

mittees of the House of Representatives to ascertain and identify those areas in which differences in treatment or application, on the basis of sex, exist in connection with the administration and operation of those provisions of law under their respective jurisdictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 277. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Children to conduct an investigation and study of social conditions adversely affecting the development of children; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL, Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. HAYES of Indiana, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MANN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. SISK):

H. Res. 278. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia and the Paris Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 279. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the nationalization of the oil industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H. Res. 280. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to the practice of abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 281. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to comprehensive planning grants (deferral No. D 75-107) which is proposed by the President in his special message of November 26, 1974, transmitted under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 282. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on

Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. EARLY:

H.R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Jorge Claudio Raholin, Angelica Celina (Otamendi) Raholin, Gerardo Gabriel Raholin, and Vilma Myrlam Raholin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American University", approved February 24, 1893; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Gary Daves and Marc Cayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FELIX R. MCKNIGHT ON DEFICIT FINANCING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, inflation remains the No. 1 concern of the American people. Inflation is caused by our congressional overspending. Some optimists predict \$52 billion, but a fair outlook would be \$85 billion from a peacetime budget.

Congress is spending this country into escalating inflation. A concise editorial on this deficit financing was written on February 26, by Felix R. McKnight of the Dallas Times Herald. Here are the highlights of the McKnight comments.

DEFICIT FINANCING

Since the depression days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt there have been "emergency" federal deficits that have been rationalized in the same tireless rhetoric.

If we all hang in there with the good old American genius we will contain and counterbalance the rush to bankruptcy with boundless growth of the Gross National Product—the dollar measurement in goods and services the national economy produces each year.

So say the soothing rationalizers, the latest of which is outgoing Budget Director Roy L. Ash. In reassuringly holding our hands to allay fears about what The Daily Oklahoman aptly terms "the creeping debacle," Mr. Ash reasons:

"The upcoming \$35 billion deficit for the fiscal year ending next June 30 will equal only about 2.4 percent of the \$1.43 trillion estimated GNP for 1975. And the \$50 billion deficit in prospect for the ensuing fiscal year will amount only to about 3.2 of the estimated \$1.6 trillion GNP of 1976."

But, in Mr. Ash's shell game, he does not reveal that under that first shell at the right, is a massive spending program by federal, state and local governments that represents precisely one-third of the total Gross National Product.

Further, President Ford, in recent brooding over the growing enormity of federal as-

sistance programs that are part of the GNP, observed:

"Were the growth of domestic assistance programs to continue for the next two decades at the same rate as in the past 20 years, total government spending would grow to more than half our national output. We cannot permit this to occur."

But, it keeps occurring and when we get to a national health program, expanding Social Security and a few other items being held in the wings, the courtship with bankruptcy nears the ring-giving stage.

Today, with the deficit at near \$500 billion, and likely to pass \$600 billion by mid-1976, the "temporary" emergencies still exist and we rocket on to fiscal ruin.

No economist, to be certain, but as a concerned citizen who thumbed back into history's New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier and Great Society programs designed to solve the myriad of social, business and individual problems through federal financing, one gets a bit gunshy.

It all leads to deficit financing and, as a San Diego colleague reminds, deficit seems to have only two consequences. One drains capital away from the private sector of the economy which creates productive jobs with its capital investments.

The other is a thoughtless expansion of the money supply which will subject the healthy part of our economy to further inroads of inflation, the most serious threat it faces.

It took 60 years, from 1789 to 1848, for the U.S. government to spend one billion dollars.

Next year, under projections of the Ford Administration, it will take barely a day for the government to spend one billion dollars.

And away we go on another "emergency" that could cost a trillion in three years of the Ford Administration. Indeed, the flirtation with national bankruptcy is real. And Washington will be the scene of the wedding.

PRAYER IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Pastor Richard Peterson is serving the people of

rural America by bringing together men, women, and children of every faith with the power of prayer.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append a brief statement describing Pastor Pete's work in rural America so that all Americans can be made aware of the ministry of prayer.

The statement follows:

Prayer Power, Inc. is a truly Rural American venture. It is the only directed prayer ministry in the United States with headquarters in Rural America, that ministers exclusively to Rural America.

Its goals are to help save rural America, build better business and strengthen the church. This will be done through united, directed Christian Prayer. Three prayer times have been set aside daily to correspond with Biblical times of prayer—9:00 A.M., 12:00 noon and 9:45 P.M.—Ps 55:11, Daniel 6:10, Acts 10.

This is part of God's prophetic ministry in keeping with the Bible, the foundation of the great freedom documents of our nation. This prophecy was given to Pastor Pete, "The one chance to save Rural America is through united Christian Prayer," thus saith the Lord. (see II Chronicles 7:14 for parallel)

From its beginning on one station, KMHL, Marshall, Mn., with a forty mile radius, June 6, 1971—this ministry is now covering eight states and parts of Canada with sixteen one half hour broadcasts each week. Its projection is a daily prayer call program, "Prayerways to Peace" three times daily to call Christians in Rural American states to prayer. This is ready for launching in the spring of 1975. Daily prayers are prayed seven days a week and on all broadcasts for our President and all in positions of leadership in our nation.

No nation in world history has remained strong two generations beyond the time it lost its strong Rural population. Rural America is the Nation's Heartland with the lines of food, fibre and young men and women transfusing our nation. Prayer Power, Inc. is geared to keep Rural America strong and make it stronger through daily, united directed prayer. Anyone needing prayer can call anytime night or day for prayer.

This organization is not tied to any organized body but is native American. America was built by "Uncommon, common men"

and we believe it will be rebuilt the same way—Prayer Power is people oriented—Prayer Power is people. Praying people united in daily prayer. Our priority in this ministry is people and no one is turned away regardless of circumstances—People have priority in Prayer Power, Inc.

If other parts of the nation would like to begin a similar movement we would be only too happy to assist them in any way.

As the Pilgrim Fathers covenanted in the Mayflower compact, "To The Glory of God," this is our aim to glorify the God who has given us this great land.

EVERETT E. SCHELL

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 22, 1975, at the Century Plaza Hotel in Century City, Calif., Mr. Everett E. Schell will be honored at a testimonial dinner hosted by the City of Hope Medical Center.

A native of the Midwest, Everett Schell has been making influential contributions to labor relations for over three decades. He was elected in 1946 and served as executive secretary of the Metal Trades Council of Southern California. He has served as business manager of the Southern California Trades Council No. 16 since 1952, and as vice president of the California State Building Trades Council since 1966.

He has served as delegate to 18 California State Building Trades Conventions and 25 State AFL-CIO Conventions. He has been a member of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Negotiating Committee for 5 years, the Los Angeles Building Trades Minority Plan, and advisory member of the Piping Industry and Education Fund of Southern California since 1959.

He has served on the Los Angeles County District Attorney Advisory Committee since 1964 and the California Attorney General's Advisory Committee since 1970.

On January 1 of last year, Everett Schell became vice president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

On Saturday evening, the Spirit of Life Award will be presented to Everett Schell for his outstanding contributions to his fellow men as an exemplary labor leader and humanitarian, and a research fellowship will be established in his name at the City of Hope.

Everett Schell richly deserves this tribute. He has contributed so much to industry, the cause of better labor relations, and to the community. His humanitarian ideals and aspirations closely parallel the great principles of the beneficiary of this Testimonial—the City of Hope and its pioneering programs of research and healing.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the honor which is being paid to Mr. Schell on March 22. It is a tribute

which reflects the regard and respect of all who are privileged to know him.

DO WE NEED SHERLOCK HOLMES TO SOLVE THE INFLATION MYSTERY?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the witty insights and wise remedies for the current inflation-recession which appeared in a guest editorial in the Riverdale Press in its January 30 issue:

PRESIDENT FORD, SHERLOCK HOLMES AND THE MYSTERY OF THE GREAT INFLATION

(By Jay I. Olnek)

SCENE: The Oval Room in the White House, Washington, D.C.

PRESIDENT FORD: "Do come in, Mr. Holmes. I am so happy you accepted my invitation."

SHERLOCK HOLMES: "It is indeed an honor to be invited, Mr. President. May I know the purpose of this meeting?"

PRESIDENT FORD: "I am sure you are well aware of the problem besetting the dollar. Every year, its value becomes less and less. Ordinarily, this would be a problem to be handled by my economists. However, every time I meet with them, I get a headache. One economist very learnedly presents one recommendation. Another economist uses equally learned language to recommend the exact opposite. After every meeting, I must rush out and take two aspirins."

"Betty has become concerned about my health. As a last resort, I am seeking your help."

SHERLOCK HOLMES: "This is a little out of my field. But let us examine the evidence. Perhaps it can show us a way . . ."

THE TWELVE CLUES

Clue No. 1: The escalation of the interest rate proved ineffective.

Inflation ordinarily is caused by excessive demand for a limited supply of goods. Following basic economic doctrine, the Government attempted to limit demand by increasing the interest rate to an astronomical figure. The inflation continued apace, although demand was reduced. In fact, demand for goods within the country was reduced to such an extent that we went into a recession, and the Government is now following a reverse course with respect to the interest rate.

Is it possible that the excessive demand for American goods comes from outside the country rather than within the country?

Clue No. 2: Reduced Government spending proved ineffective.

Both President Nixon and the present Administration failed to spend the full monies appropriated by the Congress in an attempt to limit inflation. With less money going into circulation within the country, there was less purchasing by Americans. Again, this seemed to make no difference to the rapid advance of inflation.

Is it foreign rather than American purchasing power, that is causing this inflation?

Clue No. 3: Inflation is world-wide.

In the past, we have seen inflation beset one particular country or another because of economic conditions within the country involved. Now the entire world (except for the communist countries) is going beserk. What makes inflation spread from one country to another?

Countries relate to each other economically through international trade.

Clue No. 4: Devaluation of the Dollar.

President Nixon wanted to obtain a more favorable balance of our international trade so he, on two occasions, reduced the value of the dollar. This made American goods much more attractive, price-wise to foreign countries. The demand for American goods was increased—and our rate of inflation was also increased from approximately 6% to the double-digit figures now besetting us.

With the devaluation of the dollar, foreign currencies were worth more dollars, all at once. Was devaluation of the dollar something akin to printing billions of dollar bills, putting them into airplanes, flying all over the world and dropping these billions of dollars of printed bills on foreign countries?

Clue No. 5: Free trade.

For the first two centuries of capitalism, industries within each country were protected from foreign competition by tariffs. This produced a degree of stability.

Since World War II, the world has embarked on a free trade adventure. The Government attempts to increase trade by reducing tariff barriers in our country and other countries. Free trade has become an end in itself.

Does this double-digit inflation bear any relationship to this great new adventure, this voyage on uncharted waters?

Clue No. 6: The European Common Market.

There is "free trade" among the members of the European Common Market, and a high rate of inflation (except for Germany).

Clue No. 7: The German Mark.

Germany has a relatively low rate of inflation—about 6%. The German Mark is a strong currency. When foreigners attempt to purchase goods from Germany, it therefore costs them more. In fact, the German Mark is a form of trade barrier, reducing foreign demand for German goods.

Clue No. 8: The oil field equipment shortage.

Oil has been, or is being discovered all over the world. We ourselves produce two-thirds of our oil needs from Texas, Louisiana, Florida and California. Alaska will be producing oil. There is oil in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran. Nigeria in Africa is another source. Oil has been discovered off Scotland, off Norway, off Finland. China and Russia have great quantities of oil. Oil has been discovered in Brazil and Mexico. Libya, Venezuela and Algeria are great sources of oil, and plans are being made to develop Egyptian oil.

It appears that this entire earth may lie upon a bed or ocean of oil. However, oil under the ground or under the ocean is not of much value until it is brought to the surface. To bring oil above the ground, you need drilling equipment and you need pipes.

The greatest oil equipment producer in the world is the United States. It is U.S. companies who are playing the leading role in developing oil resources throughout the world.

The problem arises however, that as soon as oil is discovered in a foreign country, that country wants to get the maximum price for its oil. Therefore, it joins the oil cartel countries or follows their prices.

We must accordingly produce more oil within our own country. However, there is a small problem with respect to producing more oil in this country. We do not have sufficient equipment here to meet the needs of our independent oil producers, since we are exporting so much oil field equipment overseas.

Major oil companies are investing millions of dollars of American equipment—in oil cartel countries. These international oil companies have bought up all the oil drilling equipment that our factories can produce for the next two years.

A Texas oilman, in the New York Times of December 16, 1974: "If we could get the pipe and the rigs and other equipment, I honestly believe that we could find enough fuel oil and gas in the next two or three years to make up for the imports. Make that four years, just to be safe."

Is the oil shortage in the United States actually an oil field equipment shortage?

Clue No. 9: Zeroing in. (Concentrated Buying.)

Foreign governments may be short of a particular product. Suddenly, they arrive on the United States scene and buy up a huge quantity of this vital item, all at once; for example, wheat or building materials. A shortage is created and prices rise.

Clue No. 10: Automobiles

16% of cars presently being sold in the United States are of foreign origin. American auto plants have shut down. American automobile workers are jobless. With money from the sale of autos in the U.S., foreign countries can buy products in the United States, of which they are short—in concentrated quantities.

Clue No. 11: Foreign Credits.

The United States gave the Soviet Union \$500,000,000 of purchasing power. This was exercised in the big wheat deal, when all at once this money was spent on one product. The cost of bread has been going up ever since.

Clue No. 12: The I.L.G.W.U.—The Voice in the Wilderness.

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union has continually appealed, in its radio and newspaper advertising, for Americans to buy American-made clothing. Nevertheless, the textile industry has been hard hit by foreign imports made with cheap labor. Businesses have gone under. Textile workers have been laid off, and the number of workers has steadily decreased.

SOLUTIONS

Trade among nations is vital. Our own manufacturing community needs many raw materials. To obtain the funds to purchase those raw materials, we must sell abroad.

However, free trade means excessive international trade. We buy products we do not need, like automobiles or textiles. We export products we do need, like oil drilling equipment.

Free trade has become an end in itself. The important thing is to buy, buy, buy and to sell, sell, sell. But free trade opens up a nation to the potential demand and purchasing power of the other three billion or so people on this earth.

Can our nation—or any other nation—adjust to the magnitude and vagaries of so much purchasing power?

To eliminate inflation:

1. Revalue the dollar upward.
2. Embargo exports of oil field equipment until the needs of our independent oil producers have been satisfied.
3. Reduce the outflow of dollars.
4. Protect American industry and jobs from foreign competition.
5. Place high tariffs on importation of automobiles, textiles and other manufactured goods that we produce here.
6. Limit foreign credits and spread the use of such credits over a period of time.
7. Give foreign aid in goods rather than dollars.
8. Control foreign government purchases within the United States and spread such purchases over a period of time.
9. Form a business-labor coalition to defend their mutual interests.

SHERLOCK HOLMES WITH DR. WATSON

WATSON: "Holmes, it was uncanny how you were able to solve the economic inflation for President Ford. What led you to the discovery of the Twelve Clues?"

HOLMES: "It was elementary, Watson."

When a government follows a certain economic policy which produces undesired results, how would you get favorable results?"

WATSON: "By changing the policy?"

HOLMES: "By reversing the policy, Watson."

WATSON: "Bless my soul! Why didn't I see that before!"

HOLMES: "Because it was too obvious, my dear Watson."

GHANA'S 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, marks the 18th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Ghana. Originally known as the Gold Coast, Ghana declared her independence from Great Britain on March 6, 1957. Since that date, she has successfully achieved a high degree of self-sufficiency while raising the standard of living of her people. I take this occasion to submit to my colleagues the following paper, prepared by the Embassy of Ghana, commemorating this Nation's extraordinary record of achievement.

On this anniversary I join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and throughout the Congress in saluting the achievement of Ghana and its industrious people and the able efforts of the distinguished Ambassador of Ghana to the United States, His Excellency Samuel E. Quarm. We look forward to a strengthening of the already close ties of friendship between our nations.

The paper follows:

GHANA CELEBRATES 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Ghana today is celebrating the eighteenth anniversary of her Independence, at a time when the whole world is beset by inflation coupled with sharp increases in the prices of petroleum products. Nonetheless, Ghana is forging ahead with determination in her development programme aimed at raising the standard of living of her people.

Three years ago the Government of Ghana addressed herself to the major task of making the country self-reliant to the highest possible degree within her resources. The Government therefore placed emphasis on agricultural development as the general strategy to spearhead the country's economic development. The adoption of this policy was dictated by the actual conditions of the economy at that time, and Ghanians were called upon to muster all available resources to produce the food needed by the nation. The programme known as "Operation Feed Yourself" was regarded as an emergency operation aimed at reducing the country's crippling dependence on food imports. The years 1972-74 were therefore declared to be "Agricultural War Years", devoted to the increased production of selected crops and livestock.

The basic policy under the programme is the rapid and orderly development of agriculture towards self-sufficiency in food and raw materials and the diversification of agricultural exports.

Production targets have been exceeded, and Ghana has become self-sufficient in maize—the staple food of the majority—which used

to be imported in large quantities. Rice production has reached 70 per cent of the national need and Ghana hopes to become self-sufficient in rice this year.

The success story of the economic recovery during the past three years will for long be remembered. The strict discipline injected into the economy by the Government since coming into office has paid off so well that the country has been able to record a balance of trade surplus for the first time in the past two successive years.

To improve the quality of life of the people, the Government has introduced schemes for accelerated improvement in housing, health and education. A crash programme on low-cost houses for the low-income group is being pursued vigorously and work is in progress to complete, this year alone, some five thousand houses started under the scheme.

A new "Health-on-Wheels" scheme, aimed at providing more adequate medical services for the rural areas through mobile clinics, has also been instituted.

The Government has recently launched a five-year development plan aimed at effecting a structural transformation of the country's economy and promoting full and efficient use of all of the nation's resources.

The Government of Ghana has always encouraged foreign participation in our economy, and during the past year many foreign companies, including United States businesses, took advantage of a wide range of fiscal and tax incentives and good infrastructure to invest in Ghana. The country continued to maintain very fruitful partnerships with United States companies, such as Kaiser Aluminum, Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, Union Carbide, and Star-Kist.

To give practical expression to our relations with our neighbours, Ghana is exporting electrical power to Togo and Dahomey and continues to pursue a policy of friendship and co-operation with all countries.

We are determined to succeed, and with hard work and the sympathetic co-operation of our friends, we are sure we will.

MRS. MABEL ROBINSON

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Morris County Economic Opportunity Council honored Mrs. Mabel Robinson at a testimonial dinner. Because I was out of the country I was unable to join those community leaders in my district in paying a well-deserved tribute to a most outstanding citizen and a very old and valued friend in the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey. We have worked together in many good causes and I have always counted on her friendship and advice.

Mrs. Robinson's many achievements during a long and distinguished career of public service are well known in the community and I would like to share some of them with my colleagues.

Starting in 1923, when she joined the New Jersey Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Mrs. Robinson has contributed her time and talents to a host of worthwhile organizations. A partial list includes the Madison Parent-Teachers

Association, the Morris County World Citizenship program, the National Council of Negro Women, the Delta Chapter of Lambda Kappa Mu Sorority, the Morris County Chapter of the National Association of Colored People, the Morris County Urban League, the Madison-Florham Park Human Relations Committee, the New Jersey State Centennial Committee and the Morris County Tercentenary Committee.

Mrs. Robinson was cited in 1965 as New Jersey's Mother of the Year.

From 1967 until last September, she served as director as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a project of the Morris County Economic Opportunity-Council.

Mrs. Mabel Robinson throughout her lifetime has personified the ideal of good citizenship. The grateful community she has served so well for so many years is in her debt.

EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GHANA

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 18th anniversary of Ghana. I call this celebration to the attention of my colleagues because often in debates on issues related to developing nations, great emphasis is put on the need for those countries to assert a more intense effort to resolve their own problems. Ghana, in my opinion, is an example of a developing country that is doing just that.

This western African nation is determined to raise the standard of living of her people through her own development program. To achieve that goal, the government 3 years ago initiated a plan to make the nation as self-reliant as possible within her resources. The emphasis of the program was "Operation Feed Yourself." Its purpose was to reduce dependence on food imports by increasing production of certain crops and livestock. Between 1972 and 1974, the production targets of the program were exceeded enabling Ghana to become self-sufficient in maize, the staple food of the majority of her people. Self-sufficiency in rice production we almost attained.

As efforts continue in the agriculture field, the Government of Ghana now has introduced programs designed to improve health, housing, and education conditions. As a result, it is anticipated that 5,000 homes for low-income individuals will be started this year. In addition, mobile health clinics will be sent into the rural areas.

Most recently Ghana has begun a 5-year development program to restructure the nation's economy and to insure that her resources will be used efficiently.

I commend the people of Ghana and her governmental officials for their determined efforts, and I congratulate them as they celebrate this anniversary of their independence.

AID TO THE UNEMPLOYED IN INDIANA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an updated report on aid to the unemployed in Indiana. This reflects information I have received on unemployment compensation since my first report appeared in the RECORD on February 25.

AID TO UNEMPLOYED IN INDIANA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

These are the only agencies that act as clearing houses for social services information. Their Outreach program functions to find out what is needed, refer clients to the proper agencies and then follow up to ensure proper services are provided. They also act as advocates, interceding on behalf of the poor in disputes with government agencies.

Eligibility

Their mandate is to help those below the poverty line, but they will assist anyone in economic trouble. No stringent guidelines are followed.

Availability of services

All 9th District counties except Fayette, Franklin and Decatur are served by C.A.P.s.

Locations

L.O.W. Economic Development Corporation (Washington County), P.O. Box 205, Mitchell, Phone 849-4457.

Lincoln Hills Development Corporation (Harrison County), P.O. Box 113, Troy, Phone 547-8621.

BBJ Community Action Agency (Human Services, Inc.) (Bartholomew, Brown, Jackson), Box 588, Columbus, Phone 372-8047.

Floyd County Economic Opportunity Corporation (Floyd), Room 122 City-County Bldg., New Albany, Phone 945-2349.

Clark County Community Action Agency (Clark), 201 National Avenue, Jeffersonville, Phone 282-0456.

Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corporation (Switzerland, Dearborn, Ohio, Ripley), 237 Main Street, Aurora, Phone 926-1585.

Ohio Valley Opportunities, Inc. (Jefferson, Jennings, Scott), First and Broadway, Madison, Phone 265-5858.

Monroe County Community Action Program (Monroe), 101 S. College Avenue, Bloomington, Phone 339-3447.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Regular State program

Benefits

Payment of \$60 to \$100 a week, determined by number of dependents and historical earnings. Maximum payments for the first 26 weeks are:

- 4 dependents, \$100 a week.
- 3 dependents, \$90 a week.
- 2 dependents, \$80 a week.
- 1 dependent, \$70 a week.
- No dependents, \$60 a week.

Requirements for Eligibility

Must have made \$500 during the base period, the first four of the last five quarters before a claim is filed.

Must have worked the last six months of the base period.

Must have worked in a field covered by the program. Usually farm and domestic work are not covered.

Must register for work and be willing to accept work in field of experience.

Extension of Benefits

Outstanding claims may be extended by up to 50 per cent, i.e. a 26 week entitlement

could be increased to 39 weeks. Claims already expired may not be reopened for extension. Payments are reduced by 50 per cent, after the initial 26 week period.

Federal Supplemental Benefits

This is a temporary program for high unemployment areas. Indiana residents are eligible. Benefits are extended 13 weeks beyond the normal 39 week maximum. Requirements and payments are the same as for the first 13 week extension. No claim may be filed after December 31, 1975.

Special unemployment assistance

This is a Federally funded program administered by the state. Its purpose is to extend unemployment compensation to persons not normally covered by existing programs and to aid high-employment areas. Benefits are the same as for the regular state program, but may not be extended beyond 26 weeks.

Requirements

Must have earned \$500 within a year of the day claim is filed. Not necessary to have worked during the last six months of the base period as in the regular plan.

Eligibility requirements are more flexible. Occupations not covered by the regular program may meet its requirements.

Applicants should file claims at nearest Employment Security Division office. A Social Security card and a list of all employers for whom applicant worked during the last 52 weeks are required. Applicants must agree to register for work and to accept employment in their field of experience.

This is a temporary program authorized only until March 31, 1976. No claim may be filed after December 31, 1975 unless the Congress extends the program.

FOOD STAMPS

Benefits

Free or discounted food. Stamps are bought at a state Food Stamp office and used like money at the grocery store.

Eligibility

In general, the eligibility requirements are the same as for welfare or Township Trustee poor relief. Households not on assistance may still be eligible if income does not exceed specified limits in relation to their size:

Family size:	Income dollars
1	194
2	230
3	406
4	513
5	606
6	700
7	793
8	886
9	959
10	1,032

For families over 10, add \$73 for each additional member.

A family's resources, including cash on hand, stocks and bonds, savings and checking accounts, property, automobiles and other personal property are considered in deciding eligibility. Except for deductible items, total family resources may not exceed \$1500 except when a member is over 60; then, the limit is \$3000. Generally, one car, a house and lot, household goods, life insurance policies, pension funds and personal effects are deductible.

Benefits

Each family is allowed to buy a maximum number of stamps every month, according to its size. Stamp prices vary with ability to pay as measured by net income and family size. Net income is calculated by subtracting the following deductibles from gross income:

Ten per cent of earned income, but not more than \$30 a month.

Federal, state and local income tax, FICA tax, retirement payments, union dues and some types of garnishments.

Medical costs of more than \$10 a month except for special diets.

Child or invalid care costs when necessary to enable member to work or take part in job training.

Tuition and required fees for education,

but not books, supplies, school meals or transportation.

Unusual expenses such as fire, flood or theft loss or funeral costs.

Court-ordered support or alimony payments.

Shelter costs if more than 30 per cent of household income as calculated after all other deductions. Includes rent, mortgage payments, utilities, real estate taxes, basic

fee for one telephone, special local assessments. (Only for place of residence.)

The following table indicates food stamp costs to families of varying sizes and incomes. Note that a family of 4 with a net income of \$452 would pay \$130 for food stamps worth \$154. The same family with a net income of \$31 would pay \$19 for \$154 worth of stamps and would be ineligible for the program if its income were to rise to \$540.

FOOD STAMP ALLOTMENTS AND PURCHASE REQUIREMENTS (EFFECTIVE JAN. 1)

48 States and District of Columbia	Number of persons in household								48 States and District of Columbia	Number of persons in household							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Monthly coupon allotment.....	\$46	\$84	\$122	\$154	\$182	\$210	\$238	\$266	\$270 to \$289.99.....	\$64	\$76	\$77	\$78	\$79	\$80	\$81	
Monthly net income and monthly purchase requirement:									\$290 to \$309.99.....	82	83	84	85	86	87		
\$0 to \$19.99.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$310 to \$329.99.....	88	89	90	91	92	93		
\$20 to \$29.99.....	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$330 to \$359.99.....	94	95	96	97	98	99		
\$30 to \$39.99.....	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	\$360 to \$389.99.....	100	104	105	106	107	108		
\$40 to \$49.99.....	6	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	\$390 to \$419.99.....	104	113	114	115	116	117		
\$50 to \$59.99.....	8	10	10	10	11	11	12	12	\$420 to \$449.99.....	122	123	124	125	126			
\$60 to \$69.99.....	10	12	13	13	14	14	15	16	\$450 to \$479.99.....	130	132	133	134	135			
\$70 to \$79.99.....	12	15	16	16	17	17	18	19	\$480 to \$509.99.....	130	141	142	143	144			
\$80 to \$89.99.....	14	18	19	19	20	21	21	22	\$510 to \$539.99.....	130	150	151	152	153			
\$90 to \$99.99.....	16	21	21	22	23	24	25	26	\$540 to \$569.99.....	154	160	161	162				
\$100 to \$109.99.....	18	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	\$570 to \$599.99.....	154	169	170	171				
\$110 to \$119.99.....	21	26	27	28	29	31	32	33	\$600 to \$629.99.....	154	178	179	180				
\$120 to \$129.99.....	24	29	30	31	33	34	35	36	\$630 to \$659.99.....	178	188	189					
\$130 to \$139.99.....	27	32	33	34	36	37	38	39	\$660 to \$689.99.....	178	197	198					
\$140 to \$149.99.....	30	35	36	37	39	40	41	42	\$690 to \$719.99.....	178	202	207					
\$150 to \$169.99.....	33	38	40	41	42	43	44	45	\$720 to \$749.99.....	202	216						
\$170 to \$189.99.....	36	44	46	47	48	49	50	51	\$750 to \$779.99.....	202	225						
\$190 to \$209.99.....	36	50	52	53	54	55	56	57	\$780 to \$809.99.....	202	226						
\$210 to \$229.99.....	56	58	59	60	61	62	63		\$810 to \$839.99.....	226							
\$230 to \$249.99.....	62	64	65	66	67	68	69		\$840 to \$869.99.....	226							
\$250 to \$269.99.....	64	70	71	72	73	74	75		\$870 to \$899.99.....	226							

Because of administrative delays, food stamp recipients usually must wait more than six weeks before receipt of the first stamps. No interim relief is available except possibly from the Township Trustees or private agencies.

TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

Township trustees are budgeted a small amount of money for "poor relief." They do not operate continuing relief programs, but could assist those who are experiencing delay in getting food stamp approval.

Township relief budgets are so small that some run out of money before year's end and can do nothing until the next appropriation. Also, since the trustees' offices are often open only a few hours a day, it may be difficult to track one down.

Some trustees hire no employees, do no investigation and rely on person-to-person interviews to determine eligibility. They have sole discretion in deciding who gets money and how much.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

This is a nationwide program designed to aid the aged, blind and disabled. State programs for these groups have been ended.

Definitions

Aged: over 65

Blind: vision no better than 20-200 with correction or tunnel vision (limited visual field of 20 degrees or less).

Disabled: physical or mental impairment which prevents a person from doing any substantial work and is expected to last at least a year or to result in death.

The SSA is strict in determining disability. A person may be unable to do any work that is available near his place of residence or even in his state, may be unable to do any full-time work at all and still be considered employable by SSA. A single doctor's statement that a person is disabled is not sufficient proof; SSA reviews medical records and examination results and makes its own decision in each case.

Requirements

Income must be below \$438 a quarter for an individual or \$657 a quarter for a couple except \$60 a quarter of retirement income and \$195 plus half of remainder of earned income may be deducted.

Resources (bank accounts, cash on hand, stocks, etc.) must be less than \$1500 for an individual or \$2250 for a couple. Homes, cars, personal effects and household goods of "reasonable value" are not counted so long as they are essential to self-support.

Benefits

A person living alone receives \$146 a month while a couple receives \$219 a month. Under certain conditions the amount is reduced, usually because the recipient receives extra income from some other source or is hospitalized for an entire month.

Disability claims should be filed at the nearest Social Security Office.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY

This program is an extension of Social Security. It differs from SSI because it is open only to those who have earned Social Security credits. Criteria for determining disability are essentially identical, but benefits can be much higher than under SSI, depending on yearly average income under Social Security.

Eligibility

Work Credits

Length of work needed depends on age at time of disablement:

Under 24—One and a half years in the three-year period ending when the disability begins.

24 through 30—Half the time between age 21 and the time of disablement.

31 and older—Five years of work out of the last ten years before disablement.

Years need not be continuous or in units of full years.

The Blind

Some special provisions are made for the blind. Most important is a relaxed definition of "disabled" for blind between 55 and 65.

Persons Eligible

Disabled workers under 65 and their families.

Persons disabled before age 22. Disabled widows, disabled dependent widowers, disabled divorced wives (under some conditions).

Medicare

Available to anyone who has been entitled to disability checks for two or more consecutive years.

Benefits

Calculation of benefits is complex. The table below is only a guide:

Maximum family payments:	Average yearly earnings after 1950
\$141.....	\$923
297.....	3,000
489.....	5,000
549.....	6,000
598.....	7,000
651.....	8,000
689.....	9,000
722.....	10,000

In general, the disabled person will not be paid at all for the period between the time he applies and five full months later. If the disability began at least six months before he made application, some back payment can be made, but the waiting period of five months will still be in force.

A person already recovered from a disability that lasted a year or more may receive back payment if he files within 14 months of his recovery.

MEDICAID

Those who qualify for Medicaid receive free medical and dental care. Hospital and physician charges, dental work, eyeglasses and prescribed medicine are covered as are certain necessary appliances such as crutches and wheelchairs.

Some limitations are placed on the kind and amount of dental work and on such things as the frequency of eyeglass replacement. Unusual equipment needs (wheel-

chairs, hearing aids, etc.) must be approved by the State Welfare Department.

Eligibility

AFDC—all eligible AFDC recipients are covered.

Aged, blind and disabled—coverage for this group is the same as for dependent children. Eligibility requirements are roughly parallel to the SSI guidelines.

AID FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN

This is the core program for Indiana welfare assistance. Payments are made to the parent who cares for a dependent child.

Eligibility

Any dependent child under 18 who has been deprived of the support of one or both parents and whose remaining parent or guardian is unable to adequately support him/her is eligible. One parent must be dead, incapacitated or absent if the child is to be eligible. Indiana, unlike some other states, makes no provision for the father who is unemployed but lives at home.

Benefits

Maximum benefit is \$150 for a parent and one child plus \$50 for each additional child. The benefit amount is determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into account any outside income. Food stamps are not counted as outside income.

Any child eligible for AFDC is also eligible for Medicaid as is the parent who cares for him/her.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

While the Veterans Administration offers no social services programs, certain of its benefits could be of use to the veteran with economic difficulties, especially hospitalization and vocational training. In addition, those with service-connected disabilities can receive pensions, vocational rehabilitation services, etc.

Free hospitalization

Any veteran—but not his family—can receive free in-patient care at veterans hospitals, even for non-service-connected injuries or diseases. Limited out-patient care is available to those patients who would require hospitalization without it. Two veterans hospitals are located near the 9th District: Indianapolis and Louisville.

Educational benefits

The VA will provide payments for vocational training for any veteran within 10 years of his discharge date. Some limitations are imposed, but most training is acceptable so long as it is part of a program toward an identifiable vocation. A few areas (such as bartending) are prohibited. Programs are:

1. On-the-job training. The veteran works for an employer at a journeyman's wage while the VA pays the employer part of the salary.

2. College level training. The veteran receives monthly checks while he attends a college or university. Payment is calculated according to the number of dependents and number of credit hours enrolled. Full-time (12 or more credit hours) monthly benefits range from \$270 for a single veteran to \$366 for one with two dependents. In addition, \$22 a month is provided for each dependent over two.

3. Correspondence courses. VA pays 95 per cent of cost.

YOUNG BLACK COUPLE'S POETRY SALUTES BLACK HISTORY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues

the inspirational story of a young black couple whose shared interest in the black experience has produced beautiful poetry. Corrie and Roberta Haines are able to combine their prodigious talents to collaborate in writing poetic tributes to the heroes and heroines of Afro-American history. They are a young married couple, residing in the Washington area, who find time for their creative efforts while both pursuing graduate studies. Corrie Roberts, a native Cleveland, is 25 years old and a student of Afro-American studies at Howard University. His 24-year-old wife Roberta is a student of library science at Catholic University. The two young scholars have already successfully pooled their considerable abilities to produce a volume of published poetry entitled "As I See It," which appeared in June of 1974. That same summer Corrie and Roberta journeyed to Ghana at the invitation of the African Council of Arts and the Afro-American Studies Department of Howard University, in order to study the way of life of the Asanti people. During their visit they were able to tape the oral history of the Asantis as told by the elders of the tribe. Currently they are transcribing the tapes, working in collaboration with famed historian John Hope Franklin. The Haines plan to return to Ghana this summer to do more research in hopes of publishing a book on the history of the Asantis. I was so impressed with the story of these remarkable young people that I felt compelled to share the experience with my colleagues. To further acquaint my colleagues with this talented young couple I submit this example of their joint efforts:

CRISPUS ATTUCKS

(By Corrie and Roberta)

Slaveholder William Browne of Framingham, a town in Massachusetts, October second, seventeen-fifty, ran an add in the Boston Gazette:

... ten pounds reward for return of my chattel . . . Crispus Attucks I own as I do my cattle . . .

But Crispus, as though by fate directed, eluded his captors; not one collected the ten pounds reward placed on his head. Crispus Attucks successfully fled to Boston, then to open sea; slave to sailor to liberty.

Armed with fortitude for survival transmitted through his seeds, he transvalued Christian ethics and Democratic creeds.

At twenty-seven years of age, six foot two and stout, curly haired Crispus learned what freedom was about.

For twenty years they sailed together as captain and first mate, 'til March the fifth of seventy

which proved to be their date with Captain Preston and his Redcoats of the 29th Regiment who occupied the colony without citizenry consent.

That Monday, soldiers enraged the town by their maltreatment of a boy; the citizens began searching for a leader to employ.

From Jackson's Corner Crispus came without a weapon in his hands, to Custom's House on King Street, shouting, "Drive tyranny from our land!" Just seeing Crispus unafraid, the people became inspired; by his words he moved a country, even as the British fled.

Two balls struck Crispus; he fell lifeless on the spot. Weeping Freedom embraced the soul of its American patriot.

BLEAK FORECASTS BELIE U.S. STRENGTH

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Jack Anderson and Les Whitten have combined efforts to write what I believe is a pretty good article on the current state of affairs in our country. Instead of a column, it is more like a good editorial.

It is a concise yet indepth report which brings into perspective the problems of unemployment, high prices, high taxes and the basic economic dilemma we are in today.

It is an optimistic editorial when compared with the situation which existed during the Great Depression, but it brings more into focus the strength of the United States and what we stand to lose unless this administration and the Congress take careful steps to:

... strike a bold but delicate balance between short-term action to halt the slide and long-term austerity to choke off permanent inflation.

The text of the article from The Washington Post, Thursday, March 6, 1975, follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 6, 1975]

BLEAK FORECASTS BELIE U.S. STRENGTH

(By Jack Anderson and Les Whitten)

Most Americans have never known a time when economic expectations weren't bright. For two-thirds of the population, there has been a steady rise in living standards.

But now, the outlook has suddenly turned bleak. No longer can Americans count on a better life for less effort.

Will the response be panic, a demand by each distressed group that it be subsidized? Or will there be a recognition that belts must be tightened, overdue accounts reconciled, dreams deferred, individual productivity increased and the price paid for the costly development of new sources of energy?

So far, the emphasis has been on special pleading and hot air.

At their recent Washington conclave, big city mayors invoked the specter of mass rioting and mob violence unless they get \$15 billion in immediate federal aid.

Leaders of four national unions threaten to march on Washington by hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers. Penn Central regularly issues doomsday announcements, warning of a total shutdown, unless it gets more money from the Treasury.

A leading businessman, Eli Black of United Brands, has revived the 1929 syndrome by jumping to his death from the 44th floor of the Pan Am building in New York. Marxist economists have come out of the closet and on to the lecture circuit.

Capsule news bulletins keep dinning each month that the number of unemployed is the highest since the Great Depression. And nightly television interviews at unemployment lines keep turning up angry men who say they'll commit crime before they'll go without.

Well, we don't think this theater of the hysterical reflects either the condition of the country or the temper of most Americans. Our system is stronger and our people more resilient, we believe, than they are portrayed.

Let's begin by putting a few facts in perspective:

Six million unemployed out of 80 million workers is bad news. But during the Depression, we had 12 million jobless out of 35 million.

The prices of most goods have skyrocketed. Yet before we decide that our productive mechanism is slipped over a precipice, consider that a major appliance can be purchased today from the wages of only half the hours required 10 years ago.

Taxes are distressingly high. Still, the percentage of our income going for taxes of all kinds is under 30 per cent, the second lowest among the 13 top industrial nations.

Sixty per cent of American families own their own homes. Social Security and Medicare payments provide protection not available during the Depression. Federal insurance assures that bank failures will be isolated and no depositor will be victimized. Unemployment compensation, food stamps, federalized welfare and other programs provide a floor above Dickensian destitution.

But the most reassuring facet of all, in our view, is the quality of the American people. In the past few months, we have received 750,000 letters in response to an invitation to readers to tell us how they felt about the country and to suggest a slogan for next years bicentennial celebration.

From these letters we have gained a picture of a people in times of turmoil and disappointment. What shows through is a love of country undampened by the betrayals of unworthy leaders, an idealism undiminished by the sight of so much high chicanery, a willingness to sacrifice for the common good.

Dozens of organizations also responded. We were contacted by Edward J. Piszek, president of the Copernicus Society of America, who wanted to participate. The society is now putting up a \$5,000 first prize for the best slogan and 13 runner-up prizes ranging from \$500 to \$1,000.

American Motors offered a station wagon to the winner, and Holiday Inns will put up the winning family at its motels anywhere in America for 30 days.

The International Association of Fairs and Expositions will make the bicentennial slogan search part of 2,800 fairs around the country. The American Song Festival will invite aspiring composers to set the winning slogans to music.

The Jaycees, American Legion, Urban League, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, General Federation of Women's Clubs and the National Education Association are involved. Even Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn wants to promote the slogan search at baseball games.

Slogans should be addressed to Slogans, USA, Box 1976, Washington, D.C.

The temper of the times, then, is not for mass marches on the Capitol to bullrag Congress for benefits, or for billion-dollar grabs by ailing power blocs.

It is a temper which recognizes that in the months ahead the President and Congress must calmly deliberate and strike a bold but delicate balance between short-term action to halt the slide and long-term austerity to choke off permanent inflation.

PRESIDENT FORD'S ENERGY PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, numerous analyses of President Ford's energy pro-

gram have been prepared during recent weeks. Prof. S. Fred Singer of the Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia, has published an excellent article on the President's proposals. I am happy to insert Professor Singer's remarks into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT FORD'S ENERGY PROGRAM

WHAT MR. FORD'S ENERGY PROPOSALS MEAN

Full credit should be given to President Ford for at least "biting the bullet" and coming up with a comprehensive set of energy proposals. The kindest thing one can say about them, however, is that they are not all bad. They do stay clear of mandatory controls, of federally fouled-up fuel allocations, and of bureaucratically-organized rationing. They do place major reliance on market forces. Their overwhelming aim seems to be to cut oil imports by one million barrels per day (which is about 15% of all oil imports, only 6% of current oil consumption, and less than 3% of current U.S. energy consumption). An artificial increase in price is supposed to discourage oil consumption, but in the process we may be buying a lot of tough problems which none of us—certainly not Mr. Ford—has bargained for.

VOLUNTARY CONSERVATION FIGHTS INFLATION AND RECESSION

It is a real pity that voluntary conservation of energy—at the individual and at the community level—has not been given a meaningful chance. There has never been imaginative leadership to mount a real grassroots effort against waste. We know for example, that 28% of all petroleum is used by private cars, and that the savings Mr. Ford wants can be made if the millions of people who drive to work and school were to share more rides and generally eliminate nonessential driving to the tune of about 20%. Nor has there been a concerted effort to teach people how to save energy in their homes. Such simple economies, as keeping the temperature a few degrees lower than usual, plugging any leaks which waste heat, and using more insulation, could cut home consumption of energy—and fuel bills—by as much as 50%. I suppose if Mr. Ford would wear a heavy sweater to work and everyone were to follow suit, then the excess heat in office buildings would soon get turned down too.

Cutting wasteful uses of petroleum by only 6% should present no real problem—except that the consumer does not yet realize that energy conservation is good for him. How? First of all, it saves him money; and secondly, it is the only sure way of bringing down energy prices in the long run. What housewives have discovered from their boycott of meat, they need to rediscover for gasoline and fuel oil. But most important, it would avoid some of the drastic measures which Mr. Ford is now recommending, and the even less attractive alternatives which are being talked about in Congress.

Unlike mandatory measures which have the potential of causing serious economic dislocations, voluntary conservation is determined by the individual judgements of millions of users who will reduce consumption as long as it benefits them. The money saved is generally spent on other goods. In this way, energy conservation can fight inflation and recession at the same time. I believe that most Americans would be more than willing to follow a leadership that makes these facts clear to them. The real action, however, is at the local government level. A properly organized community effort can plug heat leaks and teach people how to save energy in the home—permanently. And higher parking charges and gasoline excise taxes, coupled with better public transit service and convenient car pooling arrangements, can cut down on wasteful driving. After all,

it is the community that bears the unpaid costs which come from the use of the automobile: noise, pollution, accidents, road maintenance, and traffic snarls which increase all cost from the delivery of goods to garbage collection. Yet the motorist does not pay his fair share.

OIL PROPOSALS

With respect to oil, Mr. Ford was persuaded to use a price mechanism rather than mandatory allocations. But raising the price artificially by imposing large tariffs on imports and taxes on domestic oil is a drastic measure. We have already seen the effects of the artificial price increase imposed by the oil producer cartel. Mr. Ford's proposals have the potential of causing further inflation and of really hurting many segments of the economy. There are other dangers in an arbitrary price rise, not the least of which is that OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries, may decide to raise the price on their own to make up for reduced sales. Such a price rise would of course further increase world problems, particularly in countries that are being bankrupted by the existing high price of oil.

Even though the aim of the oil tariff and tax is to cut down the use of gasoline, it works out that the percentage increase is greatest for fuel oil and least for gasoline. This means that all heating costs will go up, as well as the cost of electricity, fertilizer, food, and all manufactured goods. It would also make U.S. exports more expensive and certainly hurt our trade balance. It remains to be seen whether OPEC will use such price rises as an excuse for further raising their price of oil. One can only hope that the tariff and tax combination will be temporary and soon forgotten. But perhaps, before it fades away, it will have produced some more imaginative proposals for cutting energy use without using a sledge hammer.

One good thing about the President's proposal is that it abolishes the existing two-tier price system for oil, under which "old" oil (from wells existing before 1973) sells for a strictly controlled price of \$5.25 a barrel and uncontrolled new oil for around \$11. The whole purpose of this distortion was to avoid "windfall" profits to the oil industry—but the cure may be worse than the disease. Congress has already set up a "price equalization" program which is designed to overcome this price difference to refiners; and there are various kinds of other distortions produced by the artificial two-tier system—all of them decreasing the efficiency of oil recovery, at the ultimate expense of the consumer. Simply abolishing the two-tier price system might be enough to give Mr. Ford the cut in imports that he wants—partly from a resulting higher average price which reduces demand, and partly from a greater supply as producers pump harder in existing fields to recover more "old" oil.

The main reason for reducing imports would seem to be national security, yet that part of the President's program has not been particularly well handled. There should be no objection to imports as such, provided that they are not excessively priced and provided that there is an adequate supply of oil so that a cut-off cannot produce any important economic disruptions. In fact, the very existence of a stockpile would discourage anyone from even applying an embargo. Furthermore, a stockpile protects also against accidental cut-offs, as well as against sabotage by third parties.

The Ford proposal apparently envisages an eventual billion-barrel Government-run stockpile somewhere in the Gulf of Mexico region. A more desirable proposal would make the oil industry expand existing stockpiles without delay by insisting that each importer maintain X number of days of oil stockpiled in the United States. This is the system used by European countries, and it works very well. The oil companies would then devise the most efficient stockpiling

system; even though the cost would have to be passed along to the consumer, it would be kept down by competition. The increased cost, essentially an insurance premium, would further dampen down the consumption of oil—without the use of artificial taxes.

As far as the source of the oil stockpile is concerned, the White House has tried to reassure us that it would come from domestic sources and not increase imports. This, of course, is nonsense! If, in fact, domestic oil is used, say oil from the Naval Petroleum Reserve at Elk Hills, California, this simply means that more oil would have to be imported to make up for this deficit. In my opinion, the oil companies should be able to buy the oil wherever they can do so at the lowest price. They may well be able to make a special deal with an oil-producing country which would like to sell a larger amount, particularly right now while prices are still high. There are obvious possibilities here of breaking down the oil cartel, provided the stockpiling is handled properly.

GAS, COAL AND NUCLEAR ENERGY

While oil occupies the main portion of the President's energy message—as it should—every other energy source is of importance also. With respect to natural gas, we should have learned by now that the shortages are real and not contrived, and will get worse every year. There is little question anymore that price regulation is the cause of this shortage. Mr. Ford has proposed deregulation of the price of "new" gas. A better alternative may be a step-wise decontrol of the price over a number of years. There will be additional cost to the consumer, but at least he will be able to get natural gas—still the greatest energy bargain in the United States. Mr. Ford has also proposed an excise tax. This will cut consumption somewhat, but it will do nothing to encourage more supplies. I would favor a much larger excise tax to bring the price of gas closer to that of oil, and definitely above that of coal, so as to encourage a switchover to coal by industry. This tax could be relaxed in future years if higher-priced "new" gas enters the pipelines.

One of the bright spots of the breakdown of the Russian trade agreement is the fact that it will probably also eliminate the import of liquefied natural gas from Siberia, one of the greatest all-time rip-offs of the U.S. consumer, perhaps matched only by the famous grain deal of 1972. Under this LNG proposal at least ten billion dollars, and probably much more, would have been invested in facilities in the Soviet Union by U.S. firms with government subsidies. This would have tied us firmly to high-cost gas of dubious security, which would have to be shipped to the United States in special tankers. We will have to see now whether the Soviets are able to get the required capital from other sources; possibly they can persuade the Arab sheiks that developing natural gas in Siberia for sale to the United States is a good investment. It makes more sense though for the Russians to sell gas, as well as oil, by direct pipeline shipments to Europe. Between the USSR and the North Sea, we may well see Europe independent of Middle East oil by the end of this decade. And if recent reports about China are correct, then Japan will be getting much of its oil from nearby sources. All in all, the prospects are good for a larger production surplus of oil by the end of this decade, something which will stimulate price cutting and lead to a weakening of the oil cartel.

The President is certainly on the right track with respect to coal and nuclear energy. These are the most abundant and immediately available energy sources in the United States. I am convinced that the environmental and safety aspects of electric power production from both coal and uranium can

be handled without endangering the health of the American public; but a detailed discussion would lead us too far afield here.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND OTHER PROBLEMS

The environmental proposal that deserves greatest support is Mr. Ford's request to freeze automobile emission standards for five years at the present level. There is overwhelming evidence now that the much stricter standards originally envisioned in the 1970 Clean Air Act would have resulted in a waste of resources to the tune of some 10 billion dollars a year. We don't need this, since we can achieve nearly all of the benefits for just a fraction of this cost. Mr. Ford's proposal would give us enough time to carry out a less costly approach, and one which would save a good deal of energy as well.

A major underlying problem not mentioned by Mr. Ford is the confidence gap which exists between the energy companies, especially the oil companies, on the one hand, and the general public and the Congress on the other hand. The sticking point seems to be high profits, so-called "windfall" because the inventories of oil in the ground are now worth more. But companies cannot consume these profits or use them up like people do. Dividends paid out of profits already carry a heavy tax; the profits kept by the companies must be used for investing in much costlier future energy resources. Personally, I favor letting the companies put their profits into the Treasury by buying federal oil leases. Eventually this cost will be passed around to the consumer—it is essentially a tax which the companies would now prepay.

We will have to learn that if we want energy we must let the energy companies do their job. Whatever the tax laws are, the industry will live with them. However, there should be a deadline on Congressional debate and decision, so that the companies can make their plans soon and with some assurance of stability. There is no best solution overall—there are a number of good solutions. Let's settle on one. By now it should be clear that a solution with a minimum of regulations and maximum reliance on market forces and competition is to be preferred.

Another disturbing development is the recent growth of regionalism, which is divisive and tends to hold back the balanced energy program the country so badly needs. The United States would be in desperate shape if the southeastern states were to hold back "their" gas and oil, the western states their coal and uranium, and the eastern states the development of oil off their shores. We would all go under together! The President has not yet asked for our support, but he will need it.

ISRAEL'S UGLY LITTLE WAR

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have always been the first to condemn violence and terrorism in the Middle East and wherever else it may occur. I think the following article, which appeared in the March 17, 1975, issue of the New Times is important reading for my colleagues:

ISRAEL'S UGLY LITTLE WAR

(By Judith Coburn)

THE ARQOUB, SOUTHERN LEBANON.—Rashaya Fuqhar, once a prosperous little village

of 2,000 Christian Arabs, is now a near ghost town. Known for its simple but striking brown and tan pottery, its kilns are now cold. In the past year, five villagers have been killed and over 30 wounded by Israel air and artillery bombardment. The pottery factory has been smashed by bombs. Scores of others have been damaged by shelling. Hundreds of the village's residents are now refugees, having fled to the slums of Sidon and Beirut to the north. Only 100 residents remain. A few of the villagers still farm, but most of them are afraid to because the fields are strafed.

We visit St. George's, the Greek Orthodox Church, now the center of life in the village. The dim interior is grimy but charming with its crowded display of 19 chandeliers donated by benefactors. After five straight days of bombing in May 1974, the residents who couldn't afford to flee left their houses and moved into the church. "We know it isn't really safe," admits the village mukhtar (mayor), "but people feel safer in one place. It is faith and some superstition that we won't be killed in God's place." But already cracks have appeared in the walls and roof from the impact of nearby shells. And in October, the roof caught on fire from an incendiary shell. In one end of the room, people have made beds of coffins.

A tour of the village shows the crumbling houses, abandoned possessions, a cemetery with shattered crosses and memorial wreaths blackened by air strikes. An old woman holds up an intact American-made shell, which seems to be a casing for dropping propaganda leaflets. She squints into the sun for the photographer beside her smashed house. Up the road, a threshing field is now marked by a burned-out tractor and a large blackened smear. Mrs. Fehda Gebran tells us how her husband, Elias, was killed August 7 in a bombing raid. She, her 15-year-old son and six others were wounded in the attack. Her hand and breast are still bandaged. She still weeps, two months later, describing the day. Her husband was the only wage earner in the family of nine; they now receive a little money from a newly formed charity group, the Council of the Whole South. We return to the village in silence.

There are scores of villages like Rashaya Fuqhar in southern Lebanon. Beginning in 1968, and almost daily in recent months, the Israelis have subjected villages like Rashaya Fuqhar and a handful of Palestinian refugee camps in southern Lebanon to attacks by airplane, artillery, tanks and gunboats. Israeli commandos invade Lebanese villages and Palestinian refugee camps, forcibly checking identifications, blowing up houses, killing villagers and taking prisoners.

The Israelis call the area "Fatahland"—it is "the Arqoub" to the Lebanese—and it is from this wild terrain, leading to the approaches of Mount Hermon, the Israelis say, that Palestinian commandos run their operations against Israeli border settlements and bases. The Israelis say that the purpose of their campaign against the South is to stop commando operations by killing all the commandos in the area or by pressuring the villagers to expel the guerrillas from their midst. The Israeli military command insists it is attacking only military targets—"bases" or "concentrations" of guerrillas—and kidnapping only members of terrorist groups and those Lebanese who work directly with them.

But, as Americans discovered in Vietnam, it is never quite that simple. Bombing is not a selective weapon. Intelligence about enemy presence in villages, especially when gathered by photo reconnaissance or foreign agents, is often faulty. A six-week investigation in Lebanon indicates that, as in Vietnam, large numbers of civilians are being caught in a net cast for guerrillas. We visited scores of Lebanese villages and five Pales-

tinian refugee camps where hundreds of civilians—including women and children—had been wounded or killed. The Israelis are using the full range of sophisticated savagery known to our own military in Indochina: shells, bombs, phosphorous, incendiary bombs, CBUs and napalm. Much of it is supplied to the Israelis by the American aid program. Statistics are difficult to find and often inexact, but well-informed diplomats in Beirut and United Nations officials have compiled a surprising set of reliable numbers. They note the Israeli government reports about 800 Israelis have been killed in recent years in terrorist attacks, but they estimate that the Israelis have killed about 3,500 people in their raids on villages and refugee camps in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. The Lebanese government says 301 Lebanese civilians were killed and 682 Lebanese wounded in Israeli attacks between January 1968 and August 1974, most of them in the last year. Figures for Palestinian civilians killed are not available, but observers estimate they must be at least twice as high as for the Lebanese.

Our travels in the area also suggest that the Israeli campaign has not been successful in isolating the guerrillas. Indeed, as in Vietnam, it appears to have enhanced their credibility. Only a few Lebanese we spoke with blamed the Palestinians for the bombing. A comment by one man from Rashaya Fuqhar is typical, "Now that the Israelis are bombing our village, too, we see what the Palestinians have suffered all these years." As for the Palestinians, the bombing seems to have increased their bitterness and strengthened the hand of the political groups who favor bloodshed over compromise.

In light of the failure of the Israeli policy to achieve its announced goals, there is considerable speculation that the bombing might have another purpose. Most Lebanese and some diplomats in Beirut believe that the Israelis are pursuing a "scorched earth" policy in southern Lebanon designed to drive all population from the area and establish a DMZ. "Why burn crops, unless that's the purpose?" asks one high official of the Lebanese Foreign Ministry. "The commandos buy their supplies in Beirut anyway." Statements by Israeli officials do little to quiet these fears; last April, when he was still defense minister, Moshe Dayan told newspaper reporters that unless the Lebanese stopped the Palestinian raids, "We will step up the raids until the people find it impossible to live there. Their homes will be destroyed and the whole area will be deserted." And in a chilling echo of "Pentagonese," the Rabin government told Israelis last June that it was abandoning its previous policy of "retaliation" in southern Lebanon for a policy of "preemptive strikes."

The human suffering behind the antiseptic words is, as always, chilling:

Ein el-Hilweh, a Palestinian refugee camp near Sidon, has been bombed countless times. Last June, a poor neighborhood of Lebanese and Palestinians, including a school, was leveled. Hundreds of refugees have moved into another school. "What will we do when classes begin?" wails a teacher. An old man pokes through the rubble of his house. Although the man is Lebanese, on the one wall that still stands hangs a cheap tinted portrait of Yasir Arafat.

A young boy from near Rashaya Fuqhar says that last winter he and his friends found an intact shell, like the ones they collected and sold for lamps. But when he picked this one up, "a jelly ran out." He was badly burned on his leg, arm and hand.

The road to Rashaya Fuqhar runs by a sparkling brook, and a cafe has been built over the water. But it has been smashed repeatedly by bombs. The last time, a bridal reception was taking place and the bride was killed.

Along the same road, we pass damage from a raid that morning. A school has been hit. In the field across the way, an old Lebanese farmer tramps sadly through his olive grove. Some of the trees are ancient with huge girths. Many are shattered from bombs, others burned by phosphorous. "Every week I see more," says the old man of his trees, "sleeping like women on their sides."

Near Sidon we stop at a lemon grove, now home for three branches of an extended family of 43 Palestinian refugees. Their homes were destroyed in a raid June 20 on Ein el-Hilweh Camp. Six of the family—four children and two women—were killed. Now they are sleeping outside. Winter is coming and they are worried. The owner of the grove wants them to leave. They are his laborers, but he thought they would stay only until their homes were rebuilt. But the United Nations says there is no money for rebuilding.

Nabatieh Refugee Camp, the closest camp to the border. Here, as in other refugee camps we visit, the PLO makes no effort to hide evidence of armed soldiers in the camps. But at Nabatieh, as in the other camps, it is homes, clinics, and schools that have been hit. Nabatieh was nearly leveled in an attack last May 16. A United Nations report says of the camp, "60 percent destroyed, 20 percent severely damaged and 20 percent partially destroyed." We see no houses with roofs, few with four walls.

Eighteen Palestinian refugees were killed that day and 91 were wounded. No one knows how many were civilians and how many were commandos. But officials from the United Nations Relief Works Agency (UNRWA), which manages the camps, doubt that many guerrillas were hurt because the PLO had tried to evacuate the camps the day before. "The people who were hurt were those who wouldn't leave their belongings. Thank God most did. It could have been a lot worse," says one UNRWA official. UNRWA estimates the rebuilding of Nabatieh will cost \$1 million. "Just so they can bomb it again," sighs one official. But UNRWA itself has a \$39 million deficit of its own just for operating expenses this year. So the fate of Nabatieh Refugee Camp is uncertain.

Near Merj'Uyun, capital of the Arqoub, the depressing tour continues. We visit Ismail, a young goat herder shot the day before by an Israeli patrol, in the area's one hospital. He lies stiffly in sheets soaked with his own blood, seemingly still shattered by his misfortune. The nurse translates into French. He was tending his goats, saw the soldiers coming in a jeep. "I was frightened—they take people—I ran—they shot." That is all. He doesn't know why the soldiers fired, why they came. He doesn't know any Palestinians, except "they are Arabs." The room is a crush of onlookers, gawking at the Americans. "Why American planes to the Israelis?" drones a young hospital attendant in my ear. We leave the room. The nurse reports the hospital sees several hundred casualties from the Israeli attacks every year, more recently. "In May and June (during the heaviest raids) we had people in the halls, even on the steps. We had to send the sick people home and the worst cases to Sidon and Beirut." She hesitates. "That young man will die. Half his back is gone."

Tel Aviv—In Israel the bombing and other operations in Lebanon are not an issue. The newspapers print one-paragraph items about the bombing of "guerrilla concentrations" in Lebanon. Raids are talked about as "retaliatory." Reporters with questions about the raids are treated with hostility. After weeks of insistence, I finally received an interview with an Israeli general who is the top briefer for the DF, the Israeli Defense Forces. After putting the interview off-the-record, he answered my first question sarcastically. "What bombing?" Pressed further, he elaborated,

"We have no security problem in the North." (Pause) "And besides there haven't been any in months." Told I had visited the south of Lebanon in the last month, he finally said, "We feel Lebanon is not exercising its duties as a sovereign state to control the Palestinian enclave in 'Fatahland.' If Lebanon has internal problems like this, she will have to bear the consequences." He insisted, as do all Israeli officials, that attacks are only on military targets and that the targets are "carefully pinpointed." Security prevented further discussion.

There is little dissent about the bombing in Israel. Most leftist critics of the government seem puzzled by questions about the bombing. "Unfortunate but necessary," is the standard line. Few people are aware, or believe, that civilians are being hurt. Only groups like the far-left Matzpen liken the bombing to U.S. policy in Indochina and argue that the end does not justify the means. However, in the wake of the recent rash of guerrilla operations, a few Israeli columnists have begun to point out the ineffectiveness of the operations against Lebanon, and suggest that the raids continue at least partly for domestic consumption. It is apparently difficult for the Israelis to believe, as it was for the Americans in Vietnam, that the strategic results of their firepower are negligible.

Beirut—The Israelis insist that Lebanon must bear the consequences for allowing the PLO to operate on her soil. But the fact is, the Lebanese are in trouble no matter what they do. Lebanon's tiny 12,000-man army and one-squadron air force are no match for the Israelis. Nor does she relish the prospect of an all-out confrontation with the Palestinians, after such a push in 1973 nearly caused a civil war in the country. The 1973 clash and an earlier one in 1969 left hundreds of casualties, civilian as well as military. In 1973 Lebanese leftists joined the Palestinians, and several of Lebanon's private armies used the occasion to settle scores. A shaky truce was negotiated only after the Lebanese Air Force had bombed five Palestinian refugee camps near Beirut, wounding hundreds. Since then, the Lebanese have stepped up security, driving guerrilla military operations underground, while political and social welfare arms of the PLO continue to operate openly. It is the fervent but not naive hope of most Lebanese that the Palestinians will stop their raids in Israel. But until then, there is not much they can do. "If the huge Israeli forces can't stop the Fedayeen from coming in, how do they expect us to keep them from going out?" a young Lebanese captain asked plaintively. Individual incidents still occur between Lebanese security forces and the Palestinians, often precipitated by guerrillas refusing to show papers or trying to run the roadblocks in the South. Recently, newspapers were full of reports of a shoot out between Lebanese military police and a party of Palestinians on a deserted road.

On the international level as well, Lebanon must steer a straight course between the Scylla and Charybdis of her Arab neighbors and Israel. Each new round of attacks by Israel is followed by offers of arms, men and missiles from Egypt, Libya, Saudi Arabia and especially Syria. In recent months, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat has offered to station five squadrons of MIG-21 interceptors in Lebanon. Syria has offered soldiers and SA-6 anti-aircraft missiles. (The PLO says the Syrians are already equipping the Palestinians with the shoulder-fired "Strella" missiles the U.S. found were so lethal to helicopters in Vietnam.) But the Lebanese have refused men and planes so far, fearing they would draw them further into the Middle East conflict. They fear Syrian troops for other reasons, too; there is a long history of Syrian interest in Lebanese territory. When

the Lebanese bombed the camps in 1973, the Syrians sent large numbers of troops into Lebanon and cut off trade. A recurrent Lebanese nightmare has the Syrians and the Israelis dividing the tiny country.

Lebanon's inability to control the Palestinians or to protect her people from the Israelis has also had a political toll inside the country. Security problems were one of the factors in the fall of the most recent government last September. The crisis has brought demands from the right to expel the Palestinians and from the left to take up Syrian and Russian offers to construct a missile defense system for the country. The Beirut newspapers are regularly studded with reports of, on the one hand, agreement between the government and the PLO to curtail armed activities in the South and, on the other, meetings between PLO, Syrian and Lebanese officials about defense of the country. It is government by balancing act. In July the Lebanese got a ten-year, \$1 billion commitment from Arab defense ministers to build up the Lebanese Army. The government successfully headed off a PLO demand that the money be channeled through the guerrilla organization. The government's failure to provide adequate security in the South has also added fuel to a quasi-separatist movement of the area's Shiite Muslims, who charge that they and the underdeveloped South are neglected by the government, which is dominated by Christians and Sunni Muslims.

On trips south, we see the ambiguity of relations between the Palestinians and the Lebanese. Almost no one in Lebanon believes that the PLO regularly uses Lebanese villages as staging areas for military operations. Villagers in the area, although they do not deny they have occasional contact with Palestinians, insist they give them no aid or quarter in their villages. The tensions that have been created by the bombing, in addition to competition that has grown up between the refugees and poor Lebanese for jobs, lead most observers to doubt guerrillas would adopt a Lebanese village as a permanent base. "Most Lebanese sympathize with the Palestinians," a local Lebanese official says, "but all they would need is one person who didn't compromise their security." Lebanese intelligence is also said to have its own strong roots in many villages in the area.

A stronger case can be made that the guerrilla raids against Israel are run from the Palestinian refugee camps. Guerrillas certainly live in the camps. Planning sessions may be held in camps and arms may be stockpiled there. All visits are conducted by PLO guides, and most questions on military matters are turned aside for security reasons. But the camps, with their crowded quarters and well-developed grapevines, seem ill-suited for the launching of secret raids, even in spite of what seems to be near universal support for them in the camps. Most of the camps are relatively far from the border, near major Lebanese towns, and are closely watched from outside by Lebanese police. The one "operations" base we visited briefly was an abandoned house close to the border and nearly hidden in a grove of trees. Well-informed diplomats in Beirut believe that some of the Palestinian raids may be run from Syria, and a few from inside Israel itself by Palestinians still living there. Such reports, even if true, would not be acknowledged by the Israelis. They cannot pound Syria as they do Lebanon without risking a fifth Mideast war, and to admit raids are conducted by their own Arabs would be to concede that the Palestinians inside Israel are not as happy as the government insists they are.

American officials in Beirut agree the raids on Lebanon are largely ineffective. "We discovered in Indochina that bombing couldn't even stop large movements of men and supplies," says one official. "It certainly can't

stop three-man raiding teams." But the bombings have become so routine that virtually no one—and certainly not the Americans—wastes much time protesting them. "Frankly, I don't think it's much of an issue," says one embassy official in Beirut. "The Israelis make it clear they will continue the attacks, and continue them whether or not there are fewer cross-border raids." (In recent months, as the PLO has reached for respectability, there have, in fact, been fewer Palestinian raids—about one a month—while Israeli attacks have been almost daily.) Another U.S. official told me "Golda Meir first said there were no Palestinians. Now the Israelis admit there are Palestinians, but no Palestinian civilians."

But the balance of terror in Lebanon may not be so stable in the future. It is a real possibility that the situation there could trigger the new Mideast war that so many Israelis and Arabs expect. In recent weeks, the heaviest ground fighting yet between Israeli commandos, Palestinian guerrillas and Lebanese soldiers has broken out. The Lebanese Army is now getting more advanced anti-tank weapons from the American government, presumably to defend itself against the tanks we send the Israelis. The Palestinians are now stockpiling "Strella" missiles, increasing the likelihood that the Israelis will begin to lose planes over Lebanon. And with chances of a permanent Mideast agreement receding, there is a good chance that the Palestinians will step up raids into Israel. If that happens, few doubt that the Israelis would at least consider an invasion of Lebanon, a move that would surely prompt Syrian intervention on a massive scale. It is a scenario that is only too plausible.

In the meantime, the toll of civilian casualties builds slowly, inexorably. The bombing has become so routine that it goes largely unreported in the American press, a fact that amazes European reporters on the scene, who devote equal space to Arab and Israeli suffering. But the truth is, American editors like their violence spectacular, and after years of reporting the news from Indochina, Americans don't get terribly excited about air strikes anymore. Which is why very few Americans know or care that last year, in southern Lebanon, there were civilian casualties equal to Maalot every month.

TAX PROTEST

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. O. C. Kuhl of Wilmont, Minn., opposes abortion and the use of Government money to finance it, and wishes this, her protest, to be part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I feel that the January 22, 1973, Supreme Court ruling legalizing abortion on demand was only one step in the growing unconcern for the right to life of the unborn and for all human life; therefore: I protest the use of my tax money in government funded projects that show a complete lack of concern for the sanctity of human life and a disregard for the rights of the unborn including:

(1) Federal, state, or local funding of research into medication to produce "spontaneous abortion" regardless of the state of pregnancy,

(2) Public funding of community projects that promote and encourage abortion among the poor, and

(3) Federal matching of funds to such community projects.

AID WAS PROMISED: U.S. CREDIBILITY ON TRIAL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial from the San Diego Union in the appendix of the RECORD:

AID WAS PROMISED: U.S. CREDIBILITY ON TRIAL

There are really two issues in the debate between the Administration and Congress over sending additional military and economic aid to Cambodia and South Vietnam.

One is quite obvious—whether it is worth another \$522 million in U.S. aid to keep those two countries from falling to the Communists. President Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger believe Cambodia may collapse within a month without a continued supply of weapons and ammunition from the United States of America. South Vietnam's prospects for survival without additional U.S. aid are reckoned in terms of a few months, but the fall of Cambodia would open the way for Communist forces to step up their pressure on Saigon and that timetable might not hold.

The other issue is of much greater consequence to the United States than the fate of two countries in Southeast Asia, as portentous as their fall would be in terms of the future of that part of the world. What is at stake is the credibility of commitments which the United States has made to scores of allies in the last quarter-century.

Congressional leaders are not impressed by the fact that a cut-off of U.S. aid at this time would be disastrous for the Cambodians and South Vietnamese. They say enough is enough. However, they fail to look beyond this narrow issue to the impact of such a decision in other parts of the world.

Some of the same members of Congress who would have us turn our backs on a commitment to Southeast Asians would be aghast at the suggestion we reconsider our commitment to the survival of Israel. That would be an invitation to another war in the Middle East. The hope for a negotiated settlement there is based on a balance of power which the United States has committed itself to help maintain.

If such commitments become questionable, what becomes of the 20-year standoff between North and South Korea? Why should the Soviet Union be impressed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, whose defense of Western Europe is based on a U.S. commitment?

Another appropriation of aid for Cambodia and South Vietnam does not mean that either of those countries is going to "win" the long war that each has been fighting against Communist aggressors. However, it will signal to the Communists that they are not going to win, either, and it is that principle which must prevail if there is to be any hope for a negotiated peace in Southeast Asia.

South Vietnam and Cambodia pinned their futures on the word of the United States when the Paris agreements were signed in 1973. We cannot go back on our word to them without causing both our friends and potential enemies to question the defense commitments of the United States which are now the cornerstone of world peace.

ECUADORIAN SEIZURE OF AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Members are aware, the United States recognizes only a 3-mile territorial sea and a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone off the shores of any nation. The country of Ecuador and a number of other Latin American nations claim a 200-mile fisheries zone and territorial sea. As a result of this conflict, between January 25, and February 1, 1975, the Ecuadorian authorities seized seven United States tuna vessels while fishing between 75 and 150 miles off the coast of Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, whenever American fishing vessels are seized for fishing beyond 12 miles from foreign shores, section 3 of the Fishermen's Protective Act requires the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the owners of such vessels for amounts certified by the Secretary of State as being the actual amount paid by such vessel owners for fines, license fees, registration fees, and other direct charges in order to obtain release of their vessels and crews.

In the case of the seven tuna vessels, it is my understanding that the owners of those vessels have paid to the country of Ecuador a total of \$1,696,267.

Also, Mr. Speaker, section 7 of the Fishermen's Protective Act requires the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with vessel owners desiring to participate in a cooperative insurance program that will guarantee reimbursement to participating vessel owners for actual costs incurred, including the cost of confiscated or spoiled fish, and for 50 percent of the loss of gross income resulting from any illegal seizure and detention of such vessels by a foreign country.

Mr. Speaker, the Ecuadorian authorities held these vessels in hostage for more than a month and it is my understanding that claims to be presented under section 7 of the act—representing actual losses while the vessels were detained—will total between \$3 and \$4 million and this will be in addition to the fines and fees paid totaling \$1,696,267.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done now to discourage these acts of piracy and to cease rewarding the guilty countries at the expense of the American taxpayer. We cannot expect our fishermen to bear these exorbitant costs when they are operating legally under United States and international law. At the same time, the American public should not be asked to subsidize this blackmail when current law provides a reasonable method of recovering the moneys paid out.

The Fishermen's Protective Act as currently constituted directs that the entire amount paid out for fines, fees, and other costs of these seizures be deducted from any funds programed for assistance to the offending country—in this case, Ecuador—under the Foreign Assistance Act

of 1961, unless the President certifies that such deduction would not be in the national interest.

Unfortunately, despite my best efforts to obtain State Department assistance to assure that these costs are deducted, in every single case since enactment of this provision of the law, the Presidential "national interest" certification has been made. Therefore, the intent of the act and the intent of Congress to put an end to these unlawful seizures has been circumvented.

Today, I am introducing legislation which I hope will be the solution to this problem. My bill will repeal the provision which grants the President the authority to disapprove, in his discretion, the transfer of foreign assistance funds from the funds programed to an offending country under the Foreign Assistance Act. This will have the effect of making the offending country pay its own fines and hopefully this will be the vehicle to make these countries realize that it is not in their interest to seize these vessels.

Also, Mr. Speaker, whenever the foreign aid appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975 comes to the floor of the House for a vote, I would like to alert the Members at this time that I intend to offer an amendment to that bill which will prohibit the President from obligating or expending any funds appropriated under that act for any foreign country which, during fiscal year 1975, seized or seizes any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities beyond 12 miles from the shores of any foreign country.

I hope my colleagues will support me in my efforts to put pressure on the Department of State and the President to seek solutions that will prevent these acts of piracy from occurring in the future and put an end to this wasteful expenditure of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, following is a copy of the bill I am introducing today, and a copy of the amendment I intend to offer to the foreign aid appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975:

H.R. 4458

A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to repeal the provision which grants the President authority, on the basis of United States national interests, to disapprove the transfer of foreign assistance funds from the intended recipient country because of an unsatisfied claim under this Act against such country

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1975(b)) is amended by striking out "unless the President certifies to the Congress that it is in the national interest not to do so in the particular instance".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall only apply with respect to any claim made under section 3(a) (2) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. — OFFERED BY
MRS. SULLIVAN

Page —, after line —, insert the following:
Sec. —. Of the funds appropriated under this Act, the President shall not obligate or expend funds for any foreign country which, during fiscal year 1975, seizes any

United States fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities more than 12 miles from the shore of any foreign country.

**A TRIBUTE TO WHEELING—
A WINNING ATTITUDE**

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, nestled in the countryside of the Sixth District of Missouri is a small, inconspicuous appearing, rural town that has experienced a phenomenon that is typically American—something called a winning attitude. The town of which I speak is listed as Wheeling on Missouri maps and is called home by 268 of the proudest people in Missouri. Having experienced more than its share of the many problems that face all of our rural communities, Wheeling has been strongly determined to retain its high school system.

Much of the credit for the unusually strong school system should go to the school board, faculty and, of course, the parents. However, Mr. Speaker, the one ingredient that money can not buy is also responsible for a part of the success of Wheeling R-IV High School. That ingredient is called pride. The author, Wordsworth, once called pride, "a whizzing rocket that would emulate a star."

Speaking of stars, a girls basketball team at Wheeling R-IV has had more than its share of stars this past year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this team has achieved its ultimate goal—being State champions of the 1-A division. The story of this success does not end here.

For 3 years the Wheeling girls basketball team has worked its way to the State playoffs, winning third place in 1973, winning second place in 1974 and finally winning the elusive title this year. Over the past 4 years, this group of dedicated, self-sacrificing young ladies have amassed an overwhelming record of 113 wins and only 7 losses. Three girls of this elite group have had the distinction of being a part of the starting lineup for 4 years. Their record speaks for itself: Julie Waite, 1,352 points; Mary Timmons, 2,157 points; Paula Littrell, 1,392 points.

Mr. Speaker, to witness this kind of phenomenon where it is obvious that a determination to adhere to the principles of hard work and self-sacrifice has resulted in success, I cannot help but believe that this same kind of determination on the part of all Americans will achieve a victory over the many problems facing us today. In a time when all we read and hear is cloaked with an air of defeatism, I am most happy and grateful to have the opportunity to associate myself with a group of young people and a community that is indeed a symbol of a positive attitude and a desire to win.

This is the kind of pride, determination and the will to win that has brought our great Nation to its present position of world leadership that we are honoring

at Bicentennial celebrations this year and the next throughout this land of ours.

**UNEMPLOYMENT—CONGRESS
MUST ACT NOW**

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this Nation is in its worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, there are still many in Washington who do not comprehend the dimensions of high unemployment and the resulting effect on taxes and State and Federal programs. As most of you know, Michigan is particularly hard hit by the current recession. Especially hard hit are the families of the 18th Congressional District, the people I am privileged to represent. A most influential local newspaper, the Daily Tribune, published in Royal Oak, Mich., recently editorialized on the subject of unemployment. The Tribune editorial summarizes some of the major problems Congress must tackle before it is too late for many families and taxpayers.

The February 20, 1975, Daily Tribune states:

PAYING FOR JOBLESSNESS

Unemployment is a hardship not only for the 7.5 million persons out of work but also for the private and government-supported funds that provide jobless benefits. As the recession deepens these funds are running dangerously low. And beefing them up by raising the wage tax on employers might well lead to further layoffs.

Unemployed auto workers have been told to prepare for termination of the industry's generous supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB). Under United Auto Workers contracts, the combination of SUB payments and state unemployment benefits is designed to pay laid-off workers 95 per cent of their regular take-home wage, less \$7.50 a week—the estimated cost of lunches and transportation to and from jobs.

SUB never was envisioned as an open-ended program, however. Its purpose was to protect workers' earnings during periodic layoffs, such as those which occur during model changeovers. "If layoffs continue," UAW Vice President Irving Bluestone told Business Week, "become even more intense and of longer duration, there is no question that there will be insufficient funds to continue paying benefits."

Several states have had to borrow from the Federal Government to keep their unemployment benefit programs going. If they do not start repaying loans after two years, Federal law requires that they impose a penalty tax on employers to meet the Federal payments. It is estimated that as many as 15 states may exhaust their unemployment funds this year.

Unemployment compensation was one of the several programs authorized by the Social Security Act of 1935. The retirement benefit plan was established as a national system operated by the Federal Government, with a single pool of funds for all covered workers, whereas the jobless benefit plan was instituted as a composite of separate state programs with the Federal Government serving as banker and general overseer. Unemployment compensation is funded through Federal and state wage taxes on

employers, and benefits tend to vary widely from one state to another.

In most states, recipients of jobless benefits get approximately one-half of their weekly wage, up to a stipulated maximum. The average weekly payment is about \$65 (tax-free) and the standard eligibility period is 39 weeks. Late last year, Congress approved nearly \$3 billion in emergency benefits to provide 13 additional weeks of eligibility. The legislation also extended unemployment insurance to 12 million farmers, domestics and state and local employees who had not previously been covered.

These emergency benefits, however, will expire at the end of 1975 unless Congress decides to extend the program. Some members think more drastic action is in order. Rep. Charles A. Vanik (D-Ohio), a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which oversees unemployment insurance, said: "It is past time that the entire system was thoroughly revised and overhauled."

The House Democratic Leadership, on the other hand, has asserted that the best way to cope with unemployment is to provide additional public service jobs. Regardless of which approach is taken, assistance to the jobless is one of the most pressing legislative issues of 1975 and most of us would agree that it is better to pay people for working than not working.

**THE HONORABLE JOSEPH
PATRICK O'HARA**

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death this week of our former colleague, the Hon. Joseph P. O'Hara from Minnesota, came as a great shock to those who knew and worked with him during the years he served in Congress. Congressman O'Hara represented the Second Congressional District of Minnesota, the district I now have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives.

While serving in Congress, Representative O'Hara was a ranking member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He also served as a member of the District of Columbia Committee for 14 years. While serving on this committee, he worked hard for a well-coordinated public works program for the city and for larger Federal payments to help meet the city's needs. He actively supported the move to gain representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. Congressman O'Hara fought hard for fair trade law proposals. He introduced legislation that would strengthen condemnation of housing where landlords failed to make necessary repairs and played a key role in efforts to expand the city's court system.

Prior to his election to Congress in 1940, Representative O'Hara established his own law practice in Glencoe, Minn. He was the McLeod County attorney from 1934 to 1938. He served as vice president of the Minnesota State Bar Association and as a member of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association.

Born in Tipton, Iowa, Representative O'Hara attended the University of Notre

Dame. He served overseas as an officer in the U.S. Army during World War I. After the war he returned to Notre Dame where he graduated in 1920. He was an active member of the Army Reserve and served as commander of the American Legion Department in Minnesota from 1925 to 1926.

Mr. O'Hara served our Nation with distinction. He was a man of high principles and high qualities. I wish to join my colleagues in both the House and Senate in extending my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. O'Hara, his three sons, and all the members of his family.

**STATEMENT ON RESOLUTION TO
ESTABLISH THE NATIONAL COM-
MISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY**

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to create the National Commission on Social Security. Like many of my colleagues, I have come to the firm conclusion that our approach to the social security system must be thoroughly overhauled. There are too many warning signals that we can no longer afford to ignore.

Certainly, my heavy mail from the Fourth District of Georgia reflects the current social security malaise. People under 40 are complaining about being forced to contribute to an actuarially unsound system from which they never expect to receive full benefit.

Those people already receiving social security benefits are concerned, not only about the way the program is being administered in many instances, but also about the inadequacy of these benefits to maintain a decent standard of living.

The real basic problem is that social security was never designed to be a comprehensive retirement system. Introduced in the early days of the Roosevelt administration, it was designed as an insurance program with mandatory premiums which would maintain actuarial integrity and would provide minimum subsistence. The system was really designed to help rural migrants to urban areas who had no means of providing for their own retirement and who constituted a potential heavy burden on society.

Over the years we have allowed, at least in our own thinking, the social security system to become a comprehensive retirement program.

The outlook for the social security system has darkened drastically in the past few months as the economy has floundered. Unemployment erodes payroll tax revenues and speeds the drain on the funds as more workers seek retirement or disability payments. At the same time, inflation increases social security outlays. Because benefits are tied to living costs, there will be an automatic increase of more than 8 percent next July; last year this boost was projected at 4.4 percent. The 1974 Trustees Report, issued last June, predicted that the retirement

and disability funds would continue to increase to the year 1980 and it foresaw no need for a payroll tax increase for 5 to 10 years to come. But the latest forecasts project an immediate decrease in the trust funds leading to their exhaustion by the end of 1980.

Here are those contrasting projections:

THE 1974 PROJECTION AND 1975 PROJECTION
 1975—up \$210,000,000, down \$2,500,000,000.
 1976—up \$339,000,000 down \$6,100,000,000.
 1977—up \$797,000,000, down \$8,300,000,000.
 1978—up \$154,000,000, down \$9,500,000,000.

I would like to point to a recent syndicated survey which recently appeared in the Atlanta Journal by Dr. Robert Myers, the former chief actuary of the Social Security Administration.

Dr. Myers points to two separate but closely related problems which present major threats to the future of the social security system. The first problem stems from possible zero population growth and the second from what he considers to be an unrealistically low estimate of the system's operational cost.

What the new demographic pattern wrought by zero population growth means in simple terms is bigger bills and fewer people to pay them.

In the matter of operational costs, current social security financing is based on the unrealistic assumption, according to Dr. Myers, that there will be a 5-percent annual increase in taxable wages and price increases of no more than 3 percent each year into the indefinite future.

Although the components of Dr. Myers' rejection of these rosy assumptions are debatable and, in some cases, extremely controversial, there seems little doubt about the ultimate conclusion which he reaches:

Our current program is running up staggering bills which somebody is going to have to pay sooner or later, if the Social Security program is to be maintained.

The question is, says Dr. Myers, how will they be paid and by whom?

Mr. Speaker, these are questions whose time has come. My bill is an attempt to examine thoroughly our present social security program in all of its aspects and to examine viable alternatives to a system which many experts—not to say the vast bulk of a concerned public—believe is no longer tolerable.

The bill will abolish the present Advisory Council on Social Security and instead calls for a national commission of nine citizens to make a careful and intensive study of the entire subject area not to be confined to the four corners of our present program. At the end of 4 years the commission is to recommend specific proposals for the type of program or programs which will best suit the needs of America for the rest of this century and into the next.

This commission will travel to all parts of the Nation and hear from businessmen, retired persons, professionals, widows, working people, single career persons, from every element of our society in addition to the experts and economists. Then, in a series of annual reports and a final comprehensive report, the commission will formulate findings and recommendations in the following areas:

First, the adequacy of the fiscal condition of the present social security programs;

Second, any inequities in these programs based upon marital status, sex, or similar classifications or categories; and

Third, possible alternatives to the current programs including a substitution of the payroll tax by general revenues, establishment of a system providing for mandatory participation in a private insurance program or an alternative to participation in Federal programs, and establishment of a system permitting individuals a choice of public or private programs or both.

We must assure those people now receiving benefits under social security that they will be fully secure and provided for. Further, we must assure those people looking to the future that the system to be devised will be at least as good and, necessarily, more efficient more productive, and less costly than what we now have.

We have a national commitment to a retirement, disability, and survivor benefit program. We cannot allow that commitment to flounder, because the existing delivery system has become unsuited to our current and future needs. Our mission is not to destroy but to create; not to provide expensive cosmetic treatments to the patient, but rather to find a cure that will provide true security for all citizens in need of an affordable and realistic program for retired citizens and for the families in which the wage earner has died or has become disabled.

The bill I introduce today has that purpose, and no domestic human and social need can have any more long-term priority than solving this problem.

RALPH YARBOROUGH UNIT

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to designate a unit of the Big Thicket National Preserve as the "Ralph Yarborough Unit" in honor of former Senator Yarborough, whose name is well known to everyone familiar with the history of the Big Thicket legislation.

For the benefit of those who do not know what the Big Thicket is or where it is located, it is in east Texas and is called the biological crossroads of North America. There the temperate, subtropical, prairie, and woodland flora and fauna of the North, South, East, and West meet. The 84,550-acre preserve includes elm, birch, sugar maple and flower dogwood of the northern, temperate climates; southern cypress, magnolia and various subtropical trees; western tumbleweed and several varieties of cactus; as well as 40 species of orchids and 26 known species of fern. In summary, the Big Thicket is an unusual and interesting mixture of nature worthy of national recognition and preservation.

Legislation to establish the Big Thicket National Preserve was passed in the 93d Congress and enacted on October 11, 1974, completing efforts which date back to 1927. In that year, a considerable effort was mounted by citizens interested in preserving the unique features of the Big Thicket, but not until 1938 was a study made by the National Park Service. Although that survey recommended establishment of a large park, the war years intervened and the recommendation was never implemented.

In my view, Senator Yarborough's untiring efforts to save the Big Thicket while in the Senate and the continuation of those efforts after leaving the Senate were essential in building the necessary public support for its success.

Several of my Texas colleagues have joined me in presenting this bill to the House, and we anticipate its speedy passage. The Yarborough Unit—14,300 acres of Polk County, Tex., will be a lasting tribute to one of the pioneers in the struggle to preserve the Big Thicket.

GHANA INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to salute the nation of Ghana, which today celebrates the 18th anniversary of her independence as a sovereign state in the world community. I have always had a particularly warm affection for Ghana as a residual from my attendance at its independence in 1957 as part of the U.S. delegation, my first trip to mother Africa.

The United States, which is approaching its own 200th anniversary, is looked at by some parts of the world as one of the youngest nations. I hope that our own experiences during our first 200 years, and our relative youth as a nation-state, will encourage our understanding and support for the overwhelming difficulties that face a new nation.

I believe that Ghana, despite the enormous problems of economic and resource dislocation throughout the world, has made great strides in coping with the needs of her people.

Three years ago the Government of Ghana addressed herself to the major task of making the country self-reliant to the highest possible degree within her resources. The government, therefore, placed emphasis on agricultural development as the general strategy to spearhead the country's economic development. The adoption of this policy was dictated by the actual conditions of the economy at that time, and Ghanaians were called upon to muster all available resources to produce the food needed by the nation. The program known as "Operation Feed Yourself" was regarded as an emergency operation aimed at reducing the country's crippling dependence on food imports. The years 1972-74 were, therefore, declared to be "Agricultural War Years", devoted to the increased

production of selected crops and livestock. The basic policy under the program is the rapid and orderly development of agriculture toward self-sufficiency in food and raw materials and the diversification of agricultural exports.

Production targets have been exceeded, and Ghana has become self-sufficient in maize—the staple food of the majority—which used to be imported in large quantities. Rice production has reached 70 percent of the national need and Ghana hopes to become self-sufficient in rice this year.

The success story of the economic recovery during the past 3 years will for long be remembered. The strict discipline injected into the economy by the government since coming into office has paid off so well that the country has been able to record a balance-of-trade surplus for the first time in the past 2 successive years.

To improve the quality of life of the people, the government has introduced schemes for accelerated improvement in housing, health, and education. A crash program on low-cost houses for the low-income group is being pursued vigorously and work is in progress to complete, this year alone, some 5,000 houses started under the scheme.

A new "Health-on-Wheels" scheme, aimed at providing more adequate medical services for the rural areas through mobile clinics, has also been instituted.

The government has recently launched a 5-year development plan aimed at effecting a structural transformation of the country's economy and promoting full and efficient use of all of the nation's resources.

The Government of Ghana has always encouraged foreign participation in our economy, and during the past year many foreign companies, including U.S. businesses, took advantage of a wide range of fiscal and tax incentives and good infrastructure to invest in Ghana. The country continued to maintain very fruitful partnerships with U.S. companies, such as Kaiser Aluminium, Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., Union Carbide, and Star-Kist.

To give practical expression to our relations with our neighbours, Ghana is exporting electrical power to Togo and Dahomey and continues to pursue a policy of friendship and cooperation with all countries.

We are determined to succeed, and with hard work and the sympathetic cooperation of our friends, we are sure we will.

ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills. The first bill would create 52 additional judgeships for the U.S. district courts. The second bill would create 13 additional circuit judgeships for the U.S. courts of appeals.

These two bills have been recommended to the Congress by the Judicial Conference. On January 15, 1975, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts communicated the recommendation of the Judicial Conference to both the House and the Senate. On February 23, 1975, the Chief Justice addressed the American Bar Association, in what is commonly called the annual report on the state of the judiciary. In that report, the Chief Justice reiterated the urgent need for additional Federal judgeships.

I agree. In recent years both the number of cases has increased and the time that it takes to consider each case has increased. For as we perfect the administration of justice, it inevitably requires additional time and resources. Last year the Congress enacted the Speedy Trial Act to guarantee defendants their constitutional right to a speedy trial. But declaring that right and making it possible are two different things. If Congress does not act swiftly to create additional judgeships, the goal in the Speedy Trial Act and the goals in a host of other congressional enactments will never be realized.

Although I agree with the general need for additional Federal judgeships, I have not at this time—before I have examined all of the evidence concerning each particular district and circuit—firmly resolved that I agree with the recommendation of the Judicial Conference in every particular. But I do believe that the matter is most urgent and one which the Committee on the Judiciary should address at the earliest practicable time.

HAYS IN HOUSE DAD AT HOME

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, after certain actions taken and words spoken during the organizational period of the 94th Congress, I think my colleagues might appreciate reading a story written by Glen Duffy which appeared in the Ohio State Lantern on February 19, 1975. It is an interview of Martha Hays Steiner, the daughter of Congressman WAYNE HAYS.

It might tell the story of WAYNE HAYS better than any of us might who have known him for years. It may explain some of the characteristics that have made him unpopular in some quarters but staunchly supported in others.

I have often said that there are many sides to all of us, but that the most important side is that of the family. Perhaps we could all learn a little more about the colleagues we serve with if we were more aware of their family sides. The article follows:

HAYS IN HOUSE, DAD AT HOME

(By Glen Duffy)

What is a powerful member of the House like when he makes the transition to a member of his household?

If anyone should know, it's Martha Hays

Steiner, a senior from Flushing and daughter of U.S. Rep. Wayne Hays (D-Ohio), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Hays has been described as "abrasive," "bitter-tongued," and "the meanest man in Congress." The House Steering and Policy Committee several weeks ago made an unsuccessful bid to unseat Hays from his committee's leadership as part of a general attack upon the seniority system.

Steiner said, "I know a lot of people don't like my father simply because he doesn't usually worry about whether he makes somebody mad or not."

Of her father's much publicized temper, Steiner said, "He displayed it somewhat at home too. He has to work at his job more than eight hours a day, he has to work it almost constantly. It kind of carries over to his other (home) life I guess. He's just the type of person who's learned that to get things done, you've got to be a demanding person."

Steiner said Hays was "confident" about retaining his chairmanship when he was challenged.

"We talked to him right after we heard about it on the news," she said. "We were pretty surprised, but he didn't seem too worried. I guess he got some Congressmen to vote for him."

Steiner said she doesn't consider herself politically inclined.

"You would think I would be more political considering who my father is," she said. "I don't tend to take a stand on any particular issue. I'm not involved in any groups. I just kind of stayed out of things. He (Hays) never pushed me into anything."

"He never talked about his work much at home," Steiner said. "My mother and I would have campaigned for him if he had asked us, but he never did. About the only time he said anything about what his day was like, was when he had a conflict with somebody and got in the last word. He really seemed pleased with that."

Steiner said that while she was growing up in Flushing, "People kind of looked up to us (the family). I didn't like to feel any different, though, and I don't think I got any special treatment. I had to be careful about what I said, but I guess it's that way in any small town."

Steiner said some of the criticism of her father bothers her.

"It kind of angers me if I think it's unwarranted," she said. "I think they (the media) are saying things kind of harshly sometimes. He may spout off and say what he thinks, and it may not be that tactful or nice, and it may not be the right thing to do, but I'm not sure it warrants that kind of a writeup."

"I might be kind of biased, though, because I don't see him in the House, I just see him at home. People might have some legitimate gripes, but it's kind of hard to tell," she said.

Steiner said her father takes most criticism "in stride," but occasionally it does affect him.

"I think those papers that gave him those writeups and said what a mean person he was, he did kind of take to heart more than almost anything I've ever seen. It surprised me because I thought he wasn't that worried about it. I think he wants people to think he's efficient, but when they put it that way, I think it's starting to get to him," she said.

Steiner said that during her childhood, her father never talked much about his ambitions in politics but, "He used to tease me about his becoming President because he knew I didn't want him to."

"I just wouldn't appreciate the lack of privacy."

Steiner doesn't think her father will ever run for President, but she said, "I think he would like to be Speaker of the House."

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in honor of International Women's Year, I am introducing a bill to establish a committee to plan and convene an American Women's Conference not later than December 31, 1976. The conference will have a mandate to assess the progress that has been made in the United States toward achieving the three goals of International Women's Year—equality between men and women, integration of women in the total development effort, and recognition of women's contribution to world peace. Additionally, the conference will develop specific recommendations for the elimination of all barriers to full and equal participation of women in all aspects of national life, and will establish a timetable for the implementation of these recommendations.

I believe that a national conference of American women is an appropriate vehicle by which the United States can recognize and act on the goals of International Women's Year. A national conference could serve to focus attention on the issue of women's rights and equality, and could develop specific recommendations to achieve the goal of full integration of women in all aspects of national life. The conference could bring together representatives of women's organizations, policymakers and decisionmakers from the private and public sectors, and members of the public at large for a fruitful discussion of issues of interest to women. The recommendations developed by such a conference could serve as a blueprint for action by the Government and the private sector in the area of women's rights.

This is a particularly fitting time for American women to meet and consider the actions which must be taken to insure them full equality in all aspects of society. It was nearly 200 years ago that American men met to plan a revolution. Today, American women must meet to make sure that the fruits of that revolution are no longer denied to them.

Although I applaud the President's action in establishing a National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, this Commission has only a tiny budget and a somewhat limited mandate. Its responsibility is to promote the observance of International Women's Year in the United States by focusing attention on the need to encourage appropriate and relevant cooperative activity in the field of women's rights and responsibilities. I think it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide for such "appropriate and relevant cooperative activity" by enacting legislation designed to foster specific programs on the observance of IWY, and by appropriating a reasonable sum of money to carry out such programs. Canada and Australia have both appropriated \$2 million for programs designed to celebrate IWY. Certainly the United States can afford to assign this important year an equally high priority.

Many other nations are planning to convene national conferences on the status of women during IWY, including Switzerland, Iran, New Zealand, Canada, Belgium, and Australia. I think such efforts are fitting tributes to the importance of this year, and I urge the Congress to act promptly to insure that the United States observe IWY in an equally appropriate manner.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my February 12 Washington Report entitled "The President's Budget":

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The highlights of President Ford's budget for fiscal year 1976 include government spending of \$349.4 billion, receipts totaling \$298 billion and a federal deficit of \$52 billion, the highest ever in peacetime.

It is a breathtaking document. In a strikingly candid manner, the President presents an exceedingly grim fiscal picture. With none of the evasions or false optimism of many previous federal budgets, he projects back-to-back deficits totaling \$87 billion, a drop in total production of 3.3% in 1975 with only a moderate rise in 1976, prices rising by 11.3% and unemployment averaging 8.1% this year, 7.9% next year and 7.5% in 1977. The President believes the economy will stop deteriorating this summer or fall, and then recover slowly. In his view, the current recession will be almost twice as deep as any in the postwar period, and the anemic recovery will assure stagnation and high unemployment for years.

The President's budget will anger, perhaps even frighten, Americans, arouse grave concern among our friends abroad, and hopefully cause everyone to reflect upon the precarious finances of the nation and what should be done to improve them. The President, who has been warning that the nation must make sacrifices, has concluded that in order to end the recession without re-igniting inflation, the nation must tolerate three years of the highest unemployment the nation has had in the postwar period.

A few general observations may help put this extraordinary document in perspective. While the federal budget has risen rapidly in dollar terms in recent years, it has not grown appreciably as a percentage of the total economy. Likewise, the projected deficit is not as large as several of its peacetime predecessors when placed alongside the size of the economy.

The increased spending in the budget (11% over this year) is for the expansion of present programs or to keep up with inflation, not for new programs. One striking feature of the budget is that transfer payments (that is, payments the government transfers each year from one set of citizens to another, like social security and veterans benefits) account for 40% of the budget. Defense accounts for 25%, interest on the federal debt, 10%, and grants to state and local governments, another 10%. On the revenue side, the social security tax will produce about 30% of the projected revenue, the income tax 35% and the corporate tax 15%.

The President, who has bet his political future on his budget, confronts the toughest economic problems that any President has faced at least since the Depression. The

President wants to share responsibility with the Democratic Congress for the nation's economic troubles, and to blame the Congress for any increase in spending. He will have to contend with restive Republicans, who will view him as soft on spending, and with restless Democrats, who will accuse him of increasing spending for the military and foreign aid, but cutting domestic programs aimed at helping low and middle income people.

The proposed \$92.8 billion defense budget reverses the eroding effects of inflation on the defense program, and sets the stage for a steady upturn in military spending, which is expected to reach \$140 billion by the end of this decade. The nation's demand for energy accounts for a sharp increase in civilian research and development, which is up 12% over last year to \$7.4 billion. Nuclear energy would get the lion's share of the energy research funds, but fossil fuel research would also be accelerated. Health research would face a lean year. Federal aid to state and local government would increase modestly, largely to offset increased energy costs. Federal programs for the poor and the elderly (community and mental health, Medicaid, food stamps, welfare) are the objects of sharp cuts. The President's request for funds to fight crime represents a decline, if inflation is considered, even though the latest FBI statistics show reported crime up 16%. In transportation, the President proposes using tax revenues now marked only for highway construction to be spent for other purposes. Fewer dollars will be budgeted for farm price supports. But more will go to education, manpower training and foreign aid.

A unique feature of this year's federal budget is a listing of \$90 billion in tax expenditures, that is, taxes the government does not collect because of special tax provisions, like personal deductions for mortgage interest and the non-taxation of social security benefits. Another new feature of the budget is that future fiscal years will begin in October rather than July, and the budget includes a transition budget for July through September next year.

In the days ahead the Congress will begin the arduous task of examining the President's budget, line by line. It will ask a number of questions: Will the budget stimulate the economy sufficiently? Will it increase inflation? Should its priorities be re-arranged? Will the deficit crush the economy? The President has recommended a budget he thinks is right for the nation. The Congress must now exercise its collective judgment on the nation's bicentennial budget.

BAN THE HANDGUN—NO. 3

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the editorial below makes a point which ought to be emphasized more strongly in the debate over gun control. That is that even the strongest gun control will not end gun crime or gun death. I am not naive enough to think that there are any simple answers to these problems, nor are my colleagues who also support gun control. But we can be sure, as the editors of the New York Post also point out, that a ban on the private possession of handguns will reduce drastically the appalling number of handgun deaths which occur in this country. Surely this is a step worthy of broad support, and indeed, the Post editorial is an example

of the increasing support which a ban on handguns is receiving.

The editorial appeared in the New York Post of February 21, 1975.

CURBING HANDGUN SLAUGHTER

Congress will be besieged as usual this session with appeals from the Department of Defense for new hardware, justified, as always, as essential to national security. There will also be another request: many members will be asking that a certain domestic weapons system be dismantled, on the grounds that it does not protect but endangers.

The point is being made by Rep. Bingham (D-N.Y.) and Sen. Hart (D-Mich.), chief House and Senate sponsors of legislation which would forbid ownership of handguns by the general public in the U.S.

The legislation is not new. Since it was introduced several sessions ago, Sen. Hart estimates, some 30,000 persons have been killed with handguns. They were not, as a rule, muggers, rapists or burglars, but members of the family of the gun owner, or relatives, or neighbors. According to Hart, it is a rarity to find a real "self-defense killing," involving an armed citizen against a criminal attacker.

The Bingham-Hart bill would not eliminate all handgun deaths. It would not totally prevent smuggling of handguns. It would not eliminate the use of other weapons in homicides.

But it would clearly reduce the number of gun deaths in the U.S., which occur, on the average, every 20 minutes. That is why prominent urban and police officials, including Mayor Beame, former Police Commissioner Murphy and others, are supporting the legislation. The public should be heard from no less clearly.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record an excellent article by Mrs. Rita E. Hauser. She urges the Department of State to give greater priority to human rights in our relations with Latin America.

Mrs. Hauser suggests that the United States encourage the strengthening of the Organization of American States system for protecting human rights. The reports of the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights receive scant attention by the General Assembly. Consequently, governments accused of committing serious violations of human rights by the Commission may blithely ignore its findings.

At its spring session the OAS General Assembly will consider the Commission's report on Chile. The Commission has issued a thoroughly documented report based on a field mission. The report contains a comprehensive set of recommendations. The Government of Chile has denied many of the Commission's findings.

The U.S. Government should urge the Assembly to fully discuss the report and adopt a resolution endorsing the Commission's recommendations. The United States should also urge the Government

of Chile to invite the Commission to make a second investigation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 5, 1975]

HUMAN RIGHTS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Rita E. Hauser)

Any attempt to revise our policy toward Latin America which fails to deal with suppression of basic human rights by governments of both the left and right will simply not be credible to serious people anywhere in the hemisphere. If we are to influence Latin America in the years ahead, it must be on the basis of shared human values which underpin our common heritage of freedom from foreign tyranny. Those values were collectively stated at the Bogota Conference of 1948, when the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man was adopted as the "principal guide of an evolving American law." Included are the right to life, liberty and personal security, equality before the law, fair trial, freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech and religion. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights was established in 1960 by the OAS as an advisory group and 10 years later made an official body of that organization, empowered to "keep vigilance over the observance of human rights." The United States supported all these actions—but little else since—and has not made use of the commission on the very occasions when it might have given its best service.

Most observers would agree that an enlightened United States policy toward Latin America in the 1970s must be predicated on nonintervention in the affairs of the other American nations, with due respect for the diversity of their political and economic systems. But this is not a license for us to ignore both the legal and moral obligations we have to seek compliance by all OAS members with the norms of the Bogota Declaration, and to work affirmatively toward enforcement of those rights as against any member state flagrantly in violation of them. Indeed, for the United States to take action which could reasonably be interpreted as supportive of these violations, e.g., sending arms or aid to a government using our materiel for a systematic abuse of the rights of its nationals, is probably a breach of international law under the "aiding and abetting" concept.

What can we do in cases of gross violations of rights of nationals by a Latin state? It is not in our interest, nor is it fruitful, to take unilateral action, whether by economic, diplomatic or military steps, against an egregious violator of human rights in the Americas to compel a change in policy. The OAS Charter probably requires collective action, for only in this manner can the principle of nonintervention in the affairs of another state be legally circumscribed. The perfect vehicle for the United States to support is the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. Its members are usually distinguished jurists of independent stature; its investigations in the 1960s as to the Dominican Republic, Honduras, El Salvador and Haiti, among others, were well received and no serious effort has been made to refute its factual findings. And it must be stressed that objective fact-finding is often the most difficult task in human rights disputes. Yet, in the past few years, we have done little to support its work.

The commission made a 4-year investigation of the government of Brazil, and condemned it for acts of killing and torture of political prisoners. Brazil rejected these findings and refused to comply with the commission's request that it investigate the charges

and punish those guilty. The commission's report was presented to the 1974 Atlanta session of the OAS General Assembly, which merely thanked it for its work. No public discussion on the report took place, due, it is safe to say, to Brazilian lobbying. The United States was silent.

The commission has just completed a lengthy investigation of violations of human rights by the military government of Chile, finding serious failures on a massive scale by that government. It remains to be seen whether this report will have the same fate as the Brazilian study when it reaches the OAS General Assembly this spring—and what role the United States will take in getting it aired. If the report is debated at the Assembly, most experts believe that virtually all OAS members will feel obliged to support a resolution calling on Chile to change its practices.

In dealing with a possible change of policy toward Cuba by the United States and the OAS, we should call for a commission investigation of Cuba's violations of human rights as concerns their large numbers of political prisoners. If Cuba refuses to permit a commission study, I, for one, would have little hesitation in continuing a policy of quasi-exclusion of Cuba from the OAS.

It would be idealistic in the extreme to expect equal respect for basic rights as among the varied nations of the hemisphere. But it is likewise cynical in the extreme to ignore governmental conduct which is violative of the basic concepts that unite the people of the Americas. Not only is that course of action morally and legally indefensible, but in the long, if not the short run, it promotes instability, often violent revolution, within the countries involved and thus discontinuity in our own relations with those countries. It is in our mutual interest to work diligently for respect of basic human rights by all the governments of the Americas. A policy in support of freedom is the best policy, and the safest, this nation can pursue.

EOLINE CULL

HON. MICHAEL T. BLOUIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BLOUIN. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I wish to enter into the Record today an article from the February 6, 1975, issue of the Maquoketa, Iowa, Jackson Sentinel. The article is about Miss Eoline Cull, the Jackson County psychologist who will retire this summer.

I offer this article for the review of my colleagues today because I believe Miss Cull is yet another example of the thousands of local government employees who serve the people of this Nation faithfully and responsibly.

The article follows:

COUNTY PSYCHOLOGIST WILL RETIRE IN JUNE

(By Joean McGee)

When Jackson County loses its Board of Education in June, there will also be another loss—the spirited, 75-year-old county psychologist Eoline Cull will retire.

County boards of education are currently being replaced by Area Education Agencies.

A recipient of four college degrees who has lived and worked all over the world, Dr. Cull

said, "I've enjoyed every minute of my stay in Maquoketa."

In her nearly 11 years in Jackson County, the most important change she has noted in her counseling is that cooperation among the schools, parents, physicians and state agencies has developed.

Most of her clients are children from the county's school systems who have been referred, usually with some type of learning disability. Many of these are students in the lower elementary levels, although she also works with students in the high schools and with those of pre-school age.

Students she has been working with are those who in some cases, have visual, auditory or coordination handicaps which hinder ability to effectively learn in the classroom.

Speaking on education in general she commented, "I feel that it has been too lax on demands on the part of the older and the very bright students. Individualization of education is the answer."

But she added that in the larger classrooms this is often an impossibility.

"Courses are set at a level for the average student and the brighter students are not challenged. It is detrimental when they develop attitudes that they can 'just get by,'" she added.

During her years in Maquoketa, Dr. Cull made local history in being the first woman with a seat on the city council.

Prior to coming to Maquoketa, she received a Ph.D. degree in educational psychology from the University of South California, 40 years after receiving her first bachelor's degree. She was 63 at the time and the oldest member of her graduating class.

It was only after receiving her Ph.D. that she encountered sex discrimination. "Some (employers) didn't want an older woman who had a higher degree than some of the men," she explained.

Being an older student was not always easy. "Before getting through, I was ready to throw in the sponge several times. But still it would have been hard to quit after having begun the program," Dr. Cull said.

Her own visual problems caused her to write a dissertation involving an intelligence test for blind persons. During retirement she plans to work on refining that test.

Her first degree, a B.S. in math education, she received from the University of Nebraska, her home state. But after finishing high school, she vowed that she would never teach.

"But what was a woman to do with a degree in math in those days but teach," she asked. She taught in school systems in Nebraska and Washington states for 11 and one-half years and after she began teaching she realized how much she enjoyed it.

In Broken Bow, Nebr., one night while she was still a teacher, the beginnings of a new and different career started during a woman's club meeting.

"A group of women were talking one night. One of the women was a part owner of a funeral home. Others in the group expressed opinions that they would not like to do embalming.

"Without thinking I said, 'Oh, I would,'" Dr. Cull recalled.

At one time Dr. Cull had wanted to be a nurse but discarded that idea. "In those days with all of the lifting, it was too hard work for a woman," she said.

But Dr. Cull could see a similarity between the two occupations. She later enrolled in the Cincinnati College of Embalming. Upon completion of the 12-month course, she began instructing other students in the course, a career which lasted for one and one-half years.

While in Cincinnati she developed an interest in the Woman's Army Corps (WAC). Her enlistment and subsequent training

brought on several more skills and occupations and new places to call home.

In Japan she worked as a graves' registration officer. Other titles she earned in the WAC were billeting officer, mess officer and radio mechanic (a skill which she said she hasn't used since her Army days). In the Army she was also a counseling officer, a career in which she decided she wanted more training to qualify for work in that field.

Cataract surgery ended her Army days and began a two-year recovery period. During that period she became more determined to go back to school in educational psychology.

From the University of Arizona she received a B.A. and an M.A. in psychology. After those degrees she enrolled at the University of Southern California to begin work on her Ph.D.

Plans of where to live in retirement are uncertain. Arizona comes to Dr. Cull's mind as a good place to live. But her brothers object because, "It is too far from home." She added that she does feel at home in Maquoketa and in Jackson County.

When questioned about what her plans would be if she were given the opportunity to do it all over again, Dr. Cull responded, "I'd try to be a surgeon. I enjoy people, both as persons who can think and as persons who have bodies that can function well or not function well."

Regarding marriage Dr. Cull said, "I think it is a wonderful institution for two people to plan their lives together. It just didn't work out for me—I've been too busy."

A NEW CAREER FOR 87-YEAR-OLD GRANDMOTHER

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's senior citizens have almost become a forgotten part of our society. Until only a few years ago, those over 60 years of age were considered by many Americans a virtual burden on society.

Then, a national effort spearheaded by this distinguished body and our colleagues in the Senate began to improve the way of life for our elderly citizens. Medicare, senior citizens' nutrition programs, and programs designed to aid groups of senior citizens in founding and maintaining organizations for themselves were the result of those efforts.

All of this is promulgation of the fact that while many of our citizens may be categorized as "retirees," they continue to provide a contribution to our society with their wisdom achieved through experience and their knowledge gained in many years of living a full and rich life in an era of great achievements in technological advances, the Great Depression, and two world wars.

I have with me today a copy of a newspaper article that appeared back home featuring one of my constituents. The story focuses on the upcoming graduation of a high school class. That is not unusual. But, more specifically, the article points to one of those graduates, Mrs. Verba Paschall, who is 87 years old—not what one might refer to as a new high school graduate about to embark on a career.

Mrs. Paschall's desire to gain the academic distinction of a high school graduate through years of life and hours of study is a prime example of the continuing contribution being made by our senior citizens. The Congress has acted on programs designed to get senior citizens back into the mainstream of our society. Mrs. Paschall's achievement is an example of our older Americans' answer to those programs. An answer that says, "Yes, we are glad to be a part of American society and are happy to make the contributions that we can as a result of our experience and knowledge."

Therefore, I would insert the following newspaper story, having appeared in The Fulton Daily Leader, into the RECORD in recognition of the achievements of many of our senior citizens.

87-YEAR-OLD MOTHER OF NINE COLLEGE GRADUATES RECEIVES GED CERTIFICATE

MURRAY, Ky.—She twits herself about "taking so long to do it." But Mrs. Verba Paschall's face cannot hide the pride she feels in her record-setting learning accomplishments.

Soon she will receive a high school equivalency certificate that will make her, at age 87, the oldest person in Kentucky history to have reached that standard through the state's General Educational Development (GED) program.

Using a magnifying glass part of the time as a reading aid because "my eyesight is not as good some days as it is others," she spent three months studying before she completed the five sections of the examination at Murray State University.

Mrs. June Cunningham, a homebound teacher in the adult basic education program who works out of the Learning Center on the campus, visited weekly in the Paschall home on Puryear, Tenn., Route 2—just south of the Kentucky-Tennessee state line—to assist Mrs. Paschall with her preparation.

Their work, usually in sessions of two to three hours, paid rich dividends. Her composite score of 55 for the five sections—mathematics, literature, English, social studies, and natural science—was described by Chuck Guthrie, director of the Adult Learning Center, as "exceptionally good." He said it would probably compare to that score made by the average college sophomore.

Nobody who knows Mrs. Paschall seems surprised at her success. One granddaughter, Mrs. Mary Lawson, who is a member of the faculty in the Department of Home Economics at Murray State, told why:

"She has always placed a high value on learning. Even as a child I noticed that there were always good books in the house and that grandmother read enough that she could talk about most anything."

Eighty-eight year old Hafford Paschall, Sr., a lifetime farmer who still goes fox hunting twice a week when he can get somebody to go with him, concurs in that assessment of his wife's appetite for knowledge.

"She's always loved a good book." Then he flashed a sample of the sense of humor he shares with his wife of 65 years. "But I've kept her busy most of her life rocking babies."

Mrs. Paschall, a Henry County, Tenn., native who completed the 10th grade and once taught with an emergency certificate in her home county, delights in the family of 12 children they have raised.

"Having a large family has always meant a lot to me," she said from her rocking chair. "But it does take a great deal of time and limits some of the things a person might otherwise do."

The record established by their children—nine out of 12 are college graduates—is un-

deniable indication that education has always been considered a premium commodity in the Paschall household. Three graduated from Murray State, three from the University of Tennessee at Martin, two from the University of Tennessee and one from a Baptist college in Fort Worth, Texas.

Throughout the busy schedule of her married life Mrs. Paschall has continued to enjoy every opportunity to learn. She still reads the weekly print edition of the New York Times.

So when one of her daughters, Mrs. Viva Ellis of Murray, told her about the adult basic education program at Murray State and the high school equivalency available through the GED program, she was immediately interested.

"I've enjoyed every minute of it," she said. "I can't see well enough to cook and keep house anymore—but I strain my eyes to read."

Asked whether her high school equivalency status is a matter merely of self-satisfaction or whether she might use it in some other way, she made this observation with a wry grin:

"Well, I would think about going to college but I probably couldn't decide whether to try out for the basketball team or the cheerleading squad."

ACTION, AN AMERICAN CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, America—in the midst of shortages, recession, inflation, energy crises, and the like—is making plans to celebrate her 200th birthday. We do so with a tremendous sense of history, accomplishment, and hope for the future.

Jennifer Brodel, winner of the Wisconsin VFW Voice of Democracy essay contest, speaks of America's first 200 years. In her speech, Jennifer quite appropriately states that America will only yield as much as we are willing to put into it.

Her speech should be an inspiration to all:

ACTION, AN AMERICAN CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

"The greatest thing in this world is not so much where we stand as in what direction we are going."

In this statement Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes reflects a true "patriotism" and outlines a basic responsibility of every U.S. citizen, the responsibility to look, really look, at America, realize how far we have progressed in the short time since our birth, and yet also realize the steps that must be taken to preserve and further our democratic heritage.

Our country will soon be celebrating its bicentennial with the traditional fireworks, parades, and picnics. Benjamin Franklins, Betsy Rosses and Paul Reveres will fill the countryside, flags will be raised, and drums beaten, all paying tribute to the founding fathers of our nation. In my estimation the greatest birthday presents the public can bestow upon America are the gifts of confidence and courage. Confidence, when noting all the trials America has weathered, and the court to continue trying for at least another two centuries. America faces crises today just as she did twenty, 120, and 200 years ago. The founding fathers chose to meet their crisis head on in the hopes that

their successors would cherish and improve upon their gift and meet the crises they encountered with the same determination.

Are we as Americans today guilty of violating this "unwritten" promise? There is a disease that looms large and menacingly in our land today, the deadly plague of apathy. Americans often feel bogged down by red tape, unfair practices, and devious tactics. Many feel that election day is merely a time to step behind the curtain and employ the "eenie meenie minie moe philosophy." What is more appalling is that even more citizens are too indifferent to bother voting at all. Governmental changes never have been, or never will be, immediate, but without public concern there will be none at all. Remember, the influential majorities were once insignificant minorities who persevered and put their faith in their actions.

It is often said that a country based upon democracy is only as strong as the people behind it. The people behind America must learn that America will only yield as much as we are willing to put into it.

My responsibility as a citizen ultimately reflects an American's responsibility as a citizen, action. It is not my place to lament over America's shortcomings and curse her weaknesses, but to employ my efforts to include myself and others in working toward lasting, beneficial, accomplishments in local, state and even federal government. Accomplishments that say cooperation, concern, and courage still yields success today just as they did almost two hundred years ago. Many scoff at the idealists who believe that unity of action can save America, but I believe that my responsibility, your responsibility, the responsibility of the citizens of the U.S. demands that we try.

I whole heartedly agree with and sincerely believe the sentiment expressed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower when he said, "There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence, and energy of her citizens cannot cure."

SEVAREID SAYS WATERGATE WRECKAGE LAYS FOUNDATION FOR STRONGER GOVERNMENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Commentator Eric Sevareid on a recent Walter Cronkite newscast on Columbia Broadcasting System analyzed the meaning of the recent conviction of the men closest to former President Nixon.

He concludes that the grab for power by this White House clique ultimately contributed to a stronger Federal Government by providing the opportunity for both the Congress and the Supreme Court to reassert their respective powers.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the Sevareid commentary in the RECORD herewith.

The commentary follows:

COMMENTARY BY ERIC SEVAREID

ERIC SEVAREID. The sentences imposed today on Mitchell, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Mardian, are about as expected. These projected prison terms are merely the extra strands in the wide web of their punishment—disgrace, ruined careers, sorrowing families, mountains of financial debt.

But, said Haldeman's lawyer, what they did Richard Nixon also did, and he has received no judicial punishment—implying that therefore these men, too, should not be sentenced to jail. The more implacable opponents of the whole White House apparatus would turn it around and say that since these men and others received jail sentences, Nixon should have, too. The argument is moot in any practical sense, since Nixon has been pardoned.

In a bigger sense, it was moot from the beginning. A Nixon pardon after an indictment or some more formal finding by the House of Representatives would have been better, but there are situations in which the public interest is best served by not following the letter of the law. This government is still semi-paralyzed in the face of serious domestic crisis. A Nixon trial on top of all this would have been too much. Presidents possess their special powers for just such decisions.

There is no such thing as equal justice, there never has been and ought not be. Every case, every defendant, weak or powerful, rich or poor, has its own special characteristics. Some require a special mercy, some a special severity. Otherwise, we wouldn't need judges; clerks with a rulebook could do the deciding.

The Watergate morality tale is about ended. One moral is that in the American system, extremists tend to bring about the very opposite of the results they intend.

The late Senator Joseph McCarthy intended to prove there were Communists under every bed and ended up by persuading millions there were no Communists under any bed—an equally false proposition.

Throughout Watergate, Nixon and his associates claimed two overarching aims: protection of the powers of the President himself, as against Congress and the courts; and protection of the national security. Instead, both courts and Congress have firmly established for themselves powers that were in some doubt—the courts' power to subpoena a President, for one thing; the power of the Congress to prevent Presidential impoundment of legislated funds, for another. And instead, national security, at least in its definition as official secrecy, has been opened up for inspection by Congress, press, and public, by the irresponsible as well as the responsible, with the current probes into FBI and CIA.

The wreckage left by Nixon and his men is the wreckage of what they profess to believe in most. But a special advantage of this country is that it is strong enough and secure enough to pick up the wreckage and from it build a better structure.

AREAS OF LEGISLATION PURSUED BY CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to yesterday's insert of the legislative agenda of the Congressional Black Caucus, I submit today the major areas of legislation the caucus will pursue in the upcoming session:

AREAS OF LEGISLATION PURSUED BY CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

FULL EMPLOYMENT

The Congressional Black Caucus sees as one of its highest priorities, the passage of comprehensive legislation which establishes both the policy and the mechanism for guar-

anteering the right to useful and meaningful employment for all adult Americans able and willing to work. It is most important that the full employment concept be understood as reaching far beyond the public service jobs program to create both the right and the opportunity to meaningful jobs.

As unemployment skyrockets, with some predicting that January's 8.2 percent national unemployment rate will pass 10 percent this year, the need for relief is unquestioned. Black unemployment in January was over 13 percent and black teenage unemployment in the same month was at 41 percent. However, even many of those who recognize the need do not fully understand that Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that the real national unemployment rate—which included the underemployed, those employed part-time who seek full-time work, and those who need work but are discouraged from looking—is over 15 percent. For blacks, that means a real unemployment rate in the neighborhood of 30 percent nationally, and even higher in depressed areas.

The major thrust of the effort to attain full employment legislation centers around a bill introduced by Caucus member Augustus Hawkins. That measure would create a Job Guarantee Office and a Standby Job Corps, as well as requiring the President to develop a national full employment and production program. Full employment would be achieved through both private and public employers. Central to the proposal is the concept that there is no tolerable level of official unemployment for a narrowly-defined labor force in contrast to present practice.

As the legislative process proceeds, the specifics of a full employment program will, of course, be refined and sharpened. Complementary proposals, such as that of Congressman John Conyers to require the federal government to become the employer of last resort, will also help shape the final legislation. There should also be legislation passed providing for flexible working hours, as in Congresswoman Burke's Career Opportunity Act. Any legislation supported by the Caucus must have an adequate mechanism at the local level for ensuring jobs and eliminating red tape.

Passage of a full employment act as soon as possible is vital. Yet even as that measure is discussed the unemployment situation demands an immediate expansion of both public service jobs programs, particularly aimed at low and unskilled workers and expansion and extension of unemployment benefits. Congressman Hawkins has also introduced a bill providing for an additional one million public service jobs, which the Caucus supports. Further, a youth unemployment program aimed at getting young people from school into the labor force, including provisions for summer jobs must be established immediately.

TAX REFORM

If we are to solve our nation's basic problems of unemployment, inadequate housing, health care, public education and other social ills, it will take lots of money. When the question is asked "how shall we fund these programs," the inevitable answer given is that the average American taxpayer is already overburdened with the cost of government and simply is not willing to have taxes raised to fund desperately needed human needs programs.

The Congressional Black Caucus agrees with that assessment. We also agree that if the money to attack these basic domestic problems—which just happen to be reflected most acutely in the black experience—is ever to be raised, it must come through extensive tax reform that will close up gaping loopholes in the tax law by which rich individuals and multi-national corporations get away with over \$50 billion a year in

revenues which would come to the federal Treasury were they taxed the way the average American is taxed today. That amounts to an enormous "welfare payment", "a free ride" for the rich in our nation today.

The noted Brookings Institution economist and now Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Alice Rivlin, believes that with the annual yield from tax reform applied to our national budget we could house all of our low and moderate income families, and fund health manpower, health research and a health care system that would meet the needs of all our citizens. Over several years, we could also create jobs for all our unemployed and train less-skilled people to fill socially useful jobs on a permanent basis and substantially increase our spending on public education at every level from preschool through college. The Congressional Black Caucus agrees.

The Congressional Black Caucus will be pressing in the 94th Congress, therefore, to effect such reforms of the tax law as:

Repeal of the oil depletion allowance.
Enactment of a minimum tax to ensure that those who earn incomes are taxed on it.

Restructuring of capital gains provisions to fully tax income from whatever source.

Elimination of hobby-farm tax deductions.
Repeal of tax credit provisions which enable multinational corporations to fully deduct foreign taxes from their U.S. tax obligations and thereby avoid U.S. taxes.

Elimination of tax incentives for foreign investments that move industry and jobs from the U.S., thereby eroding the domestic tax base.

Tightening of provisions for business activity to prevent taxpayer subsidies of a high standard of living not legitimately related to business activity.

THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Despite its importance, the congressional budget and appropriations process is frequently overlooked by groups outside Congress, and not fully dealt with on the inside. Programs which are not adequately funded cannot operate effectively. Programs which are overfunded and exist and grow on the basis of unexamined premises and traditions take money from more pressing and current needs.

The Congressional Black Caucus will make a major effort this year to have federal appropriations more nearly reflect real national priorities. We are especially concerned over plans for fiscal restraints coming at a time that the Administration budget calls for defense budget authority of over \$100 billion. Defense outlays rose from \$85.3 billion in fiscal year '75 to \$94.0 billion FY '76. We are neither anti-military, nor do we advocate a weak defense posture. But we cannot see any valid relationship between the absolute size of the military budget and the quality of America's defense.

Therefore, while we can agree that there must be limits on federal spending, for us the key issue is where cuts and limits should be made. We have already worked to defeat the Administration's proposed cuts in the Food Stamp program and we will continue to work to keep the burden of anti-recessionary measures from the backs of the poor.

The time is ripe for a more realistic view of the military and foreign aid budgets and a hard questioning of the premises on which they are built.

There are numerous budget areas which deserve paring. These include:

The B-1 Bomber.
The Trident Submarine.
Overseas troop level, by 100,000 troops.
AWACS Air Warning System.
MARV Counterforce.
Additional military aid to Southeast Asia.
\$2.3 billion for inflationary costs for shipbuilding.

\$1.6 billion for 20 percent increase in research and development.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Key to the maintenance of a free and open democratic society are the rights of individuals to exercise their franchise to vote. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been perhaps the most effective piece of civil rights legislation ever passed. Focusing on areas where the exclusion of black voters was greatest, largely in the South, the Voting Rights Act has resulted in the registration of over 1 million persons since 1965. Black registration rates in covered areas in the South have risen from about 30 percent of those of voting age in 1965 to 57 percent of those eligible in those same areas in 1972. Black elected officials have increased from fewer than 100 in these same areas in 1965 to nearly 1,000 to date. Yet there is considerable evidence such as in the recent U.S. Civil Rights Commission Study, that the problems persist, and that without the Act, there would be serious regression in black voting rights.

The Congressional Black Caucus strongly supports extension of the Voting Rights Act for an additional 10 years. We feel that it is particularly crucial that the extension be for 10 years so as to cover reapportionment which will follow the 1980 census. Experience under the Act has shown it to be especially effective in overcoming racial gerrymandering. The Caucus also supports a permanent ban on literacy tests. Section 5 of the Act, which requires submission of any "change with respect to voting" in covered areas to the Justice Department or D.C. Federal District Court, has proved to be the heart of the legislation. It must be retained in the extension. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan has introduced a bill to extend the protections of the Act.

Further, the Caucus supports efforts to extend the Act's coverage to Spanish-speaking and other minorities who face severe problems of disenfranchisement.

UNIVERSAL VOTER REGISTRATION

The continuing decline in voter participation since 1960 challenges the nation's democratic principles. While voter registration and participation among blacks has increased greatly since the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it still lags significantly behind that for whites. The nationwide voter participation rate has declined from 64% of those eligible in 1960 to 55% of those eligible in 1975. In 1974 only 39% of those eligible voted in the congressional elections. Black voter participation in 1974 is estimated at under 30% of those eligible.

Over the past several years, proposals have been made to institute a system of universal voter registration. Largely, they have been bills which would simplify registration through the use of postcards for registering for federal elections. Provisions to protect against fraud and to give financial incentives for states and localities to utilize the federal postcard registrations have been included in the major bills.

Last year, H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act, failed to gain a rule in the House by a vote of 197 to 204. The members of the Congressional Black Caucus supported that bill, and continue to strongly support similar legislation this year.

The states of Maryland, Minnesota, Texas and New Jersey have systems of registration by mail and have found them to be tremendously successful.

The passage of a universal voter registration act is among the highest priorities on our agenda.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

Revenue sharing was initially proposed during the mid-1960's as a means of distributing a budget surplus to states and localities as a flexible additional sum of money to supplement categorical programs.

Under the Nixon Administration, general revenue sharing became a political weapon to shift the locus of decision-making to units of government less responsive to social needs of poor and minorities. Categorical program cutbacks, despite promises to the contrary, heightened the withdrawal from commitments to national priorities supported by the Congressional Black Caucus and its constituents. Reports and studies which have appeared to date, such as those by the National Clearinghouse on Revenue Sharing, civil rights organizations, the General Accounting Office, and the Brookings Institution, generally indicate that general revenue sharing funds have gone to purposes other than to meet most basic social needs. Few benefits of revenue sharing expenditures have reached blacks and the poor.

The Congressional Black Caucus will make a searching reexamination of the general revenue sharing program prior to endorsing its continuation. We understand the need for continuing funds for general city services at a time of financial crisis. Yet we see the review and debate concerning general revenue sharing as a focal point for discussion of our national priorities.

In that context, we will be looking closely at how responsive the program has been to the fundamental needs we perceive. We will be looking to see whether additional legislative provisions, including formula changes, might help to further that responsiveness, or whether alternative and complementary programs might better reach that end.

Even more specifically, any extension of the general revenue sharing program should contain the following key provisions:

Stronger civil rights provisions which put a greater responsibility for effective enforcement on the federal government. We do not believe that states and localities which have not demonstrated that they have the capacity, the machinery and the will to enforce the civil rights laws should be given great leeway and authority in the enforcement process.

We oppose any attempts to limit the deferral of funds power to narrow functional areas to which funds may go.

There must be a specific requirement for citizen participation in the decision-making process for fund use prior to notification to the Treasury Department of planned uses of the funds. Citizen participation should include at least public hearings, better notification of minority groups, and public reports on planned and actual uses which indicate the nature and type of projects as well as the real impact in terms of a locality's overall budget.

The formula and permissible use categories must result in greater benefits to lower-income communities and individuals.

There should be a specific requirement that the data used in the formula be responsive to the known census undercount.

SAVES FUEL BY USING RIVER

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of increasing costs for fuel and the transportation of industrial necessities, it is heartening to note an innovative project that the Swann Oil Co. has undertaken on the Savannah River between Savannah and Augusta, Ga.

In an effort to transport large quantities of industrial fuel at the lowest pos-

sible cost, the officials and engineers of Swann turned to the river and, after working on new ideas, constructed a barge that could meet the demands of the Savannah River.

According to a spokesman for the oil company, there are 173 industries employing 43,000 individuals who depend on the timely delivery of this product. The barge trips have increased tonnage on the river by 50 percent with this one operation. It is estimated that 235 man-hours and over 1,250 gallons of fuel are saved on every trip by using the river rather than conventional methods of transportation. This is an annual savings of well over 21,000 man-hours and 114,000 gallons of fuel. I commend these dedicated individuals on their progressive work.

I wish to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the January 4, 1975, *Waterways Journal* about this project. I hope that other companies will be inspired by the zeal of the Swann Oil Co. and will conduct their own engineering surveys of how to make better use of natural means of transportation to save manpower and fuel—both of which are becoming more valuable daily. The article follows:

OIL MOVEMENT MAKES HISTORY ON SAVANNAH

The death of commercial shipping on the Savannah River was inevitable. Freight tonnage had dropped to an all-time low and experts declared the stream unnavigable for all but small pleasure craft and weekend fishermen. But a creative team of engineers from the Swann Oil Company and The Waterways Company, refusing to accept the obvious, designed and built the largest vessel in the river's history and reopened the Savannah River to commerce.

Swann Oil, a leading independent oil company with headquarters in Philadelphia, wanted to barge large quantities of industrial fuel oil from a new terminal in Savannah to Augusta, Ga. The company was advised to abandon the project. Others had tried and failed. Five basic problems blocked success on the Savannah.

1. The river was said to be too shallow. Only 7½ feet deep in ideal conditions, the channel is only 6-7 feet deep in some areas.

2. The variable current fights conventional freight vessels to a standstill. Running 4-6 knots in the natural channel, narrow man-made cuts funnel the stream to even higher speeds in several places.

3. Underwater obstructions often block clear travel on the river. Sudden shoaling, hidden snags and rock outcroppings tear hulls apart and destroy cargo. Such an occurrence involving an oil barge could only result in an environmental disaster.

4. The Savannah River meanders through nearly 200 miles of switchbacks, and right angle and circular turns.

5. In some areas, the narrow, twisting Savannah courses through a streambed only 90 feet wide.

Dr. Leonard A. Swann, Jr., company president, and John J. Tyrrell, his chief engineer, were committed to transporting as much residual fuel oil as possible to Augusta as economically as possible. They were convinced river transportation was the answer and that the Savannah could, and should be used for commerce.

They also knew that bold new ideas were required to bring success where others had failed. Abandoning long accepted design practices, Swann began planning a unique new vessel to meet the Savannah on its own terms.

To transport the largest amount of fuel oil possible, Swann engineers designed the largest barge possible. The maximum size of the barge, Swann 18, was determined by the Savannah Bluff Lock just south of Augusta. The 296 by 54-foot barge, largest in the river's history, and its 63-foot long towboat Lottie Swann, fit snugly into the lock with less than a foot to spare on each side, bow and stern.

This barge can carry more than 750,000 gallons of industrial fuel oil between Savannah and Augusta each trip. To equal the barge's delivery capacity, a fleet of 125 highway tank trucks would have to run between the two cities every four days.

The barge's dimensions, as many other of the vessel's features, serve multiple purposes. The size permits maximum cargo capacity and limits draft. Full load working draft, normally only six feet, is also aided by buoyancy provided by air space between double hulls.

Swann 18 was designed with double hulls for buoyancy and environmental protection from underwater obstructions. For maximum protection, oil is transported in independent compartments within the second hull. Even if the outer hull were punctured, leaks would be prevented by the inner walls.

To work against the Savannah's unusually strong current, Swann engineers designed their innovative barge with a 50-foot rake, never before seen on the river. The long tapered bow, coupled with the vessel's shallow draft, offsets current action and allows maximum performance.

The Marie Swann, currently under construction at the Inslay yard at Crisfield, Md., was designed to work with Swann 18. A shallow draft towboat, the Marie Swann features special devices to protect her rudders and propellers from underwater damage, and Kort nozzles which increase engine power by 25 percent.

On the drawing board, Swann designed its vessel to fight the river as little as possible while fulfilling the prime requisite of maximum cargo delivery. One problem, however, remained unsolved: that of navigating the inland giant through the Savannah's corkscrew turns.

Barge Swann 18 is only four feet short of a football field in length and too large for conventional steering. A boat alone could not maneuver the barge's length, weight and mass through the Savannah's characteristic turns.

The Waterways Company, Pass Christian, Miss., provided the solution by suggesting the installation of a Steermaster unit in the bow of the barge.

Waterways also developed special electronic control systems for Swann's Steermaster. The control panel was installed in the pilothouse within easy reach of the captain. One man, therefore, literally has fingertip steering control.

Coordinating the Steermaster and the boat's propellers, the captain can actually turn the giant barge on its axis like a giant pinwheel. That capability is turning several river landings into minor tourist areas. Area residents often gather to watch the barge sweep gracefully through a tight right angle or switchback turn.

As if helping steer the largest vessel in Savannah River history weren't enough, The Waterways Company designed another chore for the Steermaster system. At dockside, the Steermaster power plant operates a special pump which strips and cleans Swann 18's oil compartments at more than 1,000 gallons a minute. The tanks are cleaned so thoroughly that another oil grade can be backhauled to Savannah without fear of contamination.

Where river cargo traffic dropped to an all-time low of only 46,000 tons last year, Swann 18 alone is scheduled to carry many times that volume in the coming year.

SPONSORS BILLS TO SPUR CAR SALES AND AUTOMOBILE FUEL ECONOMY

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills relating to the automobile industry, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Economy Act and legislation to provide a 3-year moratorium on further safety or emission control standards for new cars.

The Motor Vehicle Fuel Economy Act is an updated version of legislation which I introduced as H.R. 10035 in 1973. Since there is now widespread agreement that fuel consumption by automobiles must be reduced, and since the House-Senate task force on energy included this proposal in their recent recommendations, I offer the measure for early consideration as part of the comprehensive energy program.

The legislation would require car manufacturers to achieve a 10-percent gain in the fuel economy of their aggregate production by September 1, 1976, a 20-percent saving by September 1, 1978; and 30-percent improvement by September 1, 1980. It stipulates that no model of car sold after September 1, 1976, get fewer miles per gallon than current models of the vehicle, but offers a complete exemption from these standards for any model of car already achieving 20 or more miles per gallon.

As long as we depend on imports for more than one-third of all the oil consumed in this country, we cannot ignore the fact that the automobile—which accounts for about 40 percent of our oil usage—is the most wasteful and inefficient of our energy absorbers. The average U.S. car gets only 13.1 miles per gallon, a level we cannot tolerate when the technology for increasing that mileage is readily available and already employed in thousands of vehicles on our roads. By raising the average to 17 miles per gallon by 1980—a goal which the standards in this bill are designed to achieve—we can cut our oil consumption by approximately 2 million barrels a day, a significant dent in the more than 6 million barrels of imported oil we are using daily.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Motor Vehicle Fuel Economy Act provides a practical and realistic way to cut gasoline consumption on the highways of America. By merging this program with the other energy proposals we are going to legislate, we can take an important step in the direction of eventual energy self-sufficiency that is so crucial to our security against unilateral OPEC oil price increases or export embargoes.

The second bill I am introducing offers automobile manufacturers relief from meeting any additional standards in safety or pollution control equipment for 3 years. I want to make it clear that this is not an attempt to nullify the Clean Air Act or increase the hazards of driving on our highways. I am convinced that we have made important advances in these areas and I am not by any means

recommending abandonment of present standards.

What motivates me to introduce this legislation is the stunning January report that unemployment in the automotive industry has reached a level of 24 percent, three times the national average. More recent unofficial reports peg idleness of automobile workers through layoffs or reduced working hours at a horrendous 31 percent. That decline, from an already high 9.2-percent unemployment in the industry a year ago, bespeaks untold hardship for hundreds of thousands of auto workers and their families, as well as an incalculable number of Americans in industries dependent on car production for their economic survival.

The meteoric decline in new car sales that has brought the industry to this state is partly the result of rising prices and partly because of consumer reluctance to make major purchases at a time of nationwide economic decline. Hopefully the tax reductions and other economic measures the Congress will deliberate will lead to rising activity in the marketplace. At the same time I feel that we must avoid further Government restrictions that will raise car sticker prices even higher. Federal safety and emission requirements have added about \$320 to the cost of 1974 cars. One major automobile company executive has estimated that meeting 1977 emissions standards already in the law will cost consumers as much as \$2 billion a year, an inflationary development that will further dampen sales and keep unemployment levels unacceptably high.

I am pleased that the jobs program announced by the House Democratic leadership includes a major stimulus to increase automobile production. The bill I am introducing today could be a useful component in congressional initiatives to get unemployed Americans back on payrolls, and I urge its early consideration as part of our program to get the country on the road to economic recovery.

ARMENIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues three extraordinarily fine articles on Armenian history and culture. These three articles together are nearly of book length and are contained in the February 3, February 10 and February 17, 1975 issues of the New Yorker magazine.

The author, Michael J. Arlen, describes his Armenian heritage and relates in a most fascinating and moving way his trip to modern Armenia and what his Armenian heritage means to him.

Mr. Arlen concludes his three excellent articles by writing "I often wonder what it really is to be Armenian in our world—what message it is that we Armenians

carry down from our own journey through the centuries."

Mr. Arlen continues with these moving words:

But perhaps in the end the message of the Armenians is more particular than mere persistence. Perhaps, if there exists a deeper possibility in the psyche of this ancient, sturdy, and minor race, it is this: the capacity of a people for proceeding beyond nationhood. For to be a nation—a member of a modern nation—is to inherit territory, and pride in property and to be connected to collective dreams of quite impossible grandeur and savagery, fertility and hatred. To be an Armenian has meant that one has been compelled by circumstance to rise above or fall below—or, anyway, to skirt—these so-called imperatives of nationhood and property, and thus has been free to attempt the struggle of an ordinary life, and to dream more modest dreams, and to try to deal with one's dreams as best one could.

As I read the truly beautiful articles of Mr. Arlen over the past 3 weeks, I came to know much more fully the meaning of House Joint Resolution 148, of which I am a cosponsor; this resolution designates April 24, 1975 as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." This day of remembrance is to commemorate the first genocide of the 20th century which began on the evening of April 24, 1915 when scores of Armenian writers, intellectuals and officials were arrested in Constantinople and murdered. Three years later, in 1918, up to 2 million Armenian men, women and children had been annihilated by the Turks.

In 1975, House Joint Resolution 148 is particularly important in view of what transpired at the meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission on March 6, 1974. During the consideration of a report on genocide being prepared by a subcommittee of the U.N., the U.N. Human Rights Commission acquiesced in a request by the Turkish Representative to delete from the study a reference to the Armenian genocide in 1915.

The extraordinary articles by Michael Arlen in three issues of the New Yorker Magazine vividly portray the historical background of the deliberate attempt to exterminate the Armenian people.

Mr. Speaker, the atrocities in 1915 against the Armenian people must not be allowed to slip into oblivion because there is no Armenia in the United Nations today to represent the voice and proud tradition of the Armenian people.

The full text of House Joint Resolution 148 follows:

H.J. RES. 148

To designate April 24, 1975, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man"

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That April 24, 1975, is hereby designated as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day as a day of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who succumbed to the genocide perpetrated in Turkey in 1915, and in whose memory this date is commemorated by all Armenians and their friends throughout the world.

THE HIGH COST OF A SECOND INCOME

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a bill that I am today introducing with 20 cosponsors would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit deductions of the costs of child care as a business expense rather than as an itemized deduction. The rationale for making this change was outlined in a recent article in the Washington Post. For the information of my colleagues, I insert this article in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, March 3, 1975]

THE HIGH COST OF A SECOND INCOME

(By Richard M. Cohen)

A few years ago, a young advertising executive marked the birth of his first child with the announcement that he would no longer permit his wife to work. Nobody called him a male chauvinist pig—and it wasn't only because the term was not yet in vogue. Instead, he received a sympathetic ear when he explained that he could not longer afford a second income.

As the working husband of a working wife and parent of a non-working 3-year-old, I now understand what he meant. Much has changed since then—but not the tax laws which convinced the executive that a second income would be a losing proposition. The fact remains that Congress, for all its hosannas to Women's Lib, has refused to accept the principle that the cost of child care is a legitimate and ordinary business expense. As a result, many married couples must sooner or later face a domestic version of Hobson's choice—motherhood or a career, but not both.

The reasons for this congressional stance are not hard to deduce: some congressmen quite correctly worry about creating yet another tax loophole, while others, quite incorrectly, rail against an idea they think might encourage mothers to desert their children for the opiate of careers.

Nevertheless, the supporting doctrine of American tax law has been that the costs of producing income are deductible—a salesman deducts his car, a painter his brushes, an employer his employee. The same principle should apply to the income of all working mothers. But a mother cannot deduct her child care.

To its credit, Congress has not been blind to the dilemma and over the years it has evolved a solution of sorts. It has permitted a child-care deduction based on the size of family income, a limitation Congress has not seen fit to apply elsewhere. Surely, no salesman loses his car deduction when his income goes over a certain level.

The Revenue Act of 1971 permits an itemized deduction of up to \$400 a month for working parents with an adjusted gross income of not more than \$18,000. For families with incomes in excess of that, the deduction decreases on a sliding scale (50 cents to the dollar) until it vanishes entirely at \$27,600.

Fair enough—at first blush. But notice that Congress has specified an itemized deduction. Goodbye short form, hello long form and H & R Block. The long form, as tax men know, is the tool of the homeowner who deducts mortgage interest and property taxes. It is not used by low income persons, most of whom do not own their own homes.

Instead of itemizing, they use a short form and take standard deductions. The modest amount of child-care expenses low-income families can afford often does not get them

above the standard deductions. Thus they get no credit for child-care expenses. Child-care deductions also are denied to mothers who work only part-time. For these and other reasons, in 1972 only 1.2 million of the 10 million families with working parents took the children deductions.

At the other extreme, consider the couple earning \$30,000-a-year. It looks like a nice, healthy sum, but child-care expenses can reduce a family's income substantially. If we assume that the husband earns \$20,000 and the wife \$10,000 (a higher than average figure for women in the work force), her income erodes like this:

State, local and federal taxes and Social Security will take at least 20 percent of her pay. That's about \$38 out of her \$193 a week salary, bringing her take-home income down to \$155. If she's automatically enrolled in employee insurance plans, or is required to pay union dues, she'll lose about \$5 more—\$150.

If she obeys the law and pays her sitter the minimum wage for a 40-hour week, child care will cost about \$84. Now she's down to \$66 for the week. And if she obeys one law, why not another?—the Social Security Act. Her employer contribution would be \$4.91 a week. If she also pays the employee's share—a common practice in the Washington area where sitters strike some hard bargains—the above figure should be doubled to \$9.82. That reduces her "profit" to \$56.18 a week.

That should be the end of the slide—but it isn't. For household workers, like others, are entitled to paid vacations, sick leave and paid holidays. That can sometimes mean temporary help, overtime, or a day at home with the child, any one of which can mean a loss of income or an added expense. Moreover, there are other costs associated with work—a larger wardrobe, commuting, lunches and possibly a second car. Taking all this into account, the woman's weekly "profit" will be reduced by another \$10—or more.

She would now clear about \$46.18 a week, or about \$1.15 an hour.

For the woman who cherishes a career, what's left at the end of the week may still be worth the trouble. But for the woman who is working strictly for the money, and who may harbor some guilt about leaving her children in the care of others, what's left is hardly worth the heartache.

Which is the point the advertising executive was making—and possibly overstating. The remedy, in this case, is to remove the income ceiling all together. At all income levels, child care should be considered a necessary and normal business expense. Because it is.

ARAB INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENT POLICY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, last week we learned of the existence of an Arab boycott office and alleged Arab influence on American Government policy with respect to personnel sent to those nations. Many American citizens including myself were quite concerned that this potentially dangerous situation could disrupt Government activities and affect national security in the long run.

Subsequently, I wrote Chairman Brooks of the Government Operations Committee, requesting an investigation into alleged Arab influence within our

agencies. I include this letter to be inserted in the RECORD.

In addition, I wrote the head of all departments and agencies having an international scope requesting their cooperation in determining the extent of Arab influence. Since then, 31 of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, have joined me in cosigning this letter. Mr. Speaker, I include this joint letter, list of departments and agencies, and the list of cosigners to be inserted in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who are as concerned as I. If any more of my colleagues wish to have their names on a followup cosigner list, they may contact my office.

The articles follow:

[LETTER TO CHAIRMAN BROOKS]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, House Committee on Government Operations, Rayburn Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am particularly disturbed by the Army Corps of Engineers' confirmation of (1) the Saudi Arabian demand that the Corps not assign any Jewish officers to projects undertaken in that country and (2) the Corps acquiescence to the demand. Unfortunately, because of the wide scope of international dealings of our Federal government, I fear that this might not be an isolated incident.

Aside from the obvious concern about Federal departments and agencies being coerced to discriminate against U.S. citizens and companies by foreign nations, I believe that issues of government efficiency and national security are involved. For these reasons, an oversight investigation by the House Committee on Government Operations would be most appropriate.

The Government Operations Committee is the only committee which has jurisdiction over all Executive departments and agencies. Furthermore, it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee to investigate any policy or action, such as restrictions on the assignment of personnel, which surely affects the efficiency of government operations. Other government activities of concern include the letting of contracts, participation in government loan programs and participation in international lending programs. Finally, I view Arab "blackmailing" as a potentially dangerous situation—one in which we could easily find ourselves unwittingly bending to Arab wishes on matters of national security and international diplomacy.

I urge you to consider calling oversight hearings on this subject as soon as possible. I would be most happy to assist you in the preparation of these hearings in any manner you deem appropriate.

I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of this request to the other Members of the Committee.

I urge you to give this vital matter your immediate consideration.

Best regards,

ROBERT W. KASTEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[LETTER TO DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1975.

The Honorable

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We were particularly disturbed by the Army Corps of Engineers' confirmation of (1) the Saudi Arabian demand that the Corps not assign any Jewish officers to projects undertaken in that country and (2) the Corps' acquiescence to the demand. In view of newspaper reports of similar pressures being brought to bear on other government agencies, we fear that this is not an isolated incident.

Therefore, we would greatly appreciate your assistance in gathering all of the relevant information on this issue. Specifically, we are requesting the following:

(1) Any dealings, direct or indirect, your department or agency has with any Arab nation? The nature of such dealings? The extent of such dealings?

(2) Whether any Arab nation, officially or unofficially, has requested your department or agency to restrict or curtail any activities involving Jewish personnel, companies, lending institutions, etc. or the State of Israel? What was the nature of the request? When was the request made?

(3) What was the response of your department or agency? Have you taken any action to comply, or which might be construed as compliance, to the Arab request?

Complete and detailed answers to each of these inquiries is requested as soon as possible. If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact Representative Robert Kasten.

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor. We believe a complete record for the American public is essential if we are to formulate policies to protect the interests of the United States and her citizens.

Best regards,

ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES
DEPARTMENTS

Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Air Force, Army, Navy, Health, Education and Welfare, Justice, Labor, State, Transportation, Treasury.

AGENCIES

ACTION, Energy Research & Development Administration, Civil Aeronautics Board, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Federal Maritime Commission, Federal Reserve System, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Board of Foreign Scholarships,

Export Administration Review Board, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, Trade Expansion Act Advisory Committee, United States Advisory Commission on Information, United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Information Agency, Federal Aviation Administration.

LIST OF COSIGNERS

Abzug, Bella—N.Y.
Addabbo, Joseph—N.Y.
Brodhead, William—Mich.
Brown, George—Calif.
Daniel, Dan—Va.
Downey, Thomas—Calif.
Edgar, Robert—Pa.
Eilberg, Joshua—Pa.
Fish, Hamilton, Jr.—N.Y.
Fraser, Donald—Minn.
Hanley, James—N.Y.
Hannaford, Mark—Calif.
Harrington, Michael—Mass.
Holtzman, Elizabeth—N.Y.
Koch, Edward—N.Y.
Krebs, John—Calif.
Lafalce, John—N.Y.
Lent, Norman—N.Y.
Long, Clarence—Md.
McHugh, Matthew—N.Y.
Maguire, Andrew—N.J.
Ottinger, Richard—N.Y.
Rees, Thomas—Calif.
Roe, Robert—N.J.
Sharp, Philip—Ind.

Simon, Paul—Ill.
Steiger, William—Wis.
Van Deerin, Lionel—Calif.
Wilson, Charles—Tex.
Wirth, Timothy—Colo.
Yates, Sidney—Ill.

REVENUE-SHARING INCREASE TO
AID STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal plight of State and local governments today is a problem demanding immediate attention and remedy. In State capitol after State capitol and courthouse after courthouse, public officials are faced with due bills which cannot be paid and needed services which are becoming more and more difficult if not impossible to render.

Meeting here in Washington recently the Nation's Governors, one by one, told of suffering under the impact of inflation and recession which has shrunk expected budget surpluses until many are now faced with unexpected and unprepared for deficits.

Many of these units of government, particularly the States, are being forced to consider increased taxes because when their money runs out, their constitutional ability to spend ceases; they have no authority to pay through deficit financing. An uncertain bond market and a cut-back in Federal grant-in-aid support leave State and local governments with only one source of support for additional revenues: Increased taxation. In nearby Fairfax County, Va., I read that local property taxes are being increased up to 50 percent in an effort to offset this revenue decline/cost inflation problem.

Recently the National Governors' Conference provided me with a short but very succinct memo on the plight of State and local government and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

DECLINING STATE REVENUES

The States have, over the past several months, been experiencing a deteriorating fiscal condition largely resulting from the twin forces of inflation and recession.

Many States are confronted with budget problems characterized by falling revenues, real and anticipated cut backs in federal grant-in-aid support, and demands by local governmental units for increased state aid.

For the first time in decades, state highway, gas and motor vehicle taxes dedicated to the support of highway construction programs, is declining often to the point that state matching for federal highway trust funds is jeopardized. Also, a majority of the States are simultaneously facing short falls in general revenues.

In addition, a significant number of States are proposing increased tax action to maintain programs at a stable operational level. Paradoxically, many of the state and local tax increases will serve as a counter balance to federal tax relief activated as an anti-recessionary tool.

The problems are further compounded by state constitutional restrictions on deficit spending, as well as a sluggish bond market,

the only remaining major sources of state financing.

Simply put, revenue sharing becomes an excellent vehicle by which assistance can be granted to the States in a manner which will minimize recessionary forces.

Mr. Speaker, the revenue sharing program definitely is an excellent vehicle. It can alleviate these problems. I think it worth noting and stressing the statement in the aforementioned memo asserting:

"Paradoxically, many of the State and local tax increases will serve as a counter-balance to Federal tax relief as activated as an anti-recessionary tool."

We cannot, must not, and need not permit this to take place.

Therefore, today I am introducing legislation to extend and double the Federal revenue sharing program for the next 5 years.

Under my bill the annual Federal revenue sharing contribution would be increased from \$6 billion to \$12 billion beginning fiscal '76 on July 1 of this year. Each year thereafter for 4 years, the \$12 billion Federal contribution would be increased by \$500 million as an anticipated inflation factor.

At least partial funding for the increased revenue sharing monies might come from sources which are today being considered for the Energy Trust Fund. It is apparent that for at least 2 to 4 years there may be considerably more money available for the Trust than the energy program can effectively utilize. My own Trust Fund Task Force of the Ways and Means Committee estimated there are potentially \$10 to \$12 billion available for first-year funding of the Trust. This is about \$5 to \$7 billion more than it is believed we could efficiently put into the energy program. There is every good reason why this money should go back home through revenue sharing.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE TAX EXEMPTION FOR A MENTALLY RETARDED DEPENDENT

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, few of us here in Congress can realize the heart-break that comes with having a mentally retarded child, or the hardships that are endured in trying to raise such a child.

I am introducing today a bill that would provide an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded, a bill that I hope would ease some of the burden that these people have to bear. I think it is appropriate while we are discussing tax cuts and deductions and rebates to consider this exemption seriously.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter which I recently received from the parents of a mentally retarded child who resides in my district. This letter presents a point of view that I am sure few of us have ever considered and it illustrates well some of the problems faced by the parents of a mentally retarded child.

The letter follows:

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter in hopes that I may express to you the great and urgent needs of retarded children and their families. The discrimination, prejudice, and

injustice that these people have to endure is a national disgrace.

We have a fifteen year old daughter, who has been 100% retarded since birth. She is not toilet trained, cannot feed herself, and does not realize danger so that one of us has to be with her at all times.

We, along with other parents of retarded children, have been trying for years to get a day care center for retarded persons here in our city. This would give the mothers of retarded children a chance to work or just get away from it all for a few minutes each day, as well as provide badly needed dental and medical care.

Please forgive me for being so crude and sounding so bitter, but after fifteen years of trying to raise our daughter in this society it seems as though all hope is lost for us as well as all other parents of retarded children. We love our child too much to put her in a state institution where she would live without the love of a family for the rest of her life. We were very young when our retarded daughter came along and it scared us to death. When the doctor told us that our daughter was mentally retarded we thought we had endured the worst thing that a young family could possibly endure. But I tell you, Sir, that was nothing compared to all of the injustice and discrimination that we have had to face ever since then just because we loved our daughter enough to keep and raise her.

Our son plays in his school band and will be participating in a concert in the park in a few weeks. All the parents will be there, that is all the parents that do not have another child at home who is retarded. Our son also plays all sports, but the only way we can get to see him play baseball and football is to park outside and look through the fence and hedges. Sir, could you imagine how it is for a mother and dad to have to park outside a ball park with a fifteen year old daughter just to get a glimpse of their son play a ballgame? That is the only way my wife and I can go together.

We also have a younger daughter who is eight years old and very normal. Last week she brought a paper home wanting parents to come to a very special P.T.A. meeting. All the parents will be there, except parents such as ourselves. How do you make an eight year old understand that the society she lives in would hinder her parents from participating in activities with their normal children simply because this prejudiced society will not recognize little retarded children as being human? Our society seems to care about all people except retarded and handicapped persons. This might sound corny to you, but it would be so very nice just to be able to leave our retarded daughter long enough for my wife, my two normal children, and myself to be able to go sit down in a cafe and eat a hamburger together, or maybe make a movie together, and it really would be wonderful to attend church together.

As you read these lines, please ask yourself the question we always seem to ponder: Will there ever be an opportunity for us to do things as a family together, or will we always have to take turns doing normal things with our normal children? Just think what it does to parents, not to mention the normal children, who have to live this way. What is so depressing is that it does not have to be this way. A day care center would provide the needs of retarded children, give their families a chance to live normal lives, and encourage other parents of retarded children to keep these children thus eliminating the need for many of those institutions to which they are sent. I believe that if these parents had an opportunity to keep these children and still be able to live a normal life, they would.

There is something else that I find very

hard to understand. This family that I work with agreed to take a handicapped child to care for and give the love of a family and family life. By agreeing to take her, they are awarded a check once a month to cover her expenses, plus all of her medical and dental needs are guaranteed to be taken care of. The thing that is so hard to understand is that a couple has to give up their child to a perfect stranger in order to have her need taken care of. If the original parents had been as graciously treated as this other couple, don't you think that they probably would have kept her?

There are thousands of retarded children put into institutions for just the same reason—their parents cannot afford to take care of their needs. A retarded child usually costs five times as much as a normal child, and our government does not even care enough to give a tax exemption for them as they do for a blind spouse. Even though our retarded daughter costs so much more to raise than a normal child, the real burden was that it cut our income in half because my wife had to quit work. At a time when we actually needed a pay increase our pay was cut in half. I ask you sir, should there be any question as to why institutions all across the country are overcrowded? Does our society or has it ever done anything to encourage families to keep these children and give them the love and protection they need and deserve?

Using tax dollars, of which parents of retarded children have to pay their fair share, the needs of normal children are fought over and cared for. They are awarded new schools, buses, parks, recreation centers, playgrounds, public swimming pools, and thousands of other programs which not only take care of their needs, but most of their whims. Children such as my daughter have no school or bus, no parks or playgrounds, and the recreation centers offer them nothing. The fact is very plain, we are forced to pay taxes so normal children and their families will be guaranteed the good life. If this is not injustice, prejudice and discrimination in the purest form, we will never see a better example. Do you think this will ever be a country of liberty and justice for all?

Please forgive me if I have written anything to degrade anyone for this was not my intention. The only reason I wrote this letter was to bring light to just a portion of the hardships that are being put on many American parents just because their child was born retarded.

Please forgive the wrinkled page but it is so hard to keep my daughter away while I am trying to write.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Speaker, I know that this bill cannot end the discrimination parents like these feel but it is an effort to reduce some of the burden that the parents of mentally retarded children must bear.

SEEKING AN ANSWER TO PATENT REFORM

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, through our nearly 200-year history, Americans have been respected for their inventiveness and their industriousness. We have been inventive in our efforts to discover practical solutions to technical problems, and we have been industrious

in our ability to apply those solutions in ways which advance our technical know-how as a Nation and improve our economic and social well-being as a people. As a result, we have developed into a strong and generous Nation and we call this growth "progress." "Progress" is a good word for characterizing the development of our Nation because it represents our willingness to take what is good from our past and build upon it to produce something better for the future.

I believe very strongly that one of the major motivating factors behind our progress is the patent system—the system we have for encouraging and rewarding intellectual contribution. Our Founding Fathers recognized the importance of insuring the participation of individuals in seeking solutions to the many problems that face a Nation. The framers of the Constitution provided a patent clause in Article I, section 8 which states that Congress shall have the power "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." The constitutional mandate has been followed throughout our history and the title 35 law, under which we have worked for more than 20 years, has guided our country through its most rapid period of growth and development.

Mr. Speaker, our patent laws have worked well for the collective good of our citizens. But experts both within and without Congress are in general agreement that reform of our patent system is not only needed but long overdue. Since 1967 numerous bills have been introduced to bring about major changes in the way in which patent applications are reviewed and processed by the U.S. Patent Office. These changes were offered as a sincere effort to make our patent system more perfect—to guarantee, if you will, that only the most thoroughly investigated ideas and inventions would pass the test of patentability and thereby protect the public from patents on inventions which, in reality, should not have been patented.

In my view, however, past proposals to completely rewrite our patent laws offered cures that were worse than the ills of our patent system. I believe this is why, after 8 years and volumes of House and Senate hearings, a patent reform bill has yet to emerge from the Congress.

I suggest that the answer to patent reform lies in improving title 35 rather than discarding that statute and the substantial body of case law which has been interpreting it for the past 20 years. Legislation I will introduce today proposes amendments to title 35 which will improve our patent procedures while preserving the basic strengths of that law.

The primary criticism of the present law centers on the procedure by which a patent application is examined and approved by the Patent Office without any opportunity for interested third parties—the public—to point out prior art or other information which is known to them, but which was not discovered by the Patent Office. Under our present pro-

cedure, it is possible for patents to issue which have an appearance of being more significant than they really are. This places a burden on the public to sort out the good from the bad, and prolonged litigation and great expense can fall on both the patent owner and a challenging party when they attempt to determine the true scope of an invention claimed in a given patent.

The cures which have been offered were overwhelming in their efforts to achieve perfection prior to final issuance of a patent. For example, under some patent reform proposals before the last Congress, the public at large would have been allowed to oppose issuance of patents in a manner which contemplated extensive discovery and hearing procedures. Costs would have mounted for patent owners and the Patent Office. There would have been long delays in the final issuance of patents. And defective patents would still have been issued if the opposition procedure were not used by parties holding back relevant information from the Patent Office.

The overall impact of such proposals would have been to so increase the costs of obtaining patent protection that individual inventors would be discouraged from using the patent system at all and corporate research departments might well choose to keep their research efforts secret. We would lose one of the primary benefits of our patent system; namely, the early disclosure of new ideas.

By comparison, under present law the incentive of a patent grant exists largely because a patent can be obtained at a reasonable cost. If patents become too expensive to obtain, the mandate of our constitution would not be met and we would retreat from the type of progress that has marked our Nation's history. We risk becoming less enterprising as a people and we might find ourselves waiting for other nations to supply needed technology and solutions.

Mr. Speaker, my bill suggests that we build upon our present law to provide for public participation in the patenting process in a way that will be reasonable in terms of cost and still encourage the participation by those who are in a position to be of real help toward our objective of issuing only valid patents. My proposed amendments to title 35 would establish a new procedure having the following characteristics:

First. Each patent application will be fully examined by the U.S. Patent Office, as it is now, to determine patentability of whatever invention is described in the application.

Second. After patentability has been approved, pertinent information from the patent application will be published for a period of time, and the record of the patent application will be laid open for public inspection.

Third. During the period of time the application is open for public inspection, any person or party can notify the Patent Office of any new information which is known to them relevant to the patentability of the invention. This information becomes a permanent part of the record of the patent application, and the public and the patent owner can see

and evaluate the importance of any such information submitted.

Fourth. At the end of the public inspection period, the patent applicant will have a right to cancel claims or amend claims in a way which will narrow their definitions, but there will be no necessary reopening of examination of the patent application. The Commissioner of Patents will have the discretionary right to reexamine applications in situations which he may choose to define in Patent Office regulations, but the intended procedure will be one which does not unreasonably delay the ultimate issuance of the patent and which does not place a heavy cost burden on the applicant, on the Patent Office, or on the general public.

Fifth. Then, the patent will issue. Just as under title 35, the issued patent will carry a strong presumption of validity as to all matters considered and reviewed by the Patent Office during the formal examination of the application. But it will carry no presumption of validity as to the information submitted during the public inspection period which is not considered or reviewed by the Patent Office in a formal reexamination. Thus, patents will be issued with any potential weaknesses fully exposed for everyone to see and to evaluate.

The Patent Office will not attempt to resolve all of these weaknesses because they do not have the staff capability that would be required to essentially litigate every patent application in the Patent Office prior to issuance; and it would be futile to try. The most prolonged and costly review of each patent application could not hope to guarantee its validity. But we can expose as much as can be found by the public and by the Patent Office so that the final document can be more realistically evaluated without resorting to costly litigation in every case.

Sixth. It is important that we somehow encourage public participation in the patenting process so that relevant information will not be intentionally withheld for perhaps a better time and a different forum. The amendments I am introducing today face up to this potential problem by giving courts the discretionary right to assess part or all of the costs and attorneys fees of a later challenge of validity based upon information which was intentionally withheld from the Patent Office during the public inspection period. Those parties who deliberately choose not to participate in the interparties phase of my proposed procedure, and thereby may affect the issuance of a patent of questionable validity, do so at the risk of substantially higher litigation costs should those parties ever be involved in litigating that patent. In this fashion, we protect the patent owner from the heavy cost burden of learning about relevant prior art for the first time during a trial of his rights, when the same information should have been submitted to the Patent Office during the public participation period.

Seventh. A final characteristic of this procedure is its flexibility. If it is deemed desirable that the reexamination procedure be "post issuance" rather than "post allowance" as presently proposed, it can

readily be modified into a "post issuance" procedure without losing any of the important benefits I have described.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges confronting our Nation cannot be overcome unless we encourage and motivate creative minds to come forward with practical solutions. We can do this in part by preserving what is good in our patent system and by avoiding overkill reactions to its weaknesses. I offer my bill in hopes that it will contribute to the successful resolution of the patent reform issue.

V.F.W. CONTRIBUTES TO YOUTH APPRECIATION OF U.S. SYSTEM

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, at no time in history has it been more important that young Americans be encouraged to understand and appreciate the privilege and responsibility of citizenship in this unique Republic. It is upon their shoulders that the burden of national decision and leadership must soon fall.

Few programs contribute more richly to this objective than the Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxilliary. This program was originated 28 years ago by the broadcasting industry and by the U.S. Office of Education. It has enjoyed the continuing support of the National and State Associations of Broadcasters and of Secondary School Principals.

To all of the individuals involved in all of these organizations, as well as to participating students and their parents, I offer appreciation and commendation. The program's vehicle is an annual national radio script writing contest. This contest provides an opportunity for 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in our public, private, and parochial schools to think, write, and speak out for the principles of freedom and opportunity upon which our Nation was constituted.

This year's theme, "My Responsibility as a Citizen," was particularly appropriate. It inspired the entry of nearly a half million students in the competition.

In this competition, in which winners move from high school to State to national levels, each State winner receives an all-expense trip to Washington where, between March 7 and 12, he competes for one of five national scholarships, the optimum of which is worth \$10,000.

These visits also afford opportunities for the competitors to meet their Senators and Representatives in the Congress; to observe personally the workings of their Federal Government, and to visit the shrines and monuments to our American heritage.

I am pleased, particularly, that the State winner from Arkansas, Rex Alan Rains, son of a retired U.S. military man, resides in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent in this body.

I congratulate him, and I congratulate his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mitchell A. Rains, of Harrison, Ark. I am looking forward to meeting with Rex during his visit here and, quite obviously, I wish him success in his quest for national victory.

Meanwhile, I submit his State prize-winning script for the consideration of my colleagues:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of a civilization, it expects what never was and what never will be."

These are the words of Thomas Jefferson, and on how he speaks of our country today. Today we stand in one of our most apathetic ages in political history.

To stop apathy, I think that as a citizen I should try to get involved within myself, in my community, and finally in my country.

To begin with myself I should strive for involvement and should want Americanism. In American heritage—Louis Adamic states that "At its best Americanism is nobody's monopoly, but a happy concentrate of some of the highest aspirations and tendencies of humanity at its best nearly everywhere at one time or another. As it seems to me, it is the highest body of idealism in the world today. It is, among other things, a movement away from primitive racism, fear and nationalism, and herd instincts and mentality, a movement toward freedom, creativeness, and a universal or pan-human culture. In helping ourselves and in striving for Americanism, we should worship the God of our choice. For a diplomat from a neighboring country once said, "You take the Goodness out of America—and America will no longer be a great country."

Secondly in my community, I should be very active, for the community is the backbone of our great democratic society. Last year I worked for Muscular Dystrophy, and raised money for needy families, for I think that kindness is one of our great responsibilities in our community. Working for a candidate is also a way of involvement. A few years ago I worked for a Congressman in my precinct. This next election I will vote for the candidate of my choice, for I believe that voting is the greatest responsibility that I have. But the most important responsibility in our community is harmony, for without harmony there cannot be unity—without unity there is no involvement.

Finally, in our country we should be involved with the matters of the day—even in the times of Watergate and Depression we should be involved.

I once heard a story about an owner of a football team who wanted to see what made an athlete great. So he hired a renowned psychiatrist to do a prolonged study on his athletes to find the answer. After months of tests, questions and trials, the doctor found this answer—A great athlete is one who plays when he's hurt.

I believe that we can relate this story to us as Americans. In our troubles and problems we should work and strive for involvement and betterment for our nation. And in doing all these things we may finally be able to say again that our country is one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**NO AGREEMENT MIGHT BE
BETTER**

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the recent arms control agreement entered into be-

tween the United States and the Soviet Union at Vladivostok is of vital concern to us all. Both Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of Defense Schlesinger have assured the Congress that this agreement will greatly add to "the momentum of détente" without endangering the defense of the United States.

There are some of us, Mr. Speaker, who are not yet entirely convinced that the present policies which are called "détente" are all in the best interests of this country.

I would urge all of our colleagues seeking more information on this complex problem to study a thoughtful article recently published in the Armed Forces Journal International, January 1975. The author is Dr. James Dornan, chairman of the Politics Department in the Catholic University of America who has recently returned from a year in Europe as a NATO fellow.

Dr. Dornan points out that—

The arguments that the Vladivostok agreement rectified the strategic imbalances permitted by SALT I and also put a cap on the strategic arms race are inaccurate and misleading. The accord merely accelerates a shift toward qualitative improvements in weapons systems and away from increments in the size of strategic forces. Depending upon the mood of Congress and the American public, the United States will either fall short of the permitted equality in numbers of delivery vehicles, MIRVs, and throw-weight, or be forced to match existing and future Soviet achievements in these areas, at enormous cost.

I am inclined to see merit in the author's conclusion that too many of our policymakers are overeager for agreements with the Soviet Union and thus do not secure agreements in the interests of both countries which will thereby last. There may well be, as this author suggests, several good reasons for arguing that no agreement at this time would be better than the one we have.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will take the time to read this important article and make up their own minds:

**VLADIVOSTOK ACCORD MAY MAKE SOVIETS
STRONGER AT U.S. EXPENSE—MAYBE NO
AGREEMENT WOULD BE BETTER**

(By James E. Dornan, Jr.)

From the point of view of arms control, the recent Vladivostok agreement was largely a bit of sleight of hand. It neither puts a cap on the arms race, nor solves the most important strategic problem facing the U.S.

It could mean that the Soviet Union will soon possess a large counterforce—capable striking force able to threaten American land-based missiles—while the U.S. will have no comparable capability.

At the same time, it creates the appearance of progress while ignoring or deferring real problems. It thus may further contribute to the growing euphoria about Soviet-American relations which is undermining support within Congress and among the public for defense programs adequate to protect the vital interests of the United States.

The agreement is intended to supplement, extend, and in some key particulars supplant the Interim Agreement on Offensive Weapons signed in Moscow in 1972. The latter will be operative until October of 1977; at that point the new agreement will come into effect and govern the military balance between the two superpowers until December 31, 1985.

The SALT II accord, as it is already being called, establishes a ceiling of 2400 on the total number of strategic delivery vehicles permitted each power. For purposes of this agreement strategic bombers are to be included within that total. As part of that overall ceiling, each side is permitted to deploy an aggregate number of 1320 missiles with Multiple Independently-Targeted Re-entry Vehicles. Each side can determine for itself how many of these MIRVed missiles are to be of the land-based and how many of the sea-based variety. Neither side shall construct additional silos beyond the levels permitted by SALT I, and the limits on the number of silos designed for heavy land-based missiles contained in SALT I are also retained. Aside from these restrictions, each side is permitted "freedom to mix," that is, each side can determine its own force requirements for numbers of bombers, land-based missiles, and sea-launched missiles. The numerical limits on SLBMs imposed by SALT I are thus abandoned, subject only to the 2400 ceiling.

There have been some reports that the agreement bans air-mobile ICBMs; other accounts assert only that should either side deploy land-mobile missiles or air-mobile missiles with a range of more than 360 miles, such missiles will be counted against the permitted total of 2400 delivery vehicles. If the latter interpretation is correct, there are no limits on U.S. SRAM deployments.

The Vladivostok agreement places no limits on U.S. acquisition of smaller bombers such as the FB-111 nor does it restrict our development of new cruise missiles for deployment of U.S. surface ships. Forward-based aircraft in Europe are not counted under U.S. totals, and similar Soviet systems are not counted.

Finally it has been reported that the provision of SALT I which limits increases in missile silo size to 15% is retained in the Vladivostok agreement. The Soviets have interpreted the SALT I clause as allowing increases of 15% in both the diameter and the depth of missile silos and it does not appear that this ambiguity was resolved at Vladivostok. The measures necessary to verify compliance with all of the provisions of the accord have not yet been settled and are to be negotiated in coming months.

Administration spokesmen have praised the agreement because it is based on the principle that each side has a right to an equal number of strategic delivery vehicles. This, it is said, is a substantial improvement over certain features of SALT I, which froze us in a position of inferiority to the U.S.S.R. in numbers of both ICBM and SLBM launchers.

It is noteworthy first of all that the language of the Vladivostok Accord which limits the weapons permitted each side is different from the comparable terminology in the SALT I agreement. SALT I, contrary to popular misconception, regulates only numbers of launchers (silos and submarine tubes), not numbers of missile or delivery vehicles. The underlying assumption of SALT I seemed to be that missile numbers could be controlled by limiting numbers of silos, since a silo could for all practical purposes be used only once. This will not be the case, however, once the Soviets have perfected their cold-launch technique and have developed a rapid reload, rapid re-fire capability, allowing them to quickly reuse the silo by inserting extra missiles stored nearby.

It is not yet clear whether SALT II is intended to deprive the Soviet Union of that option, or whether the new language limiting delivery vehicles rather than launchers simply reflects the fact that bombers are now to be included within the aggregate force levels: it would have been awkward—and somewhat inaccurate—to refer to a bomber as a launcher. If the new agreement does prevent the Soviets from deploying more

than one missile per silo, it represents a major step forward, although it remains to be seen how such a restriction could be enforced.

Under SALT I, the Soviets were permitted to deploy a maximum of 1618 ICBMs to 1054 for the United States. Similarly, the Soviets were allowed 740 SLBM launchers to 656 for the U.S. Old ICBMs (and, in the case of the U.S.S.R., certain old SLBMs as well) could be cashed in and exchanged for new SLBM launchers. Were the latter option fully exercised, the United States could reach an overall total of 1000 ICBMs and 710 SLBMs, while the Soviet Union would be allowed 1408 ICBMs and 950 SLBMs on modern nuclear submarines. Available evidence indicates that the U.S.S.R. is in the process of exercising the conversion options permitted by SALT I.

The Soviet Union also possesses 140 bombers to be counted as strategic vehicles under the Vladivostok terms. If their number is added to that of the ICBMs and SLBMs permitted the Soviet Union by SALT I, the total Soviet force would reach 2,498, 98 above the level agreed to at SALT II. At some point, therefore, the Soviets will have to decide how to bring their force levels within the 2400 limit. Several options are available. They could simply fail to acquire all of the new SLBMs permitted by SALT I. The impact of this move could be softened if the older H-class submarines with their 30 SLBM tubes were replaced with modern boats and SLBMs. Alternatively, they might phase out some of their early-model SS-11 ICBMs. Or they could scrap up to 98 of their existing bombers, which are obsolete and not considered to be effective weapons systems in any case. The latter option is most likely. Reports indicate that the new swing-wing Backfire bomber, now coming into service, is not to be counted as a strategic delivery vehicle for purposes of SALT II. Newer versions of the Backfire apparently have intercontinental range, and the Soviets doubtless plan to make it the mainstay of their air-striking force in the future.

Even more detailed computations are necessary in order to determine the effects of the Vladivostok agreement upon U.S. force levels. A key facet of the agreement is its provision that U.S. heavy bombers are to be included within the overall strategic delivery vehicle limit. The effects of this provision are obscured by the widespread disagreement published reports concerning precisely which American bombers are to be counted within the Vladivostok force limits.

In any case, there are serious objections to counting a bomber as the equivalent of a missile in calculations of strategic strength. If used in a nuclear assault against the U.S.S.R., the U.S. bomber force would be required to penetrate the Soviets' highly efficient air defense systems, and would certainly incur heavy losses. Assertions that a U.S. strategic force 25% of which consists of bombers is the equivalent of a Soviet force which may consist totally of missiles are therefore extremely disingenuous.

If all of the B-52s, including those used strictly for training purposes and those in mothballs, are counted and added to the total number of ballistic missile launchers in the American arsenal, the United States presently possesses approximately 2,260 strategic delivery vehicles of all types. Thus, the principal short-term effect of the Vladivostok accord is to give us the privilege of counting our long-range bombers in calculating the strategic balance. We are also permitted to add up to 140 additional delivery vehicles to our present force. Since SALT II bans the construction of new land-based silos, such additions will doubtless be either new bombers, presumably of the B-1 variety, or submarine-launched ballistic missiles of the Trident type.

Because the agreement allows freedom to

mix within the 2400 delivery vehicle limit (subject only to the MIRV sublimit), the United States is also permitted to replace some—or all, if it chooses—of its old bombers with sea-launched ballistic missiles. Since the MIRV sublimit restricts the numbers of Tridents which can be deployed, some or all of the Polaris missile submarines will almost certainly be retained in service longer than planned. Additional B-1s beyond the planned purchase of 244 might also be added to the U.S. Force.

Both the B-1 and the Trident systems, however, are proving to be enormously expensive, and Congressional support for both programs may be waning. Moreover, neither Mr. Ford nor Mr. Kissinger have indicated any intention of recommending to the Congress substantial additions to the present U.S. strategic forces. The delivery vehicle equality guaranteed the U.S. by SALT II may for this reason alone prove illusory.

Thus, the Vladivostok agreement does modify some of the more objectionable provisions of SALT I. In particular, the U.S. can now acquire more SLBMs, while the Soviets are frozen at approximately their present missile launcher levels until 1985. But there is little likelihood that real equality in strategic force levels will be achieved, given political realities in the United States; this is particularly true if allowances are made for the fact that a significant proportion of the American force will for years to come consist of aging bombers of decreasing strategic value.

In defending the Vladivostok agreement, Administration spokesmen have emphasized that it provides for equality in numbers of MIRVed missiles, at a level of 1320 for each side. The United States had planned to deploy 496 Poseidon and 550 Minuteman III missiles by 1977; to that total we may now add, during the lifetime of SALT II, up to 224 Trident missiles (originally intended to be deployed or replacements for non-MIRVed Polaris missiles, under the terms of SALT I). It is thus argued that in this key index of military power, there is no longer a danger that the Soviets can surpass American totals, creating in the process either a real military danger for the United States or an appearance of superiority for the U.S.S.R. which the Soviets might exploit in crisis situations.

This argument, too, deserves the most careful examination. As noted earlier, if the Soviets build up to the maximum number of launchers permitted by SALT I and exercise all the conversion options permitted by that agreement, they would have available 1408 ICBM launchers by 1977. Of these, the Defense Department has estimated that approximately 1318 would be launchers for SS-9 and SS-11 missiles, the types soon to be replaced by the larger MIRVed missiles now being tested. It thus seems clear how the number 1320 was settled upon at Vladivostok: once again, as in SALT I, planned Soviet deployment levels became the "limits" each side was allowed to reach. Under the agreement, the Soviets are free to MIRV all ICBMs placed in the new launchers. It is likely that they will do so, despite the hope of Secretary Schlesinger that they will "send some of their MIRVs to sea." Soviet strategic doctrine during the last decade has emphasized the need for both counterforce and countervalue options; and the Vladivostok accord, when combined with the relevant SALT I provisions, affords them the opportunity for a large countervalue force based on 950 SLBMs, plus a significant counterforce capability based on 1320 MIRVed ICBMs.

This latter point is crucial to any evaluation of the claim that the Vladivostok Agreement guarantees the United States equality in numbers of MIRVed missiles. That claim is true as far as it goes, but it ignores the most significant feature of the agreement: it permits—in fact, virtually guarantees—So-

viet superiority in numbers of MIRVed warheads on land-based missiles. Moreover, these warheads will be larger than their U.S. counterparts, and thus more counterforce-effective. The reason has to do with the greater throw-weight of Russian missiles. As has often been pointed out, existing Russian ICBMs have a substantially greater throw-weight than American models; the Soviet advantage will be even greater when the replacement missiles now being tested are deployed. The SS-9 is to be replaced by the SS-18, with a throw-weight half again as large; the SS-19 has a throw-weight six times that of the SS-11.

If the U.S.S.R. chooses to miniaturize its warheads in the American manner, it will be able to deploy during the lifetime of the Vladivostok agreements over 27,000 warheads, a substantially larger number of warheads than the United States. Given their interest in the development of a counterforce capability, it is more likely that the Soviet will choose to deploy a smaller number of higher yield weapons. The U.S. may therefore retain an advantage in total numbers of warheads deployed on all delivery vehicles—particularly if one includes in the American total the SRAM warheads to be deployed on our strategic bomber force.

But even if this proves to be the case, the Soviets will possess a substantial and highly visible counterforce-capable striking force able to threaten U.S. land-based missiles, and the United States will not possess a similar capability. Thus in this key area of military strength, the Soviets will have achieved superiority, for possible use in intimidating the United States or its allies during international crises and for intrawar deterrence in the event of conflict between the superpowers. Serious questions must therefore be raised concerning Secretary Schlesinger's assertion that the throw-weight issue "deals with the issue of arms stability rather than the issue of equality or arms balance." Clearly it deals with both. Neither is the throw-weight issue "something of a phoney," as Secretary Kissinger has claimed. On the contrary, it is the most important of the several strategic problems facing the United States in the post-SALT period, and that problem was not addressed by the Vladivostok accord.

In responding to such criticisms, Administration spokesmen have argued that the agreement does not prevent the United States from deploying larger missiles in its own silos, or otherwise increasing the size and overall effectiveness of re-entry vehicles used with existing missiles. Indeed, research and development on a new missile and on more powerful and more accurate warheads is already underway. It remains uncertain in the extreme, however, whether the United States will ever come close to matching the Soviets in these areas. Congress has long been skeptical about the desirability of programs to improve the counterforce-effectiveness of the U.S. land-based missile force; the new Congress is likely to be even more so. In fact, the Ford Administration itself appears far from committed to such programs. Even Secretary Schlesinger, in his December 6th press conference in which he defended the Vladivostok accord, did not commit himself to achieving equality with the Soviets in missile throw-weight, and Mr. Kissinger is known to harbor doubts about the desirability of counterforce strategies and targeting doctrines.

In dealing with the throw-weight issue at his recent press conference, the Secretary of Defense observed that should the Soviets proceed to MIRV 1320 of their land-based missiles, the United States might respond by reducing our Minuteman force, and adding more SLBMs or bombers. This would diminish the overall vulnerability of the American second-strike force, while increas-

ing the vulnerability of those land-based missiles which we retained. Under such circumstances, the strategic flexibility afforded the U.S. by the existing mix of delivery systems would be reduced. Our ability to acquire a more effective counterforce capability would also be complicated, since it is more difficult to develop the requisite accuracy on sea-based missiles. Finally, should the United States base more of its deterrent force at sea or rely to a greater extent on manned bombers, we would be inviting the Soviet Union to invest more resources in ASW forces and in air defense, thus in the long run rendering the sea and air portions of the triad more vulnerable as well.

Thus the arguments that the Vladivostok agreement rectified the strategic imbalances permitted by SALT I and also put a cap on the strategic arms race are inaccurate and misleading. The accord merely accelerates a shift toward qualitative improvements in weapons systems and away from increments in the size of strategic forces. Depending on the mood of Congress and the American public, the United States will either fall short of the permitted equality in numbers of delivery vehicles, MIRVs, and throw-weight, or be forced to match existing and future Soviet achievements in these areas at enormous cost.

The Vladivostok accord thus appears to be another manifestation of Mr. Kissinger's belief that any agreement with the Soviets is better than none, because agreements contribute something called the "momentum of detente." It may be time to reevaluate this contention; indeed, there are several good reasons for arguing that no agreement would be better than this one. At the very least, there are good reasons to urge that the American negotiators be sent back to the table to gain Soviet acceptance of an arms control treaty which truly enhances the strategic security of both powers.

AN APPEAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I was in South Vietnam and Cambodia with the congressional delegation. Our mission, which was endorsed by the President and the Speaker of the House, was to make an estimate of the need and effectiveness of further American assistance. While I was in South Vietnam, I was given a resolution by members of various private voluntary agencies and I feel an obligation to do as they asked—to communicate to the Members of the House their views concerning the situation in South Vietnam. These are their views, not mine, but the issue of aid to South Vietnam is so important that all views should be heard.

The material follows:

AN APPEAL FOR PEACE—TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the undersigned individuals, are members of private voluntary agencies who are presently engaged in social welfare service in South Viet Nam. Some of us have been in this country only a short time; some of us for over a decade. We are therapists, nurses, doctors, administrators, missionaries, educators, relief workers, agriculturalists, and technicians. What we share is the desire to see peace return to this troubled land of Viet Nam.

We were much encouraged with the sign-

ing of the Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Viet Nam two years ago. We hoped against hope this Agreement would mark a new day of peace for Viet Nam. Unfortunately, while we have seen all the parties to the Agreement implement those provisions perceived to be in their interest, we have at the same time witnessed all sides violate other provisions perceived not to be in their interest. The result of these violations in each case is that the common folk, the people we have come to serve, have been hurt.

In the two years since the Paris Agreement was signed, over a million persons have been made homeless. Over 150,000 persons have lost their lives. This two-year death toll is three times the number of Americans killed in the ten years of U.S. military involvement here.

In the face of this high level of warfare, we learn that the Administration in Washington has requested Congress to approve additional military aid for Viet Nam. We want to register our concern that introducing increased military supplies into Indochina will not bring closer the day of peace for this country. A new round of military escalation will only increase the suffering of the Vietnamese people and preclude any chances for a negotiated political settlement.

Rather than approving more military material, we encourage you as a member of Congress to pursue more positive and constructive alternatives:

Call for a reconvening of the 12-party International Conference established to guarantee the Paris Agreement in an attempt to persuade all supplying parties to reduce, rather than increase, the level of military aid to the warring parties in Viet Nam.

Examine what influence the United States may be able to bring to bear on establishing the National Council of National Reconciliation and Concord which would enjoin the Republic of Viet Nam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government, and a third political segment to settle their differences politically.

Take new positive steps by which the United States will attempt to bind the wounds of war in all zones of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

In the name of humanity, and for the sake of the people of Indochina, we appeal to you to "seek what makes for peace."

Signees of "An Appeal For Peace" from private, voluntary agency personnel to the Congress of the United States:

Ann Ewert, Nurse, John Willms, Medical Doctor, Frances Willms, Nurse, Tom Hoskins, Medical Doctor, Julie Forsythe, Hospital Coordinator, Hiro Ichikawa, Community Development Worker, Paul Quinn-Judge, Program Assistant, Sophie Quinn-Judge, Program Assistant, Jim Klassen, Administrative Assistant, Keith Brinton, Program Director, Claudis Krich, Program Director, Arlene Stauffer, Missionary, James K. Stauffer, Missionary, William Herod, Missionary, Margaret Herod, Missionary, Earl Martin, Community Development, Patricia H. Martin, Community Development, Wallace Ewert, Agriculturist, Claire Ewert, Community Development, Mike Devadoss, Laboratory Technician, Doris Devadoss, Secretary, Max Ediger, Social Worker, Jean Hershey, Nurse, Murray Hiebert, Social Worker, Linda Hiebert, Nurse, Luke Martin, Program Director.

SECURITIES REFORM ACT OF 1975

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the securities industry in this country is in the

midst of change. Some of these changes will take the form of refining certain "housekeeping" procedures. Most of these are spelled out in H.R. 10, the recently introduced Securities Reform Act of 1975, which is identical to the omnibus securities bill reported almost unanimously by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee late in the 93d Congress.

Other changes which the securities industry and markets will be experiencing in the very near future will result in significant structural changes. Some of these will be brought about by the unfixing of Commission rates, by virtue of the Securities and Exchange Commission's adoption of rule 19b-3 last week, and by the establishment of a national securities market system for securities trading as provided for in title VI of H.R. 10. The bill directs the SEC to establish such a system which is to include, as a minimum, a transactional reporting system, a composite quotation system, and a scheme of regulation to provide for fair competition between competitors in the system.

The development and implementation of these three aspects of the national securities market system is no easy undertaking. How this is accomplished will impact directly on the viability of the securities industry, the corporations raising capital through the equities markets, and the public investors who directly or indirectly commit their funds to the growth of America's publicly owned companies. Given the nature of this undertaking, whose outcome is uncertain from the outset, and given the tremendous impact which the national securities market system will have on the markets, the securities industry, and public investors, an impact those of us who are committed to this undertaking wish to be favorable, I have introduced today a bill which would create the National Market Board. The board would contribute to the development of the national securities market system, and it would be responsible for the system's operation and regulation.

The board would serve these purposes by performing three functions. Upon appointment of the initial 15 members, the board would become the advisory body to the Commission on the development of the national securities market system. At the same time the board would transmit to the Commission its views on significant regulatory proposals of the Commission or any self-regulatory organization relating to the fairness, honesty, and efficiency of the markets for trading in securities.

The third function of the board—governing the national securities market system—would be acquired after the board or the Commission made a finding that it is in the public interest to centralize the governance of the system in a national self-regulatory body. Upon such a finding, which could be made at any time, the board would promptly file with the Commission a proposed constitution and proposed rules.

The Commission would then have 120 days to allow interested parties to make oral and written submissions on the proposed constitution and rules and to approve or require modifications. Upon ap-

proval, the board would then have the authority to regulate and govern the system, subject to Commission oversight. Existing self-regulatory bodies would continue to perform those regulatory functions not assumed by the board.

The board would have the authority to assess members, participants in, and users of the system reasonable fees to finance the cost of the board's operations. Until the board becomes the self-regulator for the national securities market system and self-financing, the bill provides for a modest sum to be added to the Commission's authorization in order to provide for staffing any office space.

One of the major advantages of the Board is that it would introduce a greater degree of flexibility into the system's operational and regulatory framework. Subject to SEC and congressional oversight, the Board would be in a position to react quickly and in the public interest to day-to-day management and regulatory problems while also being in a position to evaluate the system and anticipate problems without waiting on Congress for enabling legislation.

The second major advantage of such a board is its advisory function to the commission on the development of a national securities market system. There is much talk about the evolution of a "system," but no one really knows what that evolution will entail. As a statutorily recognized advisory body to the Commission on both the development of the system and proposed Commission regulations affecting the trading of securities in the Nation's capital markets, the securities industry, and the public would be assured of maximum involvement in guiding the system's evolution.

A third advantage is the clear delineation of regulatory responsibility for the national securities market system. The board would not add another regulatory layer; rather it would prevent the occurrence of either overlapping regulatory responsibilities or a void of self-regulatory authority. My bill would accomplish this by providing that the national securities exchanges and the National Association of Securities Dealers would continue to perform those self-regulatory functions not performed by the Board. The Board's authority would be limited to the national securities market system.

Before inserting the text of the bill, it should be pointed out that I have introduced the proposal in bill form in order to facilitate the solicitation of comment and review. I plan to offer this bill as a substitute for section 601(e) of title VI of H.R. 4111 when it comes before the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In reviewing and commenting on this proposal, I would encourage interested parties to focus on: First, the need for a self-regulatory body for the national securities market system—an industry board with public representation—and second, the areas of the system over which the self-regulatory body should be granted jurisdiction in order to insure that the system operates smoothly, in the public interest, and with an eye toward future needs. After these major substantive points are addressed, then

I think it would be helpful to comment on other provisions such as how many board members there should be, how they should be elected, who they should represent, and so forth.

We are fast approaching the implementation of key elements of the national securities market system. I would hope that if there is no consensus over other matters, there would at least be consensus on the need to stop haggling over who would have veto power and who should receive special privileges in the system.

I would also hope that this proposal coupled with agreements hammered out last Congress on provisions of H.R. 4111 would be recognized as positive steps in the direction of designing the new system before it designs itself in a fashion which may be detrimental to the securities industry, listed corporations, public investors, and the Nation's capital markets.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. 4457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended by inserting after section 15A (15 U.S.C. 78o-3) the following new section:

"NATIONAL MARKET BOARD

"Sec. 15B. (a) The Congress finds and recognizes—

"(1) that our country's capital markets are an important national asset;

"(2) that changing conditions and trading patterns have placed considerable strain on existing market mechanisms;

"(3) that in order to preserve and strengthen our capital markets, a national system (the 'System') for the trading of securities should be established;

"(4) that it is in the national interest to assure the vitality and strength of the nation's securities markets and to take all practicable steps to encourage a free and adequate flow of capital to the economy of the United States;

"(5) that a national system for the clearance and settlement of securities, wherever traded, should be established as part of the System; and

"(6) that a single national self-regulatory body may be appropriate to govern and operate the System, subject to oversight and regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"(b) The Commission is authorized, therefore, having due regard for the public interest, the protection of investors, the need to assure fair dealing in securities, the maintenance of fair, honest, and orderly markets, and the need to provide and foster competition in our capital markets, to facilitate the establishment of the System.

"(c) To facilitate the establishment and governance of a national market system, in accordance with this section, within 180 days after the effective date of the Securities Reform Act of 1975, or at such earlier date as the Commission may determine to be appropriate for the purposes of this title, the Commission shall appoint a National Market Board ('Board').

"(d) (1) In carrying out its responsibilities under subsection (c), the Commission shall appoint a Board of fifteen members, a majority of whom may, in the Commission's discretion, be persons active in the securities industry as brokers and dealers, market makers, and specialists, and the remainder of whom shall be representative of the public who, to the extent feasible, shall have knowledge of the nation's capital markets.

"(2) Nothing in this subsection or otherwise shall be construed to vest in any person any right to seek judicial review of the Com-

mission's exercise of discretion in selecting the members of the Board.

"(3) The Commission shall appoint the members of the Board for a term not to exceed two years, after which time the members of the Board shall be appointed pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, or as otherwise provided in rules adopted by the Commission pursuant to this subsection.

"(e) (1) The Board is authorized and directed to study and advise the Commission of the steps it finds appropriately should be taken, by the Commission, the securities industry, the Congress or otherwise, to facilitate the development of the System. For this purpose, the Board shall be given access by the Commission to any documents in the possession of the Commission, or obtainable by the Commission, if the disclosure of such document is deemed by the Commission (i) to be relevant to the functions of the Board and (ii) not inconsistent with the public interest. For the purposes of performing the functions set forth in this paragraph, the Board shall assume the responsibilities of, and the documents prepared for or by, any advisory committee, in existence at the time of the establishment of the Board, appointed to advise the Commission on the implementation of the System.

"(2) The Board shall have, as a continuing responsibility, the obligation to furnish the Commission with its view on significant regulatory proposals of the Commission or any self-regulatory organization relating to the fairness, honesty and efficiency of the markets for the trading in securities.

"(f) (1) If the Board or the Commission determines that it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest to centralize the governance of any System, implemented pursuant to this section in the Board as a self-regulatory body, the Board shall promptly file with the Commission a proposed constitution and proposed rules which provide, among other things, for fair and equitable procedures for the Board to accomplish the foregoing.

"(2) The proposed constitution and rules shall be published for comment by the Commission in the manner provided by section 553, of title 5, United States Code, for rule-making not on the record, except that the Commission shall give interested persons an opportunity for the oral presentation of data, views, or arguments, in addition to an opportunity to make written submissions. Such expression of views shall be requested not only with respect to the proposed constitution and rules of the Board, but also with respect to the determination that it is either necessary or appropriate in the public interest to centralize the governance of the System in a self-regulatory body created for that purpose.

"(3) No later than one hundred and twenty days after the filing of the proposed constitution and rules with the Commission, or within such longer period of time as the Commission determines to be appropriate, the Commission shall adopt a rule either approving the proposed constitution and rules or requiring specific additions, modifications of, or amendments to, such constitution and rules, or the Commission shall issue a finding that it is not appropriate or necessary to authorize the Board to assume part or all of the responsibility of governing the System at that time.

"(4) If the Commission shall approve or modify the proposed constitution and rules of the Board pursuant to this subsection—

"(A) the Board shall have the authority to regulate and govern the system, subject to Commission oversight;

"(B) the Board shall assume those powers, privileges, rights, and obligations granted to, or imposed upon, national securities exchanges and national securities associations registered with the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect on the day after the enactment of the Securities

Reform Act of 1975, which the rules of the Board provide shall be assumed by it;

"(C) all self-regulatory functions performed by the national securities exchanges and national securities associations which are not, pursuant to the rules of the Board, assumed by the Board shall continue to be performed by the national securities exchanges and national securities associations subject to Commission oversight; and

"(D) the Commission shall have the same authority over the Board as it has over the national securities exchanges and national securities associations registered with it, pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect on the day after the enactment of the Securities Reform Act of 1975.

"(g) In addition to the authority assumed by the Board pursuant to subsection (f), the Board shall have the authority to assess members and participants in, as well as users of the System, reasonable fees to finance the costs of the Board's operations.

"(h) Commencing with its creation within six months from the date of the enactment of the Securities Reform Act of 1975, the Commission is authorized to allocate to the Board from the Commission's budget the sum of \$300,000 to hire staff, rent office space and generally organize to carry out the functions set forth in this section.

"(i) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$300,000 to carry out the functions of this section."

QUINCY, MASS., HERITAGE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following is the final instalment of a series of articles on Quincy, Mass. During the past several days I have been pleased to bring the Bicentennial activities in Quincy to the attention of my distinguished colleagues. Hopefully the dedication and enthusiasm of my constituents in Quincy will provide inspiration to others throughout the country as we approach the Bicentennial.

The articles follow:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Sun, Jan. 16, 1975]
HISTORICAL SOCIETY COLLECTIONS SOON TO GO ON EXHIBIT

(By Paul Harold)

As the city prepares to celebrate its 350th anniversary, the Quincy Historical Society is entering upon a new era with the completion of the Adams Academy project.

The society will now have a permanent home to operate from and expand its activities. The society's extensive collection will be put on display for the first time and its library and reference materials will be available for research.

Work with the schools, long an important part of the society's program, will be expanded with the facilities available in the library-museum. The renovation and restoration of the old school house (1872) will allow for the old building to serve a new use while preserving an important Quincy landmark.

And while moving-day is still a few months off, work has already been done to make sure items in the collection are properly catalogued and stored.

Under the direction of Doris Oberg, the library committee has been working literally

for years in anticipation of the opening. Besides organizing current materials, the committee has been setting up resources necessary to handle new acquisitions, of almost any type. And with the assistance of a professional preservationist, members have been trained to care for the most delicate items.

A grant from the Massachusetts Arts and Humanities Foundation, Inc. provided for the services of Paul Molitor, the society's library-museum consultant.

Recently, the Board of Curators named Lawrence Yerdon, a teacher at the Woodward School, as director of the library-museum.

The membership of the society has kept pace with its expanding role, and under the leadership of membership chairman William O'Connell, the membership has passed the 1,000 mark. This is the largest membership in the 82 years of the society and is believed to be one of the largest in New England. Recently, new categories of membership for individuals and businesses were established so contributions could be made toward operating expenses, above the basic dues.

And to meet its changing role, a new Executive Committee was established to provide for more effective administration. The Executive Committee will handle day-to-day administration, while the Board of Curators will continue to set long range policy.

A fund drive is being conducted by the society to pay for the Adams Academy work. Businesses and individuals are being contacted by society members under the direction of a professional fund-raising consultant. Charles Francis Adams serves as honorary chairman for the drive.

In addition to the library-museum, the society operates the John and John Quincy Adams Birthplaces. Co-chairmen of the House Committee, Mrs. Alfred Knapton and Mrs. Hobart Holly, reported 7,074 visitors this past season. In anticipation of increased visitors next season, the birthplaces will be open seven days a week from 9 to 5.

The society has a number of on-going research projects, which are an important activity of any real historical society. The results constitute an important contribution to our historical records. Projects include: General Palmer and Germantown, by Dr. James Cameron; Mount Wollaston sites, by Dr. George Horner and yacht and small boat building in Quincy by Mr. Holly.

Appropriately, Captain Wollaston and his expedition of 1625, the 350th anniversary of which we celebrate this year, is the project being worked on by Dr. Cameron and Mr. Holly. In addition to the work being done in this country, Wollaston's expedition is being researched by professionals in England as well.

Hobart Holly, president of the Quincy Historical Society, sees the new library-museum as a real asset in being able to offer opportunities for greater involvement in local history.

"When we are in operation we plan to have as professional a staff as required and as our means will permit," said Holly. "But like all institutions of our type, even the largest, we will always depend heavily on volunteers."

Officers for the 1974-75 term in addition to Holly include: William O'Connell, first vice president; Gordon Nelson, second vice president; Mrs. Hall Carpenter, recording secretary; Mrs. Robert Justis, corresponding secretary; William Farrar, treasurer; Mrs. Rudolf Oberg, librarian; Dr. James Cameron, historian, and George Horner, archeologist.

The society's Board of Curators includes: Harold Davis, Mrs. Alfred Knapton, William Flavin, Frank Holzer, Mrs. Eleanor Brown, Gordon Carr, Mrs. Robert Kilbourn, Paul Harold, Anthony Losordo, Mrs. Louise Meredith, Fred Bergfors, Jr., James Asher, Jr., Henry Bosworth, Jr., Robert Gardiner and Carl Deyeso.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Sun, Jan. 16, 1975]

"QUINCY: 350 YEARS" TRACES CITY'S RICH HISTORY

"Quincy 350 Years", a soft-cover and hard-cover book published by Quincy Heritage, Inc., is now available.

The book tells the story of Quincy in 13 chapters, each symbolizing one of the 13 original colonies.

The book, edited by Quincy Historical Society President H. Hobart Holly, is on sale at the Quincy Heritage office located in the Quincy Center MBTA station.

A total of 4,500 soft-cover copies of the book have been printed and 500 hard-cover copies are coming off the press.

Beginning with an introductory letter from Mayor Walter J. Hannon, "Quincy 350 Years" traces Quincy's history from its early days to the present and also peeks into the city's next 350 years of growth and change.

Individual chapters deal with Quincy's government, past and present, geology and geography, religion and ethnology, education, economic life and Quincy's 27 miles of shoreline. One chapter, "Distinctively Quincy", noted the city's features and landmarks which make Quincy, Quincy.

Two separate chapters are devoted to "The Adams Family and Quincy" and "Quincy's Sons and Daughters".

The next-to-last chapter maps out Quincy's Historic Trail, "not a road by which one follows history; but rather a way by which one may experience contact with a rich and varied history."

With 350 years past, the city of Quincy and its citizens look ahead to the next 350 years in the final chapter of this saga of Quincy.

Each of the 13 chapters was written by local authors. Those contributing articles to the book were Holly, George Wilson, Rev. John J. McMahon, Dr. James R. Cameron, Thomas S. Burgin, Richard K. Chrystal, Richard W. Carlisle, Dorothy E. Newton, Thomas B. Adams and Geoffrey A. Davidson.

The many pictures dispersed throughout the pages were donated by Doris S. Oberg, Teresa Carsten, W. F. Bowman, Peabody Museum of Salem, Dorothy Cavanagh, Rosenfeld, W. C. Edwards History of Quincy, Bostonian Society, Edmund Quincy and the Museum of Fine Arts, the Thomas Crane Public Library and the Quincy Historical Society.

William Dahlgren, a post graduate student at Quincy Vocational Technical School, designed the book's red, white and blue cover combining the British and American flags.

S. Gunnar Myrbeck & Co., Inc. created the overall book design and produced the books for Quincy Heritage, Inc.

Lawrence P. Creedon is general chairman of Quincy Heritage and John R. Graham is executive director.

Co-chairing the publication committee of Quincy Heritage are Henry W. Bosworth Jr., Richard W. Carlisle and Herb Fontaine. Other members of the publication committee are Teresa Carsten, Richard Chrystal, Carl Deyeso, John Golden Jr., Carol Lee Griffin, Mildred Harrison, Sol Levenson and Robert Waywood.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Sun, Jan. 16, 1975]

QUALITY COMMEMORATIVE ITEMS AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE

Quincy Heritage has developed and marketed a host of quality commemorative items to serve as lasting reminders of the city's 350th anniversary and the American Revolution Bicentennial.

Maureen O'Brien, social-health co-ordinator for Quincy Public Schools, is the chairman of the Memorabilia Committee of Quincy Heritage. She was a member of the original 350th Anniversary Committee established three years ago under then-mayor

James McIntyre. Through the work and efforts of the Memorabilia Committee, Quincy Heritage is offering these commemorative items.

Wedgewood artist Alan Pine has designed two plates capturing the history and pride of Quincy. Both will be issued in limited editions.

One plate, "Quincy, City of Presidents", will be appropriately released on Oct. 30, 1975, the birthday of John Adams. The edge of the blue plate—trimmed with a delicate etching of branches of flowers and leaves—depicts both John Adams and John Quincy Adams, Quincy-born presidents of the United States.

The face of the plate pictures the birthplace of both presidents as well as the Adams National Historic Site and the Josiah Quincy House. The back of the plate carries the Quincy Heritage Logo.

The second plate, the Bicentennial plate, to be issued in the fall of 1976, is a crimson and white pattern carrying out the theme, "Quincy, City of Patriots". Again, the plate is edged with floral, leafy branches but the patriots pictured are John Hancock and Dorothy Quincy.

The front of the plate depicts the Dorothy Quincy House, Adams Academy, Quincy City Hall and the Thomas Crane Public Library. The back of the plate again carries the Quincy Heritage logo.

Two commemorative medals—both in sterling silver and in bronze—will be available in limited editions. The 1½ inch medals can be attached to chains or used as decorative displays. The first medal, to be issued in April 1975, pictures the Merrymount Maypole Dance on the front and the first commercial railway on the back.

The second medal, to be issued a year later, carries the slogan "Patriots, Presidents and Possibilities" and pictures John Adams and John Quincy Adams on the front face. Pictured on the reverse side is United First Parish Church, the Church of Presidents.

Both medals will be distributed nationally. Frank Leporini, a research assistant at North Quincy High School, has designed bookends, cast in bronze, they will be cast at Quincy Vocational Technical School, of the Adams' Birthplaces.

Also involved in creating commemorative items is Quincy's Paul Whalen, head of Artistic Carvings in Boston. Whalen had hand-carved and hand-painted reproductions of the John Quincy Eagle designed by his company. The eagle is available in both gold-leaf and gold-paint.

Richard Porteous, art specialist in the Quincy School System, has designed a 1776 pin fashioned with nails which are replicas of those hand-forged in America during the late 1700's. Other quality sterling silver jewelry items—such as charms and tie tacs—will also be available.

Quincy Heritage is also marketing ceramic items, such as mugs and ashtrays, as well as tiles which can be put to practical use or used as decoration.

The six-inch square tiles will depict Quincy "firsts": the first ironworks, the first commercial railway, the construction of the first nuclear surface ship at Fore River Shipyard, the first air trials at Squantum Air Base.

Commemorative glass sets and bottles will also be made. Clevenger Brothers Glass Works has designed bottles in eight shapes and sizes and in four colors. The bottles will picture famed Quincy citizens such as John Adams, John Quincy Adams, John Hancock, Josiah Quincy and Col. Francis Parker. The bottles, to be distributed through many local merchants, will carry the Quincy Heritage logo on the back.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to the Members of the House about my mission to the Middle East and the prospects for peace in that troubled area of the world.

I would like to take the opportunity now to call to the attention of our colleagues an editorial on the subject which recently appeared in the New Republic magazine. It is, I think, one of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking essays on the Middle East which has recently come out and I believe it illuminates, with insight and intelligence, the issues which currently confront the countries of the region.

For anyone who seeks to truly understand the situation in the Middle East, this article is a must, and I only hope that it will be given the attention which it deserves:

MIDEAST PEACE?

Israel has become in world affairs a pariah nation. Why this is so is both complicated and simple: Israel is, after all, the political expression of a historically oppressed people, and the power of Arab oil is just now great enough to sway both the weak and the mighty to join the anti-Israel chorus. Surely, as two prominent French leftist intellectuals wrote recently in *Le Monde*, it is not that Israel can be seen on any comparative scale—whether measured against Communist, Western, Arab, or Third World countries—as a monster state. Whatever the reasons for the lopsided anti-Israel majorities in various UN agencies or behind the hostile rhetoric of intrinsically indifferent political figures from distant and otherwise preoccupied countries, the implications of the new mood are clear—and they constitute a peril to the security of Israel.

The persuasive capacity of insincere analysis seems to be without match, and there is a particular virulence to the contagion of insincere phrases. With reference to the Middle East, these are now the stuff of orthodoxy. James Reston, in a column for some of whose factual and intellectual gaucheries he has already apologized, sees an obstacle to peace not so much in the reluctance of Israel itself to make concessions, as in the anxieties of Israel's friends in America that territorial concessions made to the Arabs will be the military advantage from which a future war begins. Tom Wicker fears Israeli defiance of an "acceptable" settlement—and fears also American (for which read Jewish) support of that defiance. Evans and Novak, Carl Rowan, Nicholas Von Hoffman, others, the same and more. "Columnists are like blackbirds on electric wires," Eugene McCarthy used to say. "They move in groups." Everywhere, it seems, it is assumed, "if only Israel were not so intransigent . . . if only Israel would return to the borders of June 4, 1967. . . ."

History and logic alike should confound the easy confidence with which such impatient sentiments are uttered. The frontiers existing at the outset of the six-day war separated Israel and her Arab neighbors for 19 years, and they were not frontiers of peace or even of real truce—but frontiers from which wars were waged and threatened.

Indeed, much of the territory in the Sinai that Israel is now urged to restore to Arab sovereignty had already been restored twice in exchange for guarantees that proved to be of no value whatever. And if this was the case when the Arab governments were weak and divided, when there was virtually no Russian presence capable of great mischief in the area, why will the territorial *status quo ante* bring peace now that the Arabs are strong and relatively united, and now that the Russians are positioned to disrupt any situation not in accord with their own—and shifting—political ends? This isn't a rhetorical question intended to bolster an Israeli minority which opposes relinquishing Arab lands. In the first disengagement on Suez after the Yom Kippur war, more reluctantly to be sure on the Golan, Israel amply demonstrated that it would make territorial concessions to build momentum toward an agreement with the Arabs. Even those who fault what they call "Israeli truculence" know that in the next round of negotiations the Jerusalem government is willing to take considerable risks to keep alive the process so painstakingly nurtured by Secretary Kissinger.

The question in the next days, however, is not what Israel will give up; it is rather what Egypt will give in return. It is sheer sloganeering to say, as some rather casually have, that since it's Egypt's land that is at issue, that country is obliged to give little or nothing to reclaim it. For what is expected of Israel is no small gesture toward Cairo. In the present environment, no one can underestimate the importance of fuel-poor Israel's withdrawing from the Abu Rhodeis oil fields at the tip of the Gulf of Suez, which have met half of Israel's petroleum needs during the last seven years. Nor, in an unstable situation, will the Shah's pledge to Kissinger to supply Israel's oil needs be fully reassuring. But the Mitla and Gidi passes, which are part of the anticipated bounty of negotiations, constitute an even more vexing problem for the Israelis. These mountain passes control the rest of the Sinai peninsula and an Israeli withdrawal would be a surrender of significant strategic advantage.

To the extent that risk is assumed, Israel is entitled to reciprocal—if necessarily asymmetrical—political concessions from Egypt. While the signals from Cairo have been confusing, perhaps deliberately so, the Egyptians do not yet seem to be particularly conciliatory. No doubt agreement to the demilitarization of the relinquished territories is a prerequisite of any Israeli withdrawal. But as with a decision to allow Israeli cargoes through the canal, this is an easily revokable concession. Installing tanks or missiles where it has been agreed they are not to be might be a *casus belli*, but that's sparse consolation. What is required from Egypt are moves, now, that would make it more difficult and costly for Egypt to wage war later—as the contemplated Israeli withdrawals would make a renewed war much more difficult and costly for Israel.

What is especially striking, and should make people suspicious, is Sadat's reluctance, in exchange for Israeli withdrawals, to commit his country to the politics of non-belligerence, to tell his countrymen that the journey of conciliation with Israel has at long last begun. A leader who fears doing that might not be able to lead his country to peace; perhaps he does not want to. If he wants to but won't say so, he limits his flexibility and circumscribes the strategy of negotiations by bellicose talk. By continually saying, as he did again last week, that this next stage entails no political commit-

ments on Egypt's part, Sadat bolsters those who want to make no political commitments to Israel of any sort. If "the hero of the crossing" cannot tell his own people what he is so eager to confide to American journalists, what Arab politician can? And if none can, how can anyone be so sure that the problem between Israel and the Arabs is simply a matter of territorial adjustments, a Mideast version of the Alsace-Lorraine question?

In addition, then, to earnestly that draw the Egyptian people into the reality of negotiations, Israel is justified in wanting to know that the infinitely more complicated problems with Syria or regarding the West Bank will not be used sometime hence as an occasion for Egypt to abrogate the concessions it makes as part of an agreement on Israeli withdrawals. The most tangible measures insulating a rapprochement between Israel and Egypt from extraneous pressures would be an indefinite or, at minimum, a long-term extension of the UN peacekeeping forces in the vacated territories, revokable only by the Security Council. The present mandate, renewable every six months, institutionalizes periodic instability, and is an open invitation to interference from outside. To argue for less is to argue for making the resumption of war easy.

Given the depth of the conflict between the Arabs and the Israelis, it would be endangering the entire process of negotiations, in fact, if one side were to get concessions on the cheap. It would establish a pattern of unrealistic expectations without creating relationships between old foes on which a peaceful future for the region depends.

What with the difficulties encountered so far in eliciting significant concessions from Egypt—not, it should be noted, in eliciting such from Israel—an assortment of journalists and politicians have fixed on the notion of American guarantees to Israel as a substitute for an accord between the two contending parties. In a discussion with *New Republic* editors last week, Kissinger said that an American guarantee by treaty or otherwise would be only "icing on the cake," that such guarantees would make sense only once there were actual agreements on and concrete movement toward final settlement by the two countries.

Kissinger had been drawn into the discussion of guarantees by the persistent Russian offer to "guarantee" Israel's 1967 borders. The Soviets, of course, are wholly without *bona fides* on this matter, and Kissinger is in any case suspicious of their intentions. There is no justification, though, he reasoned correctly, for abjuring an American guarantee at some unspecified point in the future. But he knows, as surely the Israelis and Arabs know too, what is wrong with a guarantee now.

In the absence of tangible Arab, or in this instance, Egyptian, steps toward peace, an American guarantee to Israel upon its withdrawal from militarily significant positions increases the likelihood of circumstances that may require American intervention on behalf of Israel. Now Israel has never wanted, does not now want, such an intervention. Moreover, a firm guarantee is a politically dubious proposition in the US. The Arabs may well reason that the Americans might renege on such a guarantee in an extremity; but Israel also is aware of that possibility, and thus what is being talked about should seem to Israel hardly a guarantee at all.

The idea of an American guarantee to Israel emerged under curious auspices. Many of its enthusiasts have on the record no demonstrable concern for Israel's security, a fact that raises serious and unavoidable questions about motives. Many others who find an American guarantee an attractive alternative to measurable moves by Egypt adhere to a politics that would make the guarantee simply not credible. For a real guarantee to Israel might require a declared American interest

and greater presence than the US now maintains in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf. Moreover, it implies a commitment to produce certain weapons and aircraft like the big transport planes and more advanced fighter planes which may face the ax in congressional budget-making. One cannot all at once credibly support an American guarantee in a very unsettled area while pushing for a general retrenchment of our foreign involvements everywhere else. Nor should it be imagined that the very idea of an American guarantee or protective arrangement with any country would appear at this moment in history as anything more than a bedraggled remnant of the past. There are many to blame for this, not the least the perpetrators of the Vietnam war. But congressional critics of American foreign policy, having belatedly and not very discriminately asserted legislative prerogatives against the executive, share responsibility for having rendered the US incapable of acting decisively for its own interests and those of its allies.

While there are, then, many objections to the U.S. as guarantor of agreements, there is everything to be said for the U.S. continuing its role as broker between the adversaries. Indeed, no power other than America, and perhaps no man other than Secretary Kissinger, could aspire to these historic burdens. Such achievements as there have been in the Middle East are directly attributable to him and to his persuasive powers. But the obligations that Israel and Egypt now assume in negotiations should be to each other, and not to Kissinger—if only to preserve his ability to function as broker in future talks. Otherwise any violation committed by one side may injure his credibility with the other. In an interview with Philip Geyelin of *The Washington Post*, Sadat carried the concept of pledges to Kissinger one step further by suggesting that the secretary personally be the guarantor of commitments reached through him. Mr. Geyelin thought this to reflect "new flexibility" on Sadat's part.

If Israel is gradually to withdraw from the largest portions of the occupied territories, then its enemies will have to persuade Jerusalem that these are not likely to be scenes of new battles against Israel's survival. It is fashionable to say—the power of clichés again!—that, with modern weapons, territory is no guarantee of security. But to think that is to have failed to learn one of the primary lessons of Indochina. With modern weapons, one should understand from the American air war against North Vietnam, you can heap excruciating torments on a country from afar; but unless you can get into its territory with conventional weapons and troops you cannot capture it or bring it to its knees. That is why a small country like Israel, with hostile borders straddling in places only a few kilometers of its pre-1967 territories, is justifiably anxious about exactly where her frontiers will be and what armies and hardware are to be allowed beyond them. Worrying about particular hills and valleys is no trifle for the Israelis: It is a bare hour's march from the Jordan River to Jerusalem; geography itself seems almost to threaten both the agricultural settlements in the north and population centers on the coast. The cliché about the insignificance of territory—a distinctively American perception, one thinks—ordinarily goes on to assert that the only real guarantee of security is genuine trust between neighbors. This no doubt is true, but that trust can be built best—if there is reason to trust at all—when neighbors obligate themselves to each other.

This is precisely the kind of trust that the Secretary of State has been trying to foster. It has not been easy in the past, and it will not be easier in the immediate future. What is likely to develop as Kissinger shuttles back and forth between Cairo and Jerusalem is something less than optimal movement

toward peace. This realistic expectation has provoked in many quarters, and for diverse reasons, a backlash against the step-by-step, country-by-country structure of Kissinger's mediation. But much of the pressure to dispense with these particular negotiations and revert to the Geneva conference derives also from the fact that it is now open season on Dr. Kissinger. This has much less to do with his actual performance than with the general demoralization of American politics and an embarrassed overreaction to an embarrassing exaltation of Kissinger's talents in the past. Sen. Stevenson's attack on the secretary's attachment to "the myth of his own personality and indispensability" is understandable as early campaign rhetoric. But the senator's corollary proposal to reconvene Geneva is not sensible.

For the strategy of peace requires first the maximization of those interests of Egypt that will keep it out of any future fighting in the Middle East. How much more difficult it would be to fix on the common concerns of Israel and Egypt in a conference attended by the other Arab states and with the redoubtable Gromyko in the chair. Sadat, in fact, does need peace. In a recent series of especially informative articles in the *British Guardian*, David Hirst found Egypt menaced by "serious internal instability . . . a growth of violence that is untypical of Egyptian society . . . deep social and economic frustrations, a sharpening of class antagonisms in a country where, some people now say, contrasts between rich and poor are quite as shocking, if different in nature, as they were in the day of King Farouk." This situation might incline Sadat to a diversionary adventure; but for the moment he has risked the enmity of fellow Arabs and alienated his on-again-off-again Russian benefactors to pursue Kissinger's byways. Consideration for Sadat's difficulties should not oblige the Israelis to overlook their own strategic concerns; but his problems do suggest that the coming talks may begin to unlock the generation-long political stalemate that has cost so many lives.

The reconvening of Geneva if these talks were to fall would be a perfect setting for the parties to play to the balconies, with full peace plans that don't give anything. The good offices of the United States—stigmatized by failure—would be broken. The initiative then would shift to the Soviet Union which, with the backing of the Europeans and Japan, terrorized by the specter of another oil embargo, would seek to force upon Israel a *dictat* devoid of the preconditions or components of genuine peace. Sadat might also not be in attendance, pushed by failure off history's stage; or he might be there only because the Soviets allow him once again to be their client. Every disruptive influence, including especially the PLO, which already shows signs of decline despite its successes on Manhattan's East River, will come to the fore; and the king of Saudi Arabia will frantically be trundling his billions behind those aiming in the end to undo him as eagerly as they would undo Israel. Paradoxically the king would also then be doing service for the Russians who need the format of Geneva and the vehicle of the PLO to install themselves on Israel's eastern borders, a standing irritant playing for stakes incompatible with a decent settlement.

It will probably not be possible to avoid Geneva in the long run. But what ultimately happens there will be much less inconsistent with a peaceful resolution of the conflict if Sadat's heretical tactics have paid off for him and if Israel's territorial concessions win some significant political responses from Egypt.

For this would mean that US diplomacy remains the key to an agreement between Israel and its neighbors, rather than another battered piece of evidence of how intractable their problems are. The awful prospect of Geneva without successful negotiations in

the next stage on the Sinai should not induce a desperate Panglossian optimism about these present talks. But it is precisely the prospect of a witches' sabbath in Geneva that makes the success of Secretary Kissinger's current efforts so vital to those who live and otherwise might die in the Middle East.

PRESIDENT E. BOYD GARRETT OF NATIONAL RETAIL DRUGGISTS ASSOCIATION CALLS FOR ACTION TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. Boyd Garrett of Nashville, Tenn., the distinguished president of the National Retail Druggists Association, delivered a challenging address to the national association gathered today in convention in Washington.

President Garrett cited the numerous problems which small business druggists face in competition with big chain and discount drug firms and from Government rules and regulations.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the address by Mr. Garrett in the RECORD herewith.

The address follows:

OPENING REMARKS, 7TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, BY E. BOYD GARRETT

As President of the National Association of Retail Druggists, it is my privilege and personal honor to officially greet you on behalf of the Officers, members of the Executive Committee and staff of NARD, and to warmly welcome you to this Seventh Annual Conference on National Legislation and Public Affairs. Your presence at this conference here in Washington, D.C., right in the "eye of the storm", proves the value and success of this continuing program.

It should be particularly helpful for us to gather here in this year and at this time. We have a new President and Vice President since we met here last year and we have a new Congress just beginning its work. We have the twin issues of inflation and recession coupled with high unemployment and we face increased costs for more government regulation and compliance. If you are confused, disillusioned, frustrated, unable to reconcile what government says with what government does, and unable to correlate what our society proclaims as its basic principles with what is happening, then you are in the right place and in the right group. Let me assure you that you are not alone.

The Administration, the Congress and the regulatory agencies apparently aren't getting the message from small business, particularly independent pharmacy. It is difficult to understand whether those who govern and regulate us aren't listening or haven't heard the responses they want and expect. In any event, the same questions and issues seem to arise time and again, only to be asked again and answered again, with little or no progress being made.

And these are our friends. Imagine the state of affairs if we were adversaries. President Ford has certainly been a friend of free enterprise, individual initiative and small business through the years. He has been cordial, helpful and available to NARD in the

past. And there isn't a Congressman or Senator in office now or in the past who hasn't proclaimed himself a champion of small business, free enterprise and individual initiative. Maybe this year, with our new Administration and Congress, things will be different, but we are not off to a very good start.

Already the Senate appears ready and anxious to shunt the fair trade enabling legislation into the archives along with prohibition. I would not pretend that fair trade is much of an issue with independent pharmacists today because it has suffered from neglect and only token observance and enforcement in pharmacy, with a few loyal exceptions, for many a year. We as independent pharmacists cannot enforce fair trade minimums; it is the manufacturer that has the choice of whether to utilize and maintain fair trade minimums in the first instance.

Given these facts, one would suppose that a government and Congress dedicated to free enterprise and the preservation of small business would look at why or how some few giants can sell so cheaply, to determine whether there are predatory motives, discriminatory discounts and the like, all of which are already prohibited by law. But that is not the response of either. The Federal Trade Commission takes no action and the Senate proposed to repeal the fair trade enabling legislation so that the chains and discounters will be able to drive independent pharmacies out of business all over the country as they have here in the Nation's Capital.

The Federal Trade Commission, probably known to most pharmacists for its relaxed non-enforcement of the discriminatory pricing provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, is another good example. Instead of looking into economic concentration in pharmacy, increasingly being dominated by chains and discounters, suspected predatory pricing practices and discriminatory pricing that have been laid bare with facts and examples in Congressional testimony for a decade or more, FTC embarks on a probe of prescription price advertising. And this is a good example of an agency asking a question, getting our answer, and either not listening to or not understanding the answer. FTC and the Department of Justice have, from time to time in the past, wondered why independent pharmacies do not advertise prescription charges in the newspapers and other public media. We all know the answer: it costs too much, it is not productive and in most communities, it is wholly unnecessary. FTC just plainly does not believe this economic fact of life, so it has committed its resources and personnel to proving there is some other reason. We understand that shortly we will have some edict on prescription price advertising from the FTC, developed over the past year or more, the result and utility of which will be dubious at best.

Ironically, if the FTC prescription advertising proposal has any effect at all, it will be simply to permit the giant economic chain and discount enterprises which have invaded pharmacy to more effectively eliminate independent pharmacies, and to do it faster. The chains will be the only ones which will be able to afford and benefit from public media advertising and they may do so with "come-ons" and loss-leaders until they have eliminated all significant independent competition and have the market all to themselves.

Where does the Federal government help us? Right where we least suspected we needed help. Generally, their help increases our costs and paperwork and decreases our ability to remain competitive and to serve the public. And I am sure that our problem is not unique. It is no doubt shared by all

small businessmen. However, I doubt that any small businessman is more over-regulated by local, state and federal government than the independent retail pharmacist.

Some government bureaucrats perceive a social or economic ill and either have the authority, or convince Congress that they ought to have the authority, to deal with the issue. If the initial regulatory control does not solve the "problem" but makes it worse, then the official comes up with a more complex and exacting regulation which is thought to be the answer along with some peripheral authority to deal with collateral issues that may have surfaced in the meantime. Unfortunately, the government and Congress are not subjected to "peer review" as are health care practitioners. No civil servant is going to suggest that a regulation was unnecessary in the first instance and thereby voluntarily declare himself and his staff "surplus".

But this a job that has to be done. NARD has suggested that Congress and the Administration both demand an "economic impact" statement on all proposed new programs and regulations, with particular focus on the anticipated effect on small business. This would be an important first step. We can enact safety laws, like OSHA, only to find after the fact that application of some provisions to small businesses are wholly impractical, unnecessary and unjustified. We suspect that government has imposed many requirements which under impartial examination cannot be justified, as applied to small business. Are all the reports that we must file ever read, and if read, ever used for any constructive purpose?

NARD has endorsed President Ford's National Commission on Regulatory Reform to conduct a thorough examination of the regulatory processes and priorities of the Federal independent regulatory agencies and has requested that the scope of the review be extended to all regulatory bureaus and programs in government. The Federal regulatory impact is presently so pervasive and complex that it is costly for the government, costly for the small businessman and costly to citizen-consumers who ultimately bear the costs in prices for the goods and services they need and the taxes government imposes. It is certainly appropriate that we assure ourselves that every dollar spent on government regulation is spent effectively and purposefully, and that the social benefits or assurances obtained justify the effort and expense.

We are indeed indebted to the Small Business Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. These Select Committees function principally by focusing the attention of Congress and the public upon problems and issues affecting small business, developing information as a predicate to drafting legislation, and providing a forum and sentry on Capitol Hill for small businessmen. I am especially proud and grateful for the continued help, cooperation and concern of Congressman Joe L. Evins of Tennessee, Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, with the problems in independent pharmacy and the small business community. Congressman Evins and a number of members of his committee have been patient and understanding in listening to the pleas of small business about their problems and needs and have been responsive in seeking to help us.

In your contacts with the members of Congress while you are in Washington attending this important conference, I would urge you to tell them that we need to be something besides the "backbone of the nation". The small businessman needs a new role. We want to be a dynamic part of this country. If we are going to remain the backbone then we want to be a working, vital, successful backbone with an equal opportunity.

On behalf of NARD, I welcome you to our

conference. I hope that this concentrated program, where we must cover a lot of ground quickly, will provide some insight on what we can and should do to strengthen and improve the independent practice of pharmacy and the services we provide to our patrons. We welcome your comments and suggestions, and encourage you to participate fully in the ample question and answer sessions provided.

A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, early last month I was honored to be a dinner speaker at a conference on energy conservation that I hope is a prototype for future meetings. The conference was sponsored by four southern California chapters of the American Institute of Architects and held in San Diego on February 6 and 7.

The keynote address of the conference, while containing many remarks that relate especially to southern California, did direct itself to many of the key issues now before the Congress. The keynote speaker was Dr. Robert F. Rooney, who has acquired some expertise in the field of energy conservation. He is also an economics professor at the California State University at Long Beach and he serves as a commissioner on the innovative California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission.

I recommend this paper to my colleagues, and wish to especially draw your attention to its positive suggestions on energy conservation.

The paper follows:

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND THE ARCHITECT, THE CHALLENGE OF THE NEXT 25 YEARS

(By Robert F. Rooney, Ph. D.)

There is little doubt that at the present time, the quantity of such nonrenewable energy resources as oil, natural gas and uranium available to the U.S. economy cannot readily be expanded within a short period of time without undesirable economic or environmental consequences. The sharp increases in energy prices over the past two or three years reflect the inability of the American economy to expand the domestic production of energy without substantial increases in costs and/or environmental pollution. Increases in our energy supplies for the next few years will primarily have to come from overseas sources of petroleum at prices more than three times those generally prevailing in 1970. Moreover, it will be five to ten years before domestic energy supplies can be increased significantly, and then only at the cost of greater environmental degradation and the diversion of a vast amount of scarce capital into nuclear power plants and other energy production and transportation facilities.

How we got into what some people call the "energy crisis," but which I call our "energy conservation opportunity," would take hours to discuss fully. Basically though, our energy situation, in my opinion, is the result of a long series of incredible governmental policy blunders dating back to at least 1954. The "soaring-sixties" were the result of our nation's squandering the industrial capital which had been built up

over many years through the efforts of countless Americans, as is evidenced by the shortages and sharply rising prices of energy and other key industrial commodities over the past couple of years. This capital was largely squandered through government policies based on the premise that a nation can "consume itself to great wealth and prosperity," which only works for relatively short periods of time and if excess productive capacity has been built up through past investments.

Our production capabilities had become so great by the end of the 1950s, that most Americans—politicians, businessmen, labor unionists, and sadly, economists—believed that America could produce enough of anything to accomplish any objective, no matter how obscene. And Presidents Kennedy and Johnson proceeded to do their best to prove the point by adopting a wide range of policies favoring consumption by the private sector and the military over investment in American industry. By 1970, America's consumption of energy had risen to the point that our oil and natural gas industries and electric utilities had virtually no excess capacity, primarily because our economic, energy, and environmental policies of the 1960s did not provide the necessary economic incentives to expand sufficiently rapidly the domestic energy industries. With energy demand continuing to rise rapidly, primarily because of government policies holding energy prices at unrealistically low levels, we became increasingly dependent on the oil resources of the OPEC nations.

Today, America is suffering from severe inflation and economic recession at the same time. Our governmental leaders—Republicans and Democrats alike—are trying to solve the problem of recession with the traditional remedies of deficit spending, tax cuts, and a host of similar policies designed to stimulate the auto and related energy and materials intensive industries, in spite of their impacts on the natural environment. Although we do need the employment, I doubt that American consumers are really suffering from a lack of autos, electrical appliances, etc. The situation with respect to decent housing is, in my opinion, another matter. We really need to improve our housing stock.

The politicians in Washington are trying to solve our energy supply problems by increasing the domestic production of energy from offshore oil resources, coal, nuclear power, geothermal resources, and oil shale, again with little concern for protecting the natural environment. Reasonable projections of energy demand and supply for the West Coast, by the way, indicate that there is no need for leasing the California offshore area prior to 1983 unless the oil is to be shipped to the states east of the Rocky Mountains.

Moreover, the energy policies of Project Independence insure that we will have energy shortages well into the 1980s and will likely reduce the amount of investment capital available for the housing industry. Agricultural policy continues to support large-scale, energy-intensive, chemicalized farming to provide food for Americans and for export. Wage and price controls and rationing are seriously discussed by influential Senators and Congressmen in spite of the repeated failure of these policies to do more than provide limited short-term relief of the symptoms of inflation and energy shortages. In short, these policies all are based on the assumption that structural changes in our economy are not required.

Some of these policies would make sense if, and it is a big "if," our present problems were the result of mismanagement of private and public economic affairs. To a considerable extent, the recent inflation results from overexpansion of the money supply which has minimized the succession of federal deficits due to the Viet Nam war and the "Great Society" social welfare programs. But most of our current economic problems are not

due to mismanagement of the economy, Watergate, OPEC, greedy capitalists or labor unionists, or the environmentalists. In my opinion, our present inflation and recession reflect a need to adapt our economy, and personal lifestyles, to fundamental changes in the costs of obtaining several key natural resources (especially energy) and of producing food. The days of obtaining substantial increases in domestic natural resource or food production at only a small increase in real (capital and labor) costs are long gone, probably never to return. We cannot continue to import increasingly larger volumes of oil and other mineral resources, especially if their prices continue to rise, without greatly increasing last year's record balance of payments deficit, thus forcing further devaluations of the dollar. And we can hardly afford for our polluted natural environment to get any worse.

We must adopt policies which lead to basic structural changes in our economy—including, most significantly, major changes over the next twenty-five years in the location and composition of our housing stock and many other types of buildings. These structural changes in the economy primarily involve the development of new industries producing goods and services which use relatively less energy and other scarce natural resources in their production and consumption. The American lifestyle needs to become more time-intensive, rather than goods-intensive. I don't have any concrete suggestions for government policy changes which would likely hasten these structural adjustments on a broad front throughout our economy. However, I feel confident that Americans have both the technological and, probably most importantly, marketing know-how to effect the necessary economic adjustments if government would only provide the necessary leadership to get the process started. Moreover, the new investment that would be induced by a shift to a less energy and materials intensive economy would soon take care of our present severe unemployment problems.

The traditional economic policies being pursued today by all levels of government are, at best, poorly suited to promoting adapting our economy and personal lifestyles to a world of relatively costly food, energy and other natural resources. At their worst, the policies being debated today will only delay these badly needed structural adjustments until one or more parts of our highly specialized and interconnected economy break down under the stress of rising natural resource scarcity, leading to the familiar collapse-mode graphs of the *Limits to Growth*. Americans deserve more from their elected and appointed officials, but the necessary governmental leadership does not appear to be forthcoming in this time of impending crisis.

I am convinced that we cannot rely on government to solve our present energy, economic, and environmental problems. At the national level, John Sawhill was fired as head of the Federal Energy Administration by President Ford because Dr. Sawhill strongly favored energy conservation policies over the "drain America first" policies favored by the Nixon/Ford Administration and American industrial and trade union interests. At the state level, the South Coast Regional Commission adopted strong policies requiring energy conservation, particularly with respect to new buildings. The State Coastal Commission, responding to the leadership of its consensus planners, first weakened the regional commission's policies and then knuckled-under to the pressure of Assemblyman Warren and the power companies by deferring to the newly formed California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, which likely will not be adopting energy conservation policies for more than eighteen months. And there is no guarantee that the Energy Commission will

adopt policies as stringent as those of the coastal commissions. We need tough energy conservation policies, especially a strong energy budget code, endorsed by the AIA, now—not in eighteen or more months.

With government unlikely to provide the kind of immediate leadership needed to promote effective energy conservation, much of the burden of leadership must fall upon the design professionals—the architect and industrial engineer—acting in the long-term economic interests of their clients. Even if we do manage to produce the rising amounts of energy envisioned by the Project Independence planners, energy prices are going to continue to remain high, and to rise sharply in the case of natural gas. I doubt that the OPEC countries will significantly reduce their oil prices, rather than reduce their production, in the event that large oil surpluses emerge in the next few years. The major Arab producers have few resources other than oil, and they fully recognize the need to conserve their oil for future generations. Moreover, they can now meet a substantial amount of their foreign exchange requirements from the earnings of their growing petrodollar investments.

The built environment probably directly accounts for about one-third of U.S. energy consumption. Substantial additional amounts of energy are also used to produce and transport building materials and to grow, process and transport food which could be grown and stored at home if the proper facilities were built into the single or multi-family project. In California, substantial amounts of energy are also used to transport water to residential and commercial structures and to pump, process and ultimately dump sewage into our coastal waters. Substantial savings of nonrenewable energy resources in these sectors of the economy likely can be obtained over the next twenty-five years.

These uses of energy can be directly and profoundly influenced by the decisions of architects and their land developer clients. You are in a better position than any government official to conserve the significant amounts of energy which we must conserve if we are to protect and enhance our precious natural environment; maintain a dynamic, progressive economy; and attain national independence from foreign energy resources. Architects and other design professionals will need to provide the leadership necessary to get government to adopt meaningful energy conservation policies with respect to modernizing building codes and adopting energy budget codes, providing sun rights protection for solar heated structures, modifying zoning codes to permit efficient housing unit configurations, permitting the use of clivus-type waste disposal systems, and a host of other innovations. I doubt that government will significantly change its policies regulating the design of buildings to promote energy conservation unless you—the design professionals—demand it. The work of the AIA in this regard is crucial. In my opinion, only the AIA has the intellectual resources and political expertise to get the job done.

As you will learn at this conference, significant conservation of energy from nonrenewable resources is not a theoretical possibility requiring the expenditure of millions, or even billions, of dollars on research and development before it will be economic. Considerable development work, of course, still needs to be done to obtain a sufficiently wide range of observations to permit optimization of the various alternative solar and other energy conserving technologies. In my opinion, the billions in Federal dollars now being spent on developing breeder reactors and other nuclear technologies are a great waste of the taxpayers' money.

For example, if \$3 billion per year were to be diverted from research into nuclear and

other environmentally destructive energy technologies into a subsidy averaging \$2,000 per dwelling unit for the first-cost of a solar heating and cooling system, 1.5 million dwelling units per year could be built with sophisticated solar energy systems. Installing solar systems in this many dwelling units over a ten year period would free substantial amounts of conventional energy resources (especially oil and natural gas) for use in the industrial and transportation sectors, where their use is most critical to the health of our economy.

Economically attractive hardware and design concepts capable of conserving substantial amounts of energy are available today. The building of well insulated, properly designed structures using solar energy for water heating and for 50 to 80 percent of their space heating and cooling requirements is practical today. The economics of retrofitting existing buildings with solar heating or cooling systems, unfortunately, generally are not attractive unless the building is to be extensively remodeled. Solar systems are practical today for heating both new and existing swimming pools. Recent developments with respect to passive solar heating and cooling systems appear to provide significant cost savings over active systems. Buildings using these energy conserving systems can be very attractive and fully adaptable to the typical American family's lifestyle. The first cost of the solar system and of the additional insulation is higher than that of conventional systems, but their life-cycle costs probably are less than those of conventional systems. In my opinion, you would be well advised to investigate solar heating and cooling systems and discuss them with your client early in any project's design phase.

Significant energy savings can also be obtained from carefully designing the lighting and air conditioning systems of all buildings, but most importantly those of commercial buildings such as retail shops and offices. Present lighting levels in many areas of these buildings are often far in excess of what is required for the tasks to be performed. During last year's energy crisis, some commercial buildings were able to reduce their electrical demand for lighting and air conditioning by as much as twenty percent without any significant structural changes. Much more energy could be saved in new buildings if the architect designs the lighting and air conditioning systems to optimize the use of energy, and the cost savings to the client could be substantial. The wise use of decorative and security and lighted identification signs could further reduce electrical energy consumption. Similarly, the expanded use of fluorescent lighting in residential units could reduce their use of electricity.

There also are opportunities for large energy savings in the industrial and transportation sectors; however, architects play a relatively smaller role in these sectors than in the residential and commercial sectors. By working closely with engineers, architects can none-the-less make significant contributions to energy savings in industrial and transportation structures.

There are, of course, many opportunities for architects to use their professional knowledge and artistic talents to design buildings which optimize on energy consumption within life-cycle cost constraints that are competitive with conventional energy systems. Because of the infinite variety of combinations of factors which enter into designing energy conserving buildings, the AIA has—rightly in my opinion—opposed specific standards limiting the design and technological choices available to architects. The alternative—the energy budget code—sets performance objectives for a wide range of built spaces. It is then up to the architect to develop a structure which meets the objectives specified in the code and the requirements of the client. The State of Ohio has

already adopted an energy budget code. I hope that the AIA will soon make its recommendations for a strong energy budget code to be adopted by the California Energy Commission and the coastal commissions.

I would like now to discuss briefly my views on what the rising costs of food and fuels imply for the future of the American city and American residential architecture. I think that the city as we know it today is an anachronism which will gradually suffer the fate of the dinosaur. The economies of scale in many production technologies that made large cities economic are unlikely to prevail if energy, and capital, costs continue to rise relative to the cost of labor. That is, it will become increasingly more economic to build smaller production facilities for many goods in smaller cities and towns to serve the local market, thus economizing on transportation costs for goods and workers. This is especially likely to be the case for those goods which can best use local natural resources.

With food increasingly expensive to grow using present energy and petrochemical intensive technologies and to transport to urban areas, people will have increasingly greater incentives to live where it is practical to grow at least a portion of the family's food. Growing food at home is generally more practical in smaller cities and towns where land is not very expensive, although a sensitive architect can design food producing facilities into many types of urban area structures and residential projects. The lower cost of food, and many forms of relatively time-intensive recreation, outside of the relatively densely populated urban areas, will reduce the real costs of obtaining labor in these areas, further promoting the shift of industry away from the large cities. Add escaping the crime, pollution, and high taxes of most urban areas, and you have strong economic incentives for the shift in population away from urban areas which the Census Bureau has recently detected.

By carefully situating the home or multi-family building on the lot to take advantage of its solar energy and gardening possibilities, and adopting the civus toilet system which converts kitchen garbage and human waste into fertilizer without using water (thus saving water which can be used to irrigate the garden), the architect can significantly reduce the net cost of the structure to the family occupying it. Designers of multi-family projects would be well advised to provide an appropriately sized area for a community garden for the tenants and to recommend that the manager be trained in growing foods using "organic" methods. Carefully located decorative planters for vegetables—such as tomatoes, peas, beans, and several squashes—and small greenhouse areas can also facilitate growing more food at home. As a society, we will have to prohibit building on lands suitable for commercial agriculture and develop lower cost, environmentally sounder techniques for building residential structures in hillside areas.

This view of the fate of the city is in sharp disagreement with the views of most politicians and "experts" in the urban studies field. Certainly, the growth of urban areas in the United States and elsewhere in the world has been dramatic over the past one or two centuries. However, I believe that the fundamental economic conditions which made large cities practical solutions to our population growth problems were (1) the general availability of substantial additional supplies of energy and other natural resources at costs only slightly above the then prevailing levels; (2) the development of many new transportation, industrial and agricultural technologies based on these resources and the rapid advances in basic scientific knowledge in, roughly, the 1870 through 1920 period; and (3) the capability of American agriculture and extractive industries to produce steadily increasing amounts of food, fuel, and minerals at ap-

proximately constant real costs. Since these factors favorable to urbanization are unlikely to prevail in the future, I feel that energy and natural resource conservation must be diligently pursued in the United States until our economy and society can make the necessary adjustments in the spatial distribution of our industry and population so that we can again "live within our means."

Finally, myself—as a coastal commissioner—and all other government policymakers need to know just how much energy can be conserved economically and practically. Our nation cannot afford to waste its scarce capital and labor on energy conservation policies that are too costly any more than it can afford to continue research and development into the insane nuclear technologies that are in vogue today. We must rely on you, the design professionals, to tell us whether the objectives in an energy budget code are reasonable, or whether they are hopelessly uneconomic. You must lead local and state government into new policies which will encourage and facilitate the kinds of design innovations that will conserve both our non-renewable energy resources and our scarce capital and labor. The job may seem something like those projects that took the World War II Sea Bees "a little longer," and the professional responsibilities may seem burdensome. But, those of us in government, as well as the public, are confident that you can meet, and beat, the challenge of the next twenty-five years by developing beautiful, functional, and economic buildings conserving increasingly larger amounts of our scarce energy resources.

I am looking forward to the AIA's next presentation on energy conservation to the South Coast Regional Commission. And, I hope that those of you designing projects to be brought before the commission will carefully consider the energy conservation possibilities in your designs (as well as the objectives of Proposition 20)—I really don't like voting "no" on so many permit applications.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ELIJAH MUHAMMAD

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad is cause for great sadness in the black community. The Honorable Elijah Muhammad typified for us the essence of black pride and self-reliance. He taught us a commitment to ourselves and the courage to cast loose from the moorings of dependence upon white society. His life was an inspiration to all of us and we are all diminished by his death. The Honorable Elijah Muhammad will live forever as the personification of black pride and self-esteem.

I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, an article by columnist William Raspberry appearing in the Washington Post on February 28, in which Raspberry comments on the life and work of the Honorable Elijah Muhammad.

THE MIRACLE OF ELIJAH MUHAMMAD
(By William Raspberry)

It was always easy, for those who were so inclined, to ridicule Elijah Muhammad. He was, after all, largely unschooled, not especially "charismatic," interested (it was said)

in his own personal wealth, and given to grandiose schemes.

But it strikes me as more appropriate to look at Mr. Muhammad, who died in Chicago this week, not with ridicule but with amazement.

Without getting into guessing games about numbers and politics, it is plain that this one-time farm laborer, son of former slaves, had a profound effect on this country, and on black people in particular.

The respect for the Lost-Found Nation of Islam (Black Muslims), for whose growth and development Mr. Muhammad was almost singlehandedly responsible, is so widespread among black Americans that many hardly remember a time when the respect wasn't there.

There was a period, however, when black people either ridiculed, feared or (reacting to news media descriptions of the sect as a "hate" group) apologized for the Black Muslims.

Truth to tell, some Muslims did preach hatred of whites; nearly all of them spoke of whites as the devil, for instance. But it took a long time and a lot of preaching and a lot of listening, much of it by Malcolm X—whose death preceded Mr. Muhammad's by 10 years and three days—before a different sort of understanding started to seep through: the understanding that loving black people is not the same as hating white people.

In recent years, large numbers of black Americans have come to sympathize—emotionally, if not practically—with the Muslims' call for black people to come together with themselves and to have as little as possible to do with white folks.

There has been wide admiration (though very little knowledge) of the Muslim's schools, shops and manufacturing set-ups, some of them apparently quite successful.

And there has been outright astonishment over how successful the movement has been at reclaiming young black derelicts and outlaws and giving them so obvious a sense of self respect.

As George Schyler of the black Pittsburgh Courier said as long ago as 1959: "When anybody can get tens of thousands of Negroes to practice economic solidarity, respect their women, alter their atrocious diet, give up liquor, stop crime, juvenile delinquency, and adultery, he is doing more for Negroes' welfare than any current Negro leader I know."

Which is not to say that the movement attracted *only* criminals and reprobates. While some of the more widely publicized recruitment took place in the nation's prisons, a good deal of it took place among well-educated, law-abiding and outwardly successful blacks whose bitterness with the white-dominated system finally became too much.

What Mr. Muhammad apparently managed to do was to drive home to his adherents not so much that they should hate white people but that they should distrust them and seek to the extent possible to be independent of them—in their personal lives, in their business dealings, in their life goals and in their self-assessment.

(All of this becomes separatism only for those who insist on defining everything in terms of white people.)

That aspect of the Muslim philosophy might have garnered a lot more recruits if it hadn't been necessary to buy as well the religious and dietary restrictions of the group, and its submission to religious authority.

Muslims say, of course, that the self-respect, solidarity and business success became possible only through devotion to the religious principles.

Maybe they are right. But it would have lished as a primarily secular group.

been interesting to see what might have happened if the Muslims had been established.

It will also be interesting to see what hap-

pens to the organization now that Mr. Muhammad is dead. There have long been rumblings that succession could create some potentially disastrous problems for the Muslims.

There has also been the fear that, in too many cases, the miraculous transformation of thugs into white-shirted, bow-tied gentlemen has been less than complete.

Reports that Black Muslims have been involved in criminal activities designed to raise money for the sect's business operations, in retaliatory assaults or threats of assaults on those with whom they disagreed, and most notably in the Hanafi murders here have been sources of major disappointment to Muslim supporters, sympathizers and admirers.

There is serious question—at least among non-Muslims—as to whether this trend will continue and subvert the movement now that Mr. Muhammad is dead.

But there is no question whatever that while he lived, Elijah Muhammad managed to instill solid pride in thousands of black derelicts, bums and drug addicts, turning outlaws into useful, productive men and women.

That is miracle enough.

PETER A. DREHER, OHIO VOICE
OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, this year the Ohio winner of the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its auxiliary is a resident of my district. He is 18-year-old Peter A. Dreher, a senior at Oakwood High School.

Almost 500,000 high school students participate each year in this contest, the final prizes of which consist of 5 scholarships totaling \$22,500. Next week Peter will join the other State winners here in Washington for the final judging in the competition for those awards.

The speeches for this 1974-75 contest are based on the theme "My Responsibility as a Citizen." In inserting Peter's winning statement here in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to congratulate him on his achievement and to extend best wishes for success in next week's final competition:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Peter A. Dreher)

Here it is! The decade of the 70's—the decade of the Mudslingers. I didn't choose that word—mudslingers. I heard it on television. General Alexander Haig, former White House chief-of-staff, characterized our period as the time of the mudslingers.

The 60's were bad enough—race riots, skyrocketing crime, draft dodgers, political turmoil. It seemed as if the bulging population of young people were saying, "We can't make it in the system, so tear down the system."

And that philosophy is rampant today though the violence has abated. Upstarts still seek to achieve by the tempting shortcuts of name-calling, innuendo, and disregard for the civil rights of those who disagree.

But the 70's are also a time of reminiscence and rebirth. In 1976, we celebrate 200 years of freedom—200 years of democracy. What better gift can we give than constructive citizenship. Our country needs positive thinkers, not mudslingers.

Good intentions are not enough, though.

We all want to build a better America. The question is "How?"

For myself, I've answered that question. I'm going to live up to my duties as a citizen—the political, social, and spiritual duties.

Voting will be my first constructive act. Voting is the single most powerful tool of democracy. Even more powerful now, since district reapportioning guarantees every person an equal voice. New laws limiting campaign contributions make my input, even if small—important. Now I can use my education to help solve social problems by working for candidates and political parties. After election day, I can show my interest by writing to my representatives. I asked my congressman how he handles his mail. He explained that while his secretary tallies form letters and telegrams, he reads any unusual letters. Often he finds valuable solutions he can incorporate into legislation.

In addition to political responsibilities, I have social ones. They include not only obeying the laws and paying taxes, but also serving in the military when I am called, conserving our natural resources, and promoting understanding among my neighbors. We all appreciate a clean, friendly community, and we can achieve it if we join in worthwhile projects. For instance, I like to work at the Recycling Center because I enjoy the company and I know that salvaging can prevent scarcities. Car pools not only reduce pollution, and save energy, they give neighbors and co-workers a chance to get better acquainted.

My final responsibility is spiritual. To fulfill it, I must cultivate a deep-rooted feeling of respect for everyone. Not just those around me, but those who have gone before. I must honor the founding fathers. They taught us how to endure hardships without complaining, to face problems courageously, to seek constructive solutions, and to treat opposing opinions with respect. Essentially, by spiritual duty is to promote the well-being of all. For as John Donne so aptly stated, "No man is an island, entire of itself. Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main."

I'm not going to waste the 70's in muddling. I'm going to think positively and act constructively. The bicentennial period is the time for all of us to renew our pledges of allegiance.

Allegiance to democracy, the noble experiment.

Allegiance to our country—whose piney woods and purple mountain majesties are so loved by us all.

And allegiance to the spirit of the founding fathers, a spirit which is positive, constructive, therefore American.

EMIGRATION OF SOVIET JEWS TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of Soviet Jews have been emigrating to the United States and the agency that has made the transition to a new life possible is United HIAS Service.

This remarkable worldwide immigration service has done an outstanding job through the years in assisting immigrants and has responded in its tradition of compassion and efficiency to the needs of the migrating Soviet Jews.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD a summary of the activities of HIAS during the past year:

HIAS NEWS RELEASE

Increased emigration of Soviet Jews to the United States and Canada was the major concern of United HIAS Service in 1974, reported Gaynor I. Jacobson, executive vice president of the worldwide migration agency, in his annual year-end report.

During 1974, 20,634 Jews left the Soviet Union. Of these, 3,490 requested and received HIAS assistance to come to the United States, an increase of more than 2,000 over 1973.

An additional five hundred HIAS-assisted Soviet migrants emigrated to countries other than the United States, including Canada and Australia, New Zealand, Latin America, Western Europe, pushing the total of HIAS-assisted Soviet migrants in 1974 above 4,000.

While the total number of Jews allowed to leave the Soviet Union dropped by 40 per cent in 1974, a greater proportion of those leaving were referred to HIAS in Vienna by the Jewish Agency, primarily for family reunion in countries other than Israel. The Jewish Agency referral rate to HIAS climbed from 3 per cent in the early months of 1973, to over 30 per cent in the last months of 1974.

"It's important to keep immigration trends in perspective," Mr. Jacobson emphasized. "Israel's record of absorption is unequalled in modern history. Since 1971, of the nearly 100,000 Jews leaving the Soviet Union, 95,000 have successfully resettled in Israel.

"We anticipate that Soviet Jews will again make up the largest single group of HIAS-assisted migrants in 1975," continued Jacobson, "though it is difficult to predict the precise number. That will depend in part whether the Soviet Union permits emigration. For the moment we are projecting that HIAS will resettle at least 5,000 Russian Jews, in the coming year, 4,000 of them in the U.S. This is based on a HIAS caseload in Rome of almost 2,000 Russian Jews and the increased Soviet Jewish caseloads of non-Jewish migration agencies in Western Europe."

NON-RUSSIANS HELPED TOO

Not all migrants who received HIAS' help in finding countries of resettlement came from the U.S.S.R. United HIAS Service was active in Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe resettling close to 2,500 refugees from countries including Morocco, Tunisia and Rumania. By the end of 1974 HIAS had moved more than 6,500 from all corners of the globe, an increase of 66% over last year's figure of 3,900.

Forty-eight thousand others received preliminary processing and counseling. HIAS was also successful in helping Jews from 40 countries locate 2,250 relatives and friends from whom they had been separated for many years.

UNITED STATES, THE DESTINATION CHOICE OF 61 PERCENT OF HIAS CASELOAD

The U.S.S.R. ranked as the number one area of emigration for the second consecutive year, contributing 64 per cent of HIAS-assisted migrants for 1974. The second largest group of HIAS-assisted migrants, 23 per cent, came from Asia and North Africa. Eastern European countries (outside of the U.S.S.R.) ranked third in emigration of HIAS-assisted cases, at 8 per cent, down approximately 10 per cent from 1973.

The United States retained first place as the destination of choice for 61 per cent of HIAS immigrants, up 10 per cent from last year; Canada supplanted Western Europe as the second ranking resettlement country, receiving 19 per cent. Western Europe, mainly France, welcomed 12 per cent of HIAS-assisted migrants in 1974.

EIGHTY-EIGHT U.S. COMMUNITIES RESETTLING RUSSIANS

Soviet Jews arriving in the U.S. are now being resettled in 88 communities by Jewish family services and other local agencies. In New York where 50 percent of the caseload settles, NYANA, (the New York Association

for New Americans) is the resettlement agency.

"We are particularly pleased that every community contacted has agreed to participate in the program," said Carl Glick, president of HIAS. "During 1974, 23 new communities joined the HIAS absorption program, and others are slated to begin accepting immigrants shortly."

In addition to providing for such basic needs as housing, vocational counseling, job placement, health care, English instruction, day care and education, agency professionals and volunteers are very much concerned with total social and religious adjustment.

Starting life anew in an open society with a free-market economy presents many new concepts for the average Russian family. Suddenly there is freedom of choice about where to live, what schools to send the children to, what to read, where to open a bank account. The abundance of consumer goods, particularly food and cars, is overwhelming.

OFFERS OF HELP

"Services offered by family agencies are being augmented with many 'extras' that make the newcomers feel a part of American life. English 'ulpan,' home hospitality, synagogue membership, free nursery school day care, shopping excursions, and cultural events are just part of the local volunteer effort," said Ann Rabinowitz, Director of U.S. Migration Services for HIAS. "Several national organizations including the National Council of Jewish Women, The Synagogue Council, the Jewish Welfare Board and B'nai B'rith have approached HIAS with offers of help. We are encouraging coordination of volunteer efforts under the umbrella of local Jewish family service agencies."

An unusually large number of Soviet immigrants—estimates run as high as 60 per cent—are classified professionals and academics. Highly trained and motivated, the migrants are anxious to make an immediate transition to the job level held in the USSR. Unfamiliar with the concept of "upward mobility" they are often reluctant to accept lower job status—sometimes the only employment immediately available—fearing they will be stuck there forever. Physicians face difficult accreditation exams which require a good command of the English language and strenuous "refresher" courses.

Despite the unique adjustment problems the Russian movement has brought, a report of the Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare indicates that a majority of Soviet Jewish immigrants studied required the same amount of time to become self-supporting as other recent immigrant groups. NYANA (the New York Association for New Americans) reports that within one or two months of arrival, 80-85 per cent of all the newcomers are in their own apartments. Within three to six months, assuming no special problems, the average Soviet family is fully self-supporting.

"The American Jewish community is demonstrating that our responsibility for the Jews of the Soviet Union does not end when the exit permit is granted," said Gaynor I. Jacobson. "The quality of life in the free world will ultimately determine the success of this historic movement."

HIAS is a beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal and of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds throughout the United States.

MS. EDELIN SPEAKS OUT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the abortion-related manslaughter conviction of

Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin, the first American black chief resident in obstetrics and gynecology at Boston City Hospital, may have far-reaching consequences not only for poor, black women, but also for the black medical fraternity. Dr. Edelin has already returned to his work at the hospital, but the shock waves from his appealed conviction have not yet subsided.

Although separated from Dr. Edelin since 1973, his wife, Prof. Ramona Hoage Edelin, recently spoke to reporters about her husband's case. Professor Edelin, a noted scholar in African-American studies, spoke eloquently in Dr. Edelin's behalf, noting the racial issue which effected this case. She is quoted in the following article from the Boston Evening Globe, February 19, 1975, edition, which I submit for the interest of my colleagues:

EDELIN'S WIFE SAYS ISSUE IS RACISM AND RELIGION

(By Carmen Fields)

"The only fair trial would have been no trial," said Prof. Ramona Hoage Edelin, wife of Dr. Kenneth Edelin, from whom she has been separated since 1973.

She was quoting Angela Davis, but speaking of the trial in which Dr. Edelin was found guilty of manslaughter in the death of an aborted fetus.

In granting her first interview since the investigation and subsequent indictment of her husband the 29-year-old head of the African-American Studies department at Northeastern University said she was "over the shock of the verdict," and all that is left now "is the anger."

"It is time we got off the fictional level, and deal with the realities of this case," she said as she sat at a large conference table in her office at Northeastern, an office filled with pictures of black students and black political leaders.

For her, the reality is not a case of abortion or manslaughter, but a case whose major issue was racism and a judgment from the perspective of the Catholic Church.

"It is ironic that the man chosen to bear the burden of trial was one who is not making money hand over fist on abortions, as some are; one who was the first American black chief resident in obstetrics and gynecology at Boston City Hospital; one who was primarily in service to the poor," she said in a soft but staccato voice that has traces of a Southern accent.

"I cannot accept the Catholic Church or the 'right to life' mentality as a regulating body. Their morality is not necessarily law nor should judgments be made as if it were," she said, pointing to the fact that the majority of jury members were Catholic and to the Catholic Church's anti-abortion stand.

"What realistically do they care about a black fetus?" she asked very calmly (but bitterly). "Yes, everyone has a right to life, but we (blacks) have a right to starve and the right to be spit upon, all in the name of an insane morality."

"These same people," she said, "are spitting and throwing rocks at black children going to school on a bus. What they perceive now as a right to life would in six years be a right to be called names."

Ms. Edelin has tried to shelter her two children, Kenneth Jr., 7, and Kimberly, 4, from the ordeal of their father's trial—a difficult task, she admitted.

Her son devours the newspapers, and anxiously watches the news on television. At school he has contended with what his moth-

er called "some insensitivity on the part of a few people," but she feels on the whole he has been spared cruel torment.

A spirit of lawlessness that began with the Nixon Administration was carried over to the jury deliberations, said Ms. Edelin, who is a PhD candidate at Boston University.

"Because lawlessness was so rampant among people in public office, you find more people now not ashamed or afraid to be bigoted. A segment of society has been shown that it does not have to obey the law."

She said the jury completely disregarded the charge given it by Suffolk Superior Court Judge James P. McGuire, a charge she described as "the clearest and fairest charge anyone could hope for . . ."

Ms. Edelin expressed annoyance with the composition of the jury, not only because the selection process discriminates against women, she said, but because blacks were excluded.

"It was obviously not a jury of his peers, or one that could be expected to be impartial."

On learning of the minimal sentence that Judge McGuire imposed yesterday, she observed that the judge "obviously supports my opinion that he was disappointed in the decision by the jury."

The expression on Judge McGuire's face when the verdict was issued stands out in Ms. Edelin's mind. "I saw him when the verdict was given and I would interpret what I saw as utter shock and dismay."

After the verdict, Ms. Edelin rushed home to tell her son, hoping to do so before the news reached the airways.

"When I got there Kenny was still taking his nap," she said. "I woke him and told him that this jury had said his daddy was guilty. His only question was, 'Are we going to take it on up?' (to a higher court). I said, 'Yes,' he laid his head down and sobbed briefly."

A native of Atlanta, Ms. Edelin was courted by Kenneth Edelin while she was a student at predominantly black Fisk University in Nashville, and he was studying at nearby Meharry Medical College.

Married in 1967, the Phi Beta Kappa graduate earned her MA degree in philosophy at the University of East Anglia, at Norwich, England, while Dr. Edelin was stationed there on a tour of duty in the Air Force.

"He chose Boston City Hospital—he could have gone anywhere in the country," she said, noting that Dr. Edelin had been president of his class at Meharry all four years.

"He made waves," she said characterizing his work at BCH. "For black women, poor, Third World women. Even before he was chief resident, he was critical of hospital policy and attitudes of some of the people that worked on the wards. He let it be known that he was not satisfied with the care of his patients."

"There is no question that he was resented by some people for making waves," she said.

Obviously still fiercely loyal to her husband, Ms. Edelin declined to discuss the separation. "There were personal problems," she said, "problems not at all involved in this clearly unjust issue."

Ms. Edelin caustically assessed the support her husband has received. Dr. Edelin, she says, is "overly generous to the physicians in this town."

He has received support from a few. "Those who have come forth are appreciated, but for every one of them, there are 10 more who have done nothing, many of whom are most affected professionally by what is decided."

"Fifty thousand dollars isn't anything to come from that community," she said, speaking of the fees already incurred in the court

battle. "That is a lot of money, however, for black people to nickle and dime up."

"Black people, intellectuals, women and liberals have all been victimized in this case. What has happened affects all these groups directly. I hope this country is not returning to the era where any time a white man says a black is guilty, he is, no matter how outrageous the charge may be."

"Who can be free if you can be tried and convicted of something that is not a crime?" she asked in a soft but vehement voice. "Legally anyone can find themselves a convicted felon at the whim of any one group."

TEACHERS AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and I are today introducing a bill to save tax money by preventing the possible misinterpretation of well-intentioned legislation enacted in late December. At that time, recognizing the economic emergency and realizing that people in public, as well as private jobs were joining the ranks of the unemployed, Congress told the States they may include public employees in their unemployment compensation package and the Federal Government would pay the cost for 26 weeks.

Now we have reports that a few States have interpreted that law—Public Law 93-567—to mean that these funds should be available to teachers during their summer vacations. They note that the Federal law is silent on this question, and indeed Public Law 93-567 is. This being so, the decision on whether to use Federal funds for this purpose is apparently subject to State interpretation.

Most States, I expect, will take cognizance of the times and of another law, Public Law 91-373. It required the States to include higher education personnel in their unemployment compensation program, but it specifically denies benefits to any public employees in that arena who have contracts for the ensuing term.

I do not believe, however, that we can afford to leave this decision to State-by-State interpretation. American taxpayers must not be burdened with paying extra vacation money for our 2 million teachers. That would be wrong even if the Federal budget were in balance. It is doubly so in this precarious year when our deficit will run between \$50 and \$70 billion.

The bill Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois and I are introducing today, therefore, would extend to our public elementary and high school teachers the same ban on unemployment benefits that now applies to professional personnel in our public colleges. We, of course, seek early committee action and congressional approval of this measure.

NO WINDFALL FOR TEACHERS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ERLNBORN) in introducing legislation to close a loophole that would allow teachers to draw unemployment compensation during summer vacation.

The loophole was created last December when Congress passed the

Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974. This legislation provides special unemployment assistance to two basic groups: Those who have exhausted their regular, additional and extended compensation; and those in a line of work which is not covered under existing State plans. The bill extends coverage to persons otherwise ineligible for regular compensation, provided they meet the State's regular wage and employment standards for compensation on the basis of total employment during the year preceding the claim. By failing to specifically exclude teachers who are not actually working at jobs

during the summer, the law permits the States to extend jobless benefits to them, and Illinois has decided to do this.

The legislation being introduced today by Mr. ERLNBORN and myself would deny summer unemployment benefits to any elementary or secondary school teacher who has a contract for the coming school year. The Congress did not intend to create a windfall profit for teachers at the expense of the taxpayer. Just as I am in favor of taxing windfall profits which accrue to big oil companies at the expense of the American consumer, so too am I against such profits evolving from Government programs. I urge its speedy enactment.

SENATE—Friday, March 7, 1975

The Senate met at 8:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In the morning and the evening and at noonday we offer our thanks to Thee, O Lord, for Thy goodness and mercy. Open our lives to Thy light and Thy truth that we may serve Thee with our whole mind and soul and strength. May the words of our mouths, and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our Strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1975.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be considered as read and approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Victor V. Veysey of California to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army; and Donald G. Brotzman of Colorado to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 4) to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to the limitation of debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 1 hour for debate on the cloture motion on Senate Resolution 4, as amended, shall be equally divided and