the proposal offered by Sen. Gale McGee, D-Wyo., is a cumbersome, awkward approach which, if approved by Congress, may not get past the White House.

McGee's bill would require the federal government to mail every household in the country registration forms every two years. The basic problem with that approach is that it is too expensive, a factor that may bring a White House veto.

The McGee procedures also would only apply to federal elections. Voters wishing to participate in state and local elections would still have to register under current procedures. Some people invariably would end up being registered to vote in either the national or the state and local elections, a situation which could create mass confusion at the polls.

A proposal by Rep. Don Bonker, D-Wash., also calls for postcard registration. Like the McGee bill it eliminates the need for a deputy voter registrar. But it would not require registration forms to be mailed. Instead, they could be made available to the public at the county auditor's office or could be distributed by groups or organizations.

As the Congressional Quarterly report notes, registration laws in many states are restrictive. Not only do the laws vary from state to state, but their administration may vary from county to county as well.

With registration being as much a part of voting as stepping into the voting booth, it should be a uniform, simple and inexpensive process. Bonker's proposal appears to be the best way to get the job done.

LESSONS ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of us were privileged to observe portions of the recent Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva. One of the most perceptive of those observers was our colleague, GILBERT GUDE of Maryland. Mr. GUDE's report is grounded in his prior experience as an advisor at the First International Conference on the Environment at Stockholm in 1972, his chairmanship of the World Environment and International Cooperation of Members of Congress for Peace through Law, and from 8 years as one of our foremost environmentalists in the House. I am pleased to offer his report for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

LESSONS ON THE LAW OF THE SEA
(By Hon. GILBERT GUDE, Republican
of Maryland)

Despite a myriad of complexities the recently adjourned spring session of the Law of the Sea Conference at Geneva has produced a Single Negotiating Text and substantial progress towards a comprehensive Law of the Sea Treaty. The failure to produce a final treaty document in this round, however, has already resulted in a renewed Congressional interest in hard-nosed unilateral legislation in an attempt to protect our maritime interests. However, the Congressional crew which listens to the Lorelei song of untold wealth and ignores the rest of the world, could well note some of the legal circumstances surrounding the Mayaguez incident before sailing into treacherous waters.

The seizure of the Mayaguez resulted in part from different interpretations of basic sea law concepts. The United States has recognized a three mile territorial limit; the Cambodians claim twelve (in this case twelve miles from an island, the precise status of which is also in doubt and not clearly set forth in present international law). A more extreme case of course, is illustrated by certain Latin American countries, notably Peru and Ecuador, which claim 200 mile territorial seas and have seized American fishing boats "trespassing" in those waters.

Those who deplore these seizures should pause to remember the origin of such extravagant territorial claims, because, ironically, the precedent the Latin American nations cite is the claim of President Truman in Proclamation 2867 of September 28, 1945, which asserted U.S. jurisdiction and control over the natural resources of the contiguous continental shelf. The Truman proclamation did not mention specific limits and did not stake out territorial claims, but it nonetheless served as a rationale for the South American countries to stake out the two hundred mile limit.

The inability of this spring's Conference session in Geneva to produce a treaty which would settle the territorial sea questions, as well as a number of other vital maritime issues, could bring unilateral Congressional action which, in turn, would again signal other nations, large and small, to stake out for themselves expanded economic and territorial high sea claims. In this sense the United States plays an important role—because of our power and strength other nations will often develop and change their policies in response to American action. For example, it is quite likely that Mexico, Norway, and Iceland are ready to assert to two hundred mile economic zone of much broader dimension than has been set forth in the Single Negotiating Text issued at the end of the Geneva session, given an excuse to do so. Unilateral action on our part, however circumscribed it may be, has a symbolic value, the effect of which will be to provide precisely that excuse and lead to other unilateral moves which will complicate the entire negotiating picture.

Precipitate action on our part reduces our leverage and bargaining power at the next Law of the Sea (LOS) session. Barring such complicating actions, there is good reason for optimism that the next session (to be held in New York in March and April of 1976) will build on the single Text developed at Geneva, and that this document will evolve into a treaty text.

THE GENEVA SESSION

International conferences such as that on the Law of the Sea begin with high hopes and optimistic predictions. Hard work is promised but a successful treaty is the hoped-for reward. Once negotiations actually begin and work gets underway, the difficulties begin to transcend the hopes and the pace can become glacial. This is understandably the case of the LOS Conference, in

part because of the large number of nations represented (approximately 140) and the diverse interests they bring to the Conference, and because of the complex web of the various parts of the projected treaty. Agreement on one issue—the territorial sea, scientific exploration, economic zones, control of pollution in territorial waters to cite a few—is inevitably contingent upon satisfactory resolution of the other issues. To cite one instance of the interrelationship of issues, extensions of economic zones may seem like fine insurance policies to protect offshore resources, but they raise ominous specters for military leaders who have deep concerns about innocent passage through narrow straits. For example, strategic passageways like the Strait of Malacca and the Straits of Gibraltar, will become territorial waters if a twelve mile limit is adopted. There are 108 such passageways in total. Obviously unimpeded passage through such straits is vital to our security as well as our economic vitality. Unilateral action setting the territorial limit at 12 miles in conjunction with a 200 mile economic zone will cost us an important bargaining chip at the next Conference session in New York in obtaining agreement on unimpeded passage. Thus, unlike a jigsaw puzzle where one piece is added at a time, the LOS Treaty is likely to all fall into place at once as many agreements and compromises are reached simultaneously.

Despite the tedious pace and apparent need for an additional round of negotiations, this latest session had some positive signs. First, the tone of the proceedings was noticeably serious and determined. Rhetoric was used less frequently, and there was considerable bargaining over specific proposals. Polemics normally expected from nations such as the People's Republic of China were mild and combined with restrained statements of position. Unlike the Caracas session last year, it was clear that many governments had staked out positions of their own which they were prepared to explain and defend, but at the same time they were willing to listen and bargain seriously. Such bargaining was not always fruitful, but the fact that it took place at all is a hopeful sign.

Second, groups have begun to form based on community of interest. Old allegiances and traditional attitudes are breaking down as nations discover interests vary. While on the one hand this can be viewed as a hopeful sign that the Conference has moved beyond posturing, on the other hand the possible hardening of these groups into determined interest blocs is a real danger. This is true in any international conference but is particularly a problem at the LOS Conference because of the special role geography plays. Coastal states inevitably have different needs and interests than landlocked states, and the inflexibility of geography limits the degree to which those interests can be compromised. A nation can build a fleet or gain technology; it cannot give itself an outlet to the sea if it has none, or a coastal state cannot alter the extent of its continental shelf.

Three large groups of caucuses have emerged at the Conference. The first two are the Group of 77, primarily developing states, and the Evenson Group, primarily coastal and developed states, including the United States. These two groups symbolize an underlying conflict of the Conference being echoed world wide in a variety of forms—the gap between the rich and the poor. It is the feeling on the part of the lesser developed countries that the developed states technological advantages are widening this gap and that any LOS agreement which fails to provide either for strong coastal state sovereignty or strong international authority will have the inevitable result of enriching the developed states at the expense of the poor, further widening the gap.

The third group, including some members of the first two, is that of the landlocked

and geographically disadvantaged states. These states, often initially in sympathy with the Group of 77, have begun to discover that neither the developed states nor the developing nations have a satisfactory answer to their problems, expressed primarily in terms of access to the sea and its resources.

A principle diversion of the three subgroups which emerged, cutting across all three of these main groups, was that of those nations with land mineral resources as opposed to those without. Attitudes of nations towards the exploitation of deep sea mineral resources is strongly determined by their own assets as well as their own technology. Another encouraging development at Geneva was the multiplicity of seemingly endless informal meetings and communications which were carried on within these three primary groupings.

THE DEEP SEA MINERALS

The question of the exploitation of the deep minerals was a dominant theme of the Conference, revolving around the facts as suggested above that developed states' technological advantages are widening the gap between rich and poor. In part this concern is the same reflection of a colonial heritage widely viewed as exploitation which has manifested itself in the oil embargo and other efforts to form resource cartels. Poor countries feel their land resources have been stolen, and they are determined to guard against the theft of their share of sea resources.

This is an attitude which our nation and other developed states must recognize if there is to be a treaty. In the area of deep seabed mining, for example, those with the technology in hand will have a major role to play regardless of what structure is finally set up. Haggling over terms now could well produce stalemate, although of course recognition that falling a treaty, the United States might act unilaterally is an incentive to the Group of 77 to reach agreement. There has been some quiet criticism in this regard, that the State Department has been too conciliatory in trying to reach agreement. A more realistic view, however, is that State has taken a solid moderate position, and it makes sense for us to hold to that stance, avoid impetuous action and give the developing states time to move in our direction. Our technological advantage gives us the luxury of waiting in this case—our involvement at some level is assured. Poorly thought out unilateral action, again, may make immediate monetary gains, but the resentment against such action can further exacerbate third world activities.

Of even greater significance, and a problem which should give the whole world pause, would be the ushering in of a new era of exploitation where the gap between the rich and poor would be so widened as to make a legacy for violent dispute ten to fifty years hence from which mankind might not recover.

In light of these possibilities, the discussion of the means of seabed mineral exploitation takes on deep significance. The means encompass a range of alternatives: 1) private company exploitation in which companies would be licensed to mine and keep the proceeds; 2) service contracts, in which private companies do the actual mining but the seabed minerals remain the property of an international Authority; 3) a contractual joint venture where a specific contract defines the relationship of the various partners, both private and governmental; 4) equity joint ventures where several parties join to create a new entity to exploit the seabed; and 5) an international Authority controls and performs the exploitation.

Each of these alternatives has multiple permutations and complications, particularly legal ones. For example, private companies

are subject to national laws. These may or may not be identical to those for other participating companies from other nations, and they may not be consistent with the international law or cooperation. A further question is that of the actual ownership of the minerals at the bottom of the sea. Countries arguing for a strong international Authority are prepared to claim that since the minerals lie in international waters, they are internationally owned, and an institution should be created to assume control of their extraction and use. Countries which are at present technologically prepared to do the extraction assert that the minerals in fact belong to no one until they are mined, at which point they become the property of the miner.

Even with a foreseeable compromise, the question remains as to whether the enterprises doing the work are contracting ownership or merely the right to extract—whether true ownership comes only after extraction and payment of the proper royalties. This may be an insufficient protection of one's investment from an entrepreneurial point of view, though from a lesser developed country's point of view it may simply mean the continuation of developed state technological dominance. These attitudes and fears themselves must be compromised if agreement is to be reached on a treaty.

Despite the problems and complexities, however, the scope of the conflict can be seen. Technologically developed states favor reliance on private enterprise since any such enterprise would almost certainly be theirs. Developing states, on the other hand, tend to favor a strong international authority which presumably will be neutral in terms of benefits, thus protecting the less developed countries.

At that point of course, the decision making procedures of the Authority become an important subject of debate.

In this controversy, it is important to recognize that procedures we feel are fair and open—licensing, competitive bidding, etc.—procedures which most developed nations use regularly—are widely, and correctly, regarded by less developed countries as working to their disadvantage. Indeed, a licensing system is not fair if in fact only one or two firms from one country could obtain a license. In this sense, there is a distinction between cheating and playing with a stacked deck. We are charged all too frequently with the latter and not the former, though the effect is often the same. This is another attitude we have to be prepared to deal with.

Although the ideological gap between the developed and underdeveloped states was not substantially narrowed, there were substantial gains in understanding these diverse viewpoints at the Conference. If Congressional action in the deep sea exploitation area develops in the next year, it should not be something that is interpreted by other nations as a declaration of independence from the U.N. General Assembly's statement that the ocean beds are "the common heritage of mankind".

The United States is powerful and strong, but other centers of strength, particularly economic strength, are fast developing, and it will not be in our long run interest to seek to go it alone in respect to the development and use of the ocean resources.

Running Midas-like to scoop glittering riches from the ocean beds and using gun boat diplomacy to protect our fishing fleets are tempting themes to Congress and the American people in these days of isolationist and anxious mood. And so Congress must use restraint, self control and statesmanship to help produce a Law of the Sea which is in both our national interest and the interest of all mankind.

THOUGHTS FROM A REFUGEE LINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to an article by Barbara Hipsman, a former staff member of the Tinsley Park, Ill., Star Tribune, and now the news editor of the Pacifican in Guam.

Miss Hipsman had the opportunity to take a first-hand look at the Vietnamese refugees as they arrived in Guam. I believe that her well written article merits the attention of all the Members.

The article follows:

THOUGHTS FROM A REFUGEE LINE

(By Barbara Hipsman)

"They can make me run no further." Tired eyes stare out, deep-set and brown. They aren't sad eyes. They're eyes that have weathered years of fear, doubt, waiting—and waiting to run.

"No more running? No more?" The woman speaking these words fights back tears of pride and happiness. But she is unsure of where to go or what to do next. She is just one in the mass of people.

They are coming, the Vietnamese I had read about and about whose lives so filled with horror we learned on the television screen nightly. They are coming to Guam, and I am to tell their story.

And so I can't avoid the war no longer. It is over, but more than ever, I can't avoid it. The cruel instrument of revenge has quit its work; the United States has withdrawn from the country, and the Viet Cong are ready to take over, in hours, or in days.

"Please don't use my name." The spy-looking man of about 50 gathers his family around him, and he is frightened by my moving pen.

"I do not want to be interviewed. Please, no interview."

"But sir, I just want to get your opinions of what happened in Saigon—how it was before the fall."

Gently, the man explains that the last time he spoke out he was in Saigon. He says he got thrown into jail the next day. The government had seen him on the U.S. national news media.

"I was so lucky—they didn't kill me."

How do you explain something you have always had that this man has yet to experience? Freedom to us—to any American citizen—is something taken so much for granted. As a student, there was no questioning my right to speak out against the war. This man must have thought he had the right, too. Narrowly, he escaped with his life.

"Don't use my real name," he said. "That man (the old name) is gone forever. I am a new man with a family who will have a brighter future here in the United States."

I wondered how I could explain to him about the problems in the United States. About the racial prejudice his family will face. About how even though his family had been well-known and upper class in Viet Nam, that won't matter here.

About the people in my country who said we must fight our war to the end in Viet Nam. How we must "bomb the hell out of those gooks." About how we must become involved . . . become involved . . . become involved . . .

And we did. President Johnson told us in the mid-60's

that the USS Maddox was bombed without cause by the North Vietnamese and we must, as a nation, join together to fight back. That was the quiet beginning. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution was passed, only two legislators pointing thumbs down. Both legislators are dead now. We found out later the ship was on a spy mission.

Now, sir, you and your family will have the pleasure of facing those who supported the war almost to the end—until we started losing. They will not understand why you are fleeing to the United States. Some of them will call you a coward.

Maybe some will understand why you are here. They will realize that it was your affiliation with the United States that marked you for almost certain death.

"They would not kill us right off, I don't think, but in a different way," the man says, assured now his real name won't be used.

"They will have a different way this time. They will take and put men into positions far away from their families. They will say, 'You are so lucky we put you here in this good job.' Soon, you would grow tired of never seeing your family. A year or two would go by without hearing a word from them, and you might start to complain.

"That's how they will do it," he says, looking off towards the unending lines of refugees, lined up for processing. "You will complain and they will say, 'You are ungrateful. Here we are, the enemy, giving you this good job and you are not appreciative.' Then they will put you in jail. They may do worse than just that, but if you go to jail, you will die mysteriously one night. That's what they will say happened when they tell your family."

"I have seen it before," he goes on. "I must go now." The old man shakes my hand tightly, and then shuffles off toward the long mass of humans.

The people realize they have no home, no country. What can you say in response when a very old woman takes your hand as you pass, grasps it urgently, and apologizes to you over and over?

"Oh, my good lady," she says. "I am so sorry to bother your people like this . . ."

Over and over: "I'm sorry. I'm so sorry . . ."

I'm sorry, too, ma'am. And guilty.

The fear is real, even though we Americans of the 70's may have trouble grasping it. The atrocities reported when the Cong took over Hanoi in the 50's are living memories for the older people lined up here in Guam. They have many stories to remember.

Some of the stories are fresher. There's what happened to people after the fall of Hue in March. And what happened at Da Nang, filled with refugees when the VC surrounded the city and opened fire.

I have never been a refugee (or evacuee, as the military calls one) and I doubt whether many of you back on the mainland ever have been. So we can't know what it is to run and run.

"I ran from Hanoi in 1954," one woman says. "My daughter here was only a few years old then." She refers to a young woman. I find out she and I are the same age.

"I've been running from VC as long as I can remember," the woman says. "We finally came to Saigon and now we are here."

The younger woman says she worked for the American Embassy, as did other members of the family. They were considered "high risk" when the evacuation started. Not everyone made it. The oldest son in the family, 17, was pulled off the bus headed for the airport. He was old enough to fight. So the family may never be reunited.

"I thought if I worked for the Embassy, we would always be taken care of. The Americans have always been so nice," the lady says, her voice trailing off . . .

We are at the final stage of our involvement in Viet Nam. The country as a whole must join together to "regain the sense of pride" President Ford says existed before the war.

That unity must include those who helped

us in Viet Nam. Those who believed in "the American way."

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free . . ."

They are here, coming to America just like the Poles, the Jews, the Irish, the Slavs,

the Germans, the English, the Puerto Ricans, and others were coming.

I would like to see my fellow Americans properly greet those who believe in America like Americans do.

We can make them run no further.